

Correspondence ID: 1Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Arnold, CA 95223-3371
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 09:38:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I understand they are threatened and a return may help. But unlike the Black Bear, the Grizzly is inherently a danger to human beings. It is a problem in Yellowstone, Glacier, Alaska and other areas but they have decades to deal with it and still people are harmed and killed.

DO NOT put them back in the area too small for them and risk urban/wildland encounters that will result in preventable danger to both people ad the grizzlies.

I will hike in Black bear country,. but not grizzly...too much of a risk.

Correspondence ID: 2Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 10:56:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Opportunities for in-person public comment are inadequate for this EIS. NEPA requires an EIS for actions that significantly impact the quality of the human environment. The agency has identified that an EIS is required for this action, however has scheduled a minimum of in-person meetings at locations remote from the majority of users of the area of action. For example, Newhalem, WA is as remote as one can get in Western Washington from the majority of users of the area of action, primarily recreational users of the North Cascades. This recreational user community vastly outnumbers the population of the selected location for the one public meeting on the west side of the Cascade mountain range, Newhalem (local area population estimated at less than 200).This limited public access opportunity conflicts with the requirement and intent of NEPA to provide opportunity for public comment for the impacted human community.

Correspondence ID: 3Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Grapevine, TX 76051
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 11:09:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in favor of restoring the grizzly bear to this area. It would bring the ecosystem closer to its rightful state.

Correspondence ID: 4Project:112008Document:132104

Address: patton, PA 16668
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 11:37:24

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a former resident of Washington, and someone who has spent extensive time exploring the North Cascades (I still spend most of each summer there) I oppose the restoration of grizzly bears to the ecosystem. I used to support this proposal, however, given the changes I have seen in the interim five years--including, but not limited to increased human-black bear conflict--I no longer think the reintroduction of grizzlies is a wise or viable option. course of action.

Correspondence ID: 5Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sammamish, WA 98075
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 11:58:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My wife and I hike a lot throughout the PNW. We enjoy the North Cascades trails as well as other areas like the I90 corridor, Mount Rainier and the Olympics. Having the chance to encounter a grizzly on the trail will likely prevent us from going out in those area. When considering whether to move forward and introduce grizzly bears back into the PNW, please consider hikers like us who would not be able to enjoy those areas anymore. Not everybody is comfortable hiking in grizzly country. Please reconsider this plan. Good on paper, not good in practice IMO.

Correspondence ID: 6Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ashford, WA 98304
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 12:27:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a resident and frequent recreational user of the wilderness areas of Washington State, I fully support the reintroduction of the extirpated Grizzly Bear to the region. I have previously lived in areas with active Grizzly bears (northern Wyoming) and believe that humans and bears can and should coexist with the proper management strategies. Please take this comment as my enthusiastic support of Option C. Thank you for your time and best of luck bringing this wonderful animal back to restore our historic ecosystems!

Regards,


Correspondence ID: 7Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Riverside, CA 92507
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 12:57:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We must bring back the grizzly bear! At this critical time when ecosystems are collapsing we must try to do what we can to preserve and restore what we can. The North Cascades is a huge wilderness area that can support and afford an experimental population of grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 8Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98146
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 13:32:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please record my approval for plans to reestablish a Grizzly Bear population in the North Cascades. I full support the rebuilding of the predator chain and bringing back bears to an environment where they once thrived and can thrive again. My preference is not to do this on an experimental ticket but to commit to the effort and work to build a self sufficient population.

Correspondence ID: 9Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lake Forest Park, WA 98155
United States of America

Outside Organization: Woodland Park Zoo Conservation/Preservation
Received: Sep,28 2023 13:32:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I feel fortunate enough to have spent time deep in the North Cascades, first as a teenager doing campsite building and maintenance through the North Cascades Institute and now as an adult camping and recreating in the park. I've gotten to experience the beauty and the richness of this place. Anyone who has spent time in this area knows it would be a perfect place for grizzlies to thrive, and considering it was their historic range and settlers decimated their populations it's really now our responsibility to restore their numbers here. The folks who are worried about reintroducing a large apex predator likely don't realize how avoidant grizzlies are of people, and how vast the North Cascades wilderness is. With bear safe practices and precautions already in place for those recreating here, proper bear safety is not anything new. Large carnivores are constantly demonized for existing where they've always existed, we've already made the decision to rid them from the North Cascades and we know that was wrong, we need to bring them back.

Correspondence ID: 10Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98501
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 13:34:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the growth of the grizzly population in the North Cascades. Environmental stewardship means supporting the needs of animals and the entire ecosystem. Bears to frogs. The fear of human bear encounters can be managed with education.

Correspondence ID: 11Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98122
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 13:36:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in favor of reintroducing the grizzly bears. I would leave it to the experts to determine the designation and best approach to this process. It seems like it would be good for the environment with little to no risk to humans.

Correspondence ID: 12Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98101
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 13:41:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a Seattle resident, outdoorsman, and tourist to the area, I strongly support the reintroduction of the grizzly. Growing up near Yellowstone and seeing immensely positive wolf reintroduction, I trust that the dept will similarly manage an effective reintroduction, leading to greater environments health.

Correspondence ID: 13Project:112008Document:132104

Address: CHIMACUM, WA 98325
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 13:47:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Currently, there is a closure in Terror Basin because black bears have found access to people's food. I don't think North Cascades National Park has the resources to protect bears and people effectively. There needs to be more infrastructure to allow car campers to lock food in bear lockers and more enforcement of neophyte hikers' use of bear cans.

Until the park has the backcountry ranger support and secure food storage, I don't support the re-introduction of grizzly bears. I see sad conflict on the horizon where the bears don't have a chance, people get hurt, and bears get shot. We need more funding for parks, not more issues to manage.

Correspondence ID: 14Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Columbia, MD 21045
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 13:52:41

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Restoring natural predators to the ecosystem is not only the right thing to do, especially with regards to wilderness designated areas, but have been a proven success story in other public lands, most notably Yellowstone with regards to wolves. Grizzly encounters with humans are extremely rare and backcountry programs in bear territory are easily copied from other parks. Adopting this experimental designation is a great first step.

Correspondence ID: 15Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kirkland, WA 98033
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 13:52:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My view is that grizzlies should be allowed to repopulate the North Cascades ecosystem naturally without any additional effort to accelerate the process such as importing bears from other areas. I'm an avid hiker and am in the North Cascades hiking and backpacking several times every summer and fear my visits would be less safe in the presence of a population of grizzlies. Human/bear interactions are inevitable especially if bears who don't know the area are brought in from other places, they won't know which areas to stay away from if they wish to avoid human contact. If bears filter in organically from Canada they will have a better chance to learn their way around naturally and find their place in the ecosystem. Please don't force the issue by importing bears from elsewhere.

Correspondence ID: 16Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mercer Island, WA 98040
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 13:59:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As an avid hiker I would love to see grizzly bears re-introduced to the North Cascades either in a "Threatened Species" category (my preference) or a "non-essential species" category. They will make the North Cascades more natural, healthy, and interesting. Sincerely, [REDACTED].

Correspondence ID: 17Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98118
United States of America

Outside Organization: [REDACTED] Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 14:00:21

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No. I do not want them re-introduced to Washington.

I do not believe that they are necessary to restore the ecosystem. My main concern is that I do not want to hike in areas that are a threat to my health. I do not hike in Montana for this very reason: I do not want to be attacked by grizzly bears. Let them be in other places and let Washington remain safe for hiking.

Correspondence ID: 18Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 14:00:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of Grizzlies AND wolves into North Cascades NP. Thanks for your existence dedication to mission.

Correspondence ID: 19Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bainbridge Island, WA 98110
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 14:02:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please restore the grizzlies to the North Cascades. I've hiked there many times. It's easy for humans to be safe by hiking in groups.

Thank you for considering this.

Correspondence ID: 20Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98119
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 14:09:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Yes, grizzlies should be brought back! End of story. We see other national forests and parks with grizzlies

There will need to be a lot of education, but we need to restore apex predators

Correspondence ID: 21Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 14:10:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: More bears please!

Correspondence ID: 22Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellevue, WA 98008
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 14:23:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of brown bears into the North Cascades NP. They are an integral capstone species that has been absent from the environment for far too long.

I support bringing them back as protected species, as the "experimental" tag could invite poaching.

Bring 'em back!

Correspondence ID: 23Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Issaquah, WA 98027
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 14:26:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I wholeheartedly support the reestablishment of the Grizzly Bear to the North Cascades ecosystem. I also absolutely support the Grizzly Bears being managed as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act - they will need the protection in order to become established. The bears represent a critical part of the ecosystem that is missing, and returning the bears to this ecosystem will provide important benefits to the system as a whole. Thank you! [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 24Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Pullman, WA 99163
United States of America

Outside Organization: Washington State University University/Professional Society

Received: Sep,28 2023 14:30:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a scientist I fully support active reintroduction of Grizzly Bears to the North Cascades. The science regarding large apex predators is clear, these animals are vital for promoting healthy and resilience ecological communities. As we come face to face with the negative consequences of human-driven climate change and land use modifications such as more intense forest fires using natural ecosystem-based solutions like predator re-introduction is a crucial component to ensuring that Washingtonians have access to heathland and resilient forest ecosystems.

Correspondence ID: 25Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98122
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 14:31:21

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Bring back the grizzlies! I'm supportive of alternative B or alternative C.

Correspondence ID: 26Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Redmond, WA 98053
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 14:31:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please allow recovery to happen naturally without importing Bears. I don't think I bring any novel reasons to this discussion, but any human loss of life would be a tragic consequence to this process. It seems inevitable. Even with Yellowstone's resources, there is still loss of human life. I imagine the per capita tragedy rate would be higher in the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 27Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98108
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 14:34:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I welcome a government backed effort to re-establish and restore grizzly bears to the North Cascades. They were historically a significant part of the local ecosystem and important culturally to the native peoples of the area. I strongly support an effort to relocate several juvenile bears annually to be relocated to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 28Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spokane, WA 99208
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 14:35:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a 66-year-old with a lifelong love affair for the North Cascades, I am terribly torn on this but must side against reintroducing the bears.

The more people enjoy the North Cascades, the more protection the area will get. And, frankly, grizzlies keep people away. I fear that this will reduce the number of visitors who protect the place. It also doesn't help that many ranchers and other residents who will live with these bears have already voiced opposition to them. This would potentially drive yet another wedge between environmentalists and locals, much as wolf reintroductions have--and I would argue that wolves are an even more important keystone species.

Grizzlies exist in significant numbers to the north and east of the North Cascades. This, I think, is enough.

Correspondence ID: 29Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America

Outside Organization: None Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 14:36:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support reintroducing the Brown /Grizzly Bear back to the North Cascades. They should be treated as endangered and protected from humans.

Thank you,

■

Correspondence ID: 30Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Woodinville, WA 98077
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 14:36:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As other states have shown, reintroducing animals to the environments they were originally native to is hugely beneficial. Having the grizzlies return to the North Cascades would also act as an impetus for more public engagement with state environmental efforts.

Correspondence ID: 31Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98119
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 14:36:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Yes please introduce as many as possible.

Correspondence ID: 32Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98178
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 14:37:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: YOU WANT TO PLACE THOSE MONSTERS IN A NATIONAL PARK???
A PARK FOR PETE'S SAKE?

I COULD UNDERSTAND A NATIONAL FOREST - BUT PUTTING THEM IN A NATIONAL PARK???

INSANE !!

Correspondence ID: 33Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98146
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 14:38:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hello,

I support the reintroduction of Grizzly bears into the North Cascades ecosystem.

Thanks!

█

Correspondence ID: 34Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 99103
United States of America
Outside Organization: Troutdogs LLC Business(Official Rep.)
Received: Sep,28 2023 14:39:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Our natural world is collapsing across many channels gravely endangering the survival of many species. We as a people have a moral and ethical obligation to restore and protect native animals such as the Grizzly Bear. For hundreds of years, Grizzlies roamed the vast wilderness of the North Cascades. Through man's intervention, the species was hunted to near extinction. Please reintroduce this iconic animal to its former habitat. Wherever Grizzly bears thrive, the natural order in nature is restored and ecosystems are replenished.

Correspondence ID: 35Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 14:43:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please no grizzlies in the cascades. Yes they used to be there but they were also at the corner of 3rd and pike street. That is not a reason to reintroduce a top predator in a mega hiking area.

█

Correspondence ID: 36Project:112008Document:132104
Address: University Place, WA 98466
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 14:46:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I grew up in California. I hunted deer and quail on family land in the Sierra foothills in the Mother Lode country. I remember thinking the grizzly bear on the state's flag was still alive as a species in the state and wondered if I'd ever see one from the car. Later, I learned that California's last grizzly was seen in the 1920s. I felt cheated. Decades later, long after I received my degree in Biology, I was deer hunting near Saranac Lake NY. I had inherited a collectable deer rifle from an uncle and had it with me that day, and because black bears were 4X as common as deer in that part of the country, I also carried a 9mm pistol in a shoulder holster in case I was attacked by one of those bears and needed more than just one shot to hit the attacker after missing the first shot from the rifle. The rifle was carried in a shoulder sling as I was walking.

The sun was going down, and it was time to get back to my vehicle, parked on the dirt road a ways off from where I had been hunting. I was walking on a broad clearing under the major power lines that carried electricity from Quebec into New York. There was a thin line of densely needled conifers to the left of me. One couldn't see through the foliage. I emerged from the trees near the edge of the road where the vehicle was parked. Then I noticed that a wolf had emerged from the other side of the trees at the same time I did. We stared at each other. I never unslung the rifle from my shoulder, and I never reached for the pistol. I just stared in awe and amazement. The wolf stared at me too, but showed absolutely no sign of fear or aggression. We just stared at each other. After what seemed to be many, many minutes, we simultaneously turned our backs to each other and walked in opposite directions alongside the road. I turned around once to look at the wolf again, and the wolf looked at me, and that was the last of that encounter. I never reported it.

When I started snorkeling and scuba diving in the ocean, I was warned about how dangerous sharks were too, and there were supposedly many of them in Monterey Bay, where I used to dive. Later, I learned we had to worry only about great whites and blues. I never saw either of them. Later, when I was diving in Hawaii, I saw many sharks, individually, and in large groups, and I reveled in the opportunity. I grew up.

A few weeks after I encountered the wolf, I saw an article in the New York Times that said for the first time in many decades, a grey wolf had been sighted in New York state--near Albany, about 150 miles south of Saranac Lake. That changed my life and my appreciation for sharing our planet with other living things--even ones we might have been taught to fear when we were young. The grizzly bears are like that. Let them come back. The chances of getting attacked by a grizzly in the woods is less than the chance of being killed by a car or truck getting to where you see the bear.

Correspondence ID: 37Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 14:47:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am strongly in support of reintroducing grizzly bears to the North Cascades. In addition to the support of the tribes, and many people who view the North Cascades as valuable wilderness, there should also be significant benefits to the ecosystem. As revealed in the wolf reintroduction in Yellowstone, the trophic cascades resulting from the presence of top predators in an ecosystem can be truly transformative in ways that are difficult to predict. Thus, this could be a wonderful experiment in rewilding, or rather further-wilding, since the North Cascades is already a very wild area. At any rate, it is part of the bears' historic range, and they should be restored to it.

Correspondence ID: 38Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 14:50:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Do not bring back the grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 39Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sammamish, WA 98074
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 14:55:01

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I sympathize with the goal of introducing a species back into its historical range (they were here first, right?) but I'm concerned about the aggressive nature of grizzly bears and the potential for conflict with hikers and other outdoor recreational users in the north cascades. It is a wilderness area but one that gets a fair amount of use by people. I can say that if grizzly bears are introduced into the north cascades I will no longer go hiking in that area for fear of getting attacked. Based on the number of people that are attacked in Montana and Wyoming every year it is not an unsubstantiated concern.

Correspondence ID: 40Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Issaquah, WA 98027
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 15:01:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Leave the park as is. There's no need spend time and resources on adding grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 41Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bothell, WA 98011
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 15:02:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am strongly in favor of the reintroduction of Grizzlies to the North Cascades ecosystem. Grizzly bears are a natural part of the North Cascades and would help ensure a balanced biotic community. As an avid hiker, climber, and hunter who has traveled through Grizzly country I believe we can strike a balance between property owners, recreation, and resource development while reintroducing a historically significant population to its native range.

Correspondence ID: 42Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98125
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 15:04:41

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support a managed reintroduction of Grizzlies back into the North Cascades, in particular the plan to treat them as a threatened species. In general, I believe the NPS should follow guidance from local tribes whenever possible. Thank you for allowing us to comment on this.

Correspondence ID: 43Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98107
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 15:10:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have long been a hiker in the north cascades & there IS ROOM for grizzlies. If other grizzly mountain states have too many, they should come to us.

Correspondence ID: 44Project:112008Document:132104
Address: North Bend, WA 98045
United States of America
Outside Organization: Si View Metropolitan Park District Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 15:12:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I would like to see Grizzly Bears reintroduced to the Central Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 45Project:112008Document:132104
Address: EDMONDS, WA 98020
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 15:17:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: No to reintroduction. Leave them be where they are, relying on natural recovery.

Correspondence ID: 46Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bremerton, WA 98310
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 15:20:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of grizzly bears in the North Cascades under the designation and treatment of an endangered species.

Correspondence ID: 47Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Snoqualmie, WA 98065
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 15:21:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Bring on the bears.

Correspondence ID: 48Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Des moines, WA 98198
United States of America
Outside Organization: Self Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 15:22:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Spread the grizzlies. The more natural species we introduce, the better for our wilderness

Correspondence ID: 49Project:112008Document:132104
Address: San Diego, CA 92104
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 15:24:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Bring the Grizzlies back! Doing so aligns with the US's commitment with the 30x30 initiative and the Biden administration's Conserving and Restoring America the Beautiful report.

Correspondence ID: 50Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Moses Lake, WA 98837
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 15:27:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No...do not introduce Grizzly bears into Washington State. Unless the intention is to keep people from enjoying the wilderness. Being from Alaska, and spending lots of time in the woods, I had way too many encounters with Brown Bears. It is a very scary experience. Even being heavily armed. A good friend of mine, a hunting guide was mauled by a Grizzly. He hesitated for a second, with his gun pointed at the bear, thinking it would walk away. That is all it took for him to almost die. Folks in Alaska learn to read wildlife...black bear, moose, brown bear...and can usually avoid harm...but it only takes a second! Folks, generally in the lower 48 do not know how to read wildlife, it actually takes on the job practice. Folk will suffer. I strongly encourage you to flush this idea.

Correspondence ID: 51Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Maple Valley, WA 98038
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 15:28:03

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I wholeheartedly support restoring the grizzly bear population to the North Cascades!

Correspondence ID: 52Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Shoreline, WA 98020
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 15:28:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Bring the grizzlies back!!!!

Correspondence ID: 53Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kent, WA 98031
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 15:32:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As an apex predator, grizzlies need to be reintroduced to the North Cascades. Human interaction is unlikely, and competition for other game species with hunters is likely to be minimal. Grizzlies are a vital natural resource to our area, and with their reintroduction we are one step closer to balancing and restoring what settlers damaged.

Correspondence ID: 54Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tacoma, WA 98422
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 15:34:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No, thank you!

Grizzlies are amazing creatures, but increasing the likelihood of their contact with humans will put both humans and the grizzlies at risk. It also risks destabilizing an ecosystem that has adapted to their absence. The unintended consequences could be disastrous.

Very specifically and most personally: when it comes to hiking, backpacking, and other backcountry adventures, black bears are one thing. Grizzlies are something else entirely.

And even if they once dwelt in peaceful cohabitation with local tribes, the land and its inhabitants have changed since they once walked among us.

Correspondence ID: 55Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Carnation, WA 98014
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 15:35:58

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My family and I enjoy back-country hiking and camping in the North Cascades. For the restoration of this beautiful ecosystem we support the reintroduction of this (and other) native keystone species. We consider the communities of the Methow Valley our own, and understand the real-world implications of living in proximity to large predators. As part of the reintroduction effort, resources should be dedicated to educating locals on bear safety, to warning systems, and to relocate animals which frequent populated areas. In addition a fund should be established that reimburses locals for damages done to their persons and/or property by wildlife.

Correspondence ID: 56Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sedro Woolley, WA 98284
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 15:39:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Would you folks please just get this done!

Of course the grizzlies should have a right to exist in this massive park. The black bears are much more dangerous to man than grizzlies are.

Quit with all the talking dammit and just get it done. The faster the better!!!

Correspondence ID: 57Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98102
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 15:40:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please reintroduce grizzlies into Washington state! I love predators, and our environment is much healthier with them.

Thank you!

Correspondence ID: 58Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98118
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 15:40:21

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We should restore grizzly bears to the Cascades to help bring the habitat back to its previous state. Grizzlies are an important part of the mountain environment. Additionally, it would benefit outdoor recreation.

Correspondence ID: 59Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Anacortes, WA 98221
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 15:41:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: NO to grizzlies in the north Cascades. Why would we want a major predator roaming where people hike? It would probably keep me from enjoying a hike.

Correspondence ID: 60Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Kirkland, WA 98034
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 15:43:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I fully support reintroducing Grizzly Bears into the cascades. I think either direction could work - as an endangered species with full protection and/or as an experimental species with less protection. Stronger protection is good, but what is most important is that we find a way to bring back the Grizzly

Correspondence ID: 61Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 15:43:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: PLEASE reintroduce Grizzly Bears to their native habitat of the North Cascades Range. God would want that!

Thank you,


Correspondence ID: 62Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Twisp, Wa, WA 98856
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 15:45:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Too late for this to be done safely. The wild/urban interface has expanded in the north Cascades, and humans are everywhere all the time, summer and winter. I am no "griz" expert, but I have been around them in Montana. I think this is a very bad idea that is highly likely to result in bear/human conflict.

Correspondence ID: 63Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 15:45:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly support reintroducing grizzly bears into the North Cascades. This is their home. Their absence has had systemic ecological impacts. Their return is needed, with urgent haste.

Correspondence ID: 64Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98136
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 15:46:56

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a general rule, any species that lived in this region before 1850 should be allowed to live here now. The north cascades in particular is a great place to establish a healthy population that will in turn likely enrich that area for other species. Please reintroduce the grizzlies and protect them strongly.

Correspondence ID: 65Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kirkland, WA 98034
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 15:47:58

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am supportive of having grizzly bears being reintroduced to the North Cascades with the provision that they cannot be hunted.

Correspondence ID: 66Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98136
United States of America

Outside Organization: N/A Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 15:49:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I prefer the nonessential experimental population option, because as we've seen with the existing bear populations, humans don't handle these challenges well and habituated Grizzlies would be extremely dangerous.

Correspondence ID: 67Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Næstved, UN 4700
Denmark

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 15:52:03

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As former proved by reintroducing old animals to an area, is that it leads the area to a positive change.

Even as a foreigner, do I love going to the US and its national parks, to support and preserve the nature the land got. I hope for Grizzlies to return so the area may once more, find another thriving path. Bears help uproot plants which may suffocate other important plants, while also clearing the path for plants which may have been losing.

Turning of soil can also help plants spread to get nutrition as their roots may be too short once the nutrition in the local ground area has run dry.

Correspondence ID: 68Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98109
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 16:03:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support returning grizzly bears to the Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 69Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 16:11:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Thank you for seeking input.

As a Seattle-born local who has been an avid hiker / backpacker all around the Northwest since I joined the Boy Scouts 55 years ago, I vote no grizzlies.

They are simply too dangerous.



Correspondence ID: 70Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98274
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 16:12:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not institute any federal grizzly bear recovery actions in the North Cascades. This huge wilderness area is adjacent to bears across the border in British Columbia. As noted in the reports, the North Cascades is prime grizzly bear habitat. As such, it may take time, but we should let nature take its course as to when grizzly bears establish themselves south the border. This may not be the timeline that some recovery proponents would like, but there really is no reason for rushing recovery plans and there quite frankly may be many reasons not to add another layer of federal policies, goals and laws that could end up in conflict with bigger issues.

One of those "bigger issues" we are facing is the local, regional and national impacts of fires. Rural communities and ultimately urban communities both have a stake in how federal and state agencies manage or mismanage what happens to our public lands. Smoke does not just stay over the fire. It will take multiple decades to reverse the damage of the policy that promoted the elimination of logging on much of our federal and state lands, while simultaneously promoting "let it burn" policies. Over the last couple of years we are beginning to recognize the error of these past "protection" policies. As a result, we are returning to thinning forests around rural communities as a recognition that it is necessary to protect those communities, while also seeking to move in a direction where we try to get ahead of small fires before they become huge fires and impact the health of many more people and wildlife on a state, regional or even continental scale.

We can probably better protect grizzly bears and grizzly bear habitat by continuing to get our fire and forest policies in order. Adding a "layer" of separate grizzly bear protection actions / policies may only create another point of conflict in achieving larger and more important goals.

Thank you

Correspondence ID: 71Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Camano Island, WA 98282-6654
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 16:12:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzlies will naturally migrate on their own. They will follow the food sources when needed. By placing them you are putting lives at risk. Hunters and hikers will be killed. Mind your own business, the bears do fine without you.

Correspondence ID: 72Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Federal Way, WA 98023
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 16:16:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Bears deserve to be restored to their natural land! The eco system and environment will only benefit!

Correspondence ID: 73Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 16:20:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzlies have for centuries been an important part of this ecosystem. This is their home, and we should let them return to it. Nature is a delicate and irreplaceable thing, and we should atone for the sins of over-hunting these creatures to the point of their local extinction.

Correspondence ID: 74Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98178
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 16:24:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please add grizzlies back into their original habitat. We need these keystone species!

Correspondence ID: 75Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bremerton, WA 98312
United States of America
Outside Organization: N/A Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 16:27:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I think reintroducing grizzly bears to the North Cascades is an excellent idea. It would help restore the food chain. The North Cascades are relatively remote, so it would not be a public concern.

Correspondence ID: 76Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Friday Harbor, WA 98250
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 16:28:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the right to arm bears with more land.

Correspondence ID: 77Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98101
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 16:29:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Restore the ecosystem and bring back the grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 78Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98109
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 16:31:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I don't believe that the government should forcibly relocate grizzly bears from their known environment to the North Cascades. If grizzly bears migrate on their own, that is a different story.

Correspondence ID: 79Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bothell, WA 98011
United States of America
Outside Organization: Citizen Unaffiliated Individual(Official Rep.)
Received: Sep,28 2023 16:36:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I have coyotes, deer, Bob Cats, black bears looking for open trash can, rabbits, squirrels etc roaming through my well treed landscape. Some coyotes trot up our front street with their prey in their mouths. Then I see signs around the neighborhood about a lost cat or dog. Grizzlies will help cull the herd of obnoxious campers. Oh, I'm kidding, I guess. At least we can still carry an AR plat form pistol with grandfathered clips.

Correspondence ID: 80Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Gig Harbor, WA 98332
United States of America
Outside Organization: concerned hiker, hunter Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 16:38:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Are you people shitting us, what would you do something like that for. The grizzly belongs where there are no people around, they will be migrating and filtering into low lands, where the food is plentiful. You already have designated no hound hunting for cougar, or black bears to control populations of these animals. All this will do is make more hikers, mountain bikers, and hunters vanish, as they will be the prey. Then WDFW will have to hire out designated killers of these animals after they have mauled or killed children, animals, people.

Correspondence ID: 81Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Cle Elum, WA 98922
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 16:42:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Are you crazy? If you want grizzly bears please deposit them where YOU live and leave the rest of us to live in peace. We are already inundated with black/brown bears, we don't need more and if you think they'll stay where you put them I have a bridge to nowhere I will sell you. PLEASE don't do this.

Correspondence ID: 82Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mountlake Terrace, WA 98043
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 16:42:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a person who never wants to come across a grizzly ever

In the wild. I think they still have a place in Washington, they were here in these amazing mountains and forest way before colonizers came and drove them out. I think helping the population of these amazing giants should be helped to grow to a sustainable population. With that said, I am not aware of the ecological impact their return may have on plant and other wild life. As they have been grown from the Washington regions for decades. My hope is you give these animals a chance to find out. I wish the current grizzly residing in the north cascades a happy winter and may future bear be just as lucky to see those mountains.

Correspondence ID: 83Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wenatchee, WA 98802
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 16:45:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Yes. A human caused mistake has the chance to be rectified. The number of bears proposed over a century is not a big ask.

Correspondence ID: 84Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mercer Island, WA 98040
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 16:46:55

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hi

I agree with the reintroduction of grizzlies to the North Cascades. Bears have a right to be there, and in an area that large we should be able to make it work. My preference would be that they are introduced away from areas adjacent to humans (ranches, campgrounds, trails) to avoid safety issues for both bears and humans.

Sincerely

██████

Correspondence ID: 85Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Woodinville, WA 98077
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 16:47:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Introducing grizzly bears to the North Cascades will mean that I, a frequent user, will now be forced to carry a firearm into the woods each time I go on a hike or climb or go camping with my family. I am not in the least bit concerned about mountain lions or black bears but grizzlies necessitate preparation.

The reality is that my wife will not even consider camping anywhere with grizzlies so this reintroduction will rob my family of one of our favorite recreational activities.

The wilderness is doing fine without these bears; don't waste time and money on this - build some more trails and parking lots, instead.

Correspondence ID: 86Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Yakima, WA 98903
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 16:51:24

Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please restore the GRIZZLY bear population
As the Skagit Tribe wishes.

Correspondence ID: 87Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Maple Valley, WA 98038
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 16:54:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I fully support the Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan. They are extremely important to the North Cascades ecosystem, and should be allowed to grow and thrive.

Correspondence ID: 88Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Arlington, WA 98223-4900
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 16:55:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do not feel safe for my family with Grizzlies in North Cascades. Thank you

Correspondence ID: 89Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98199
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 17:00:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: This sounds terrifying not gonna lie.

Correspondence ID: 90Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Gold Bar, WA 98251
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 17:00:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I fully support grizzly bear restoration. It is long overdue to restore grizzly bears to the North Cascades. We have a once in a lifetime opportunity to bring back a keystone/umbrella species that will benefit the entire North Cascades ecosystem. I will add that we owe it to the tribes of the PNW who hold this animal in such high regard. The cultural and spiritual significance of grizzlies for Indigenous Peoples is well documented.

Correspondence ID: 91Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 17:02:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I in in favor of restoration of a balanced ecosystem, which I believe has to include top predators, other than ourselves. Nature has taken millions of years to develop what we have destroyed in just a few generations. If we are able to restore what we have destroyed, there might still be hope for our survival. I understand why many of us fear these animals but if we truly are intelligent, we must respect the balance of nature, which requires predators along with the rest of us.

Correspondence ID: 92Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Fairfax, VA 22030
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 17:08:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Thank you for your service. I respectfully support Alternative C, to reintroduce, relocate, and restore grizzly bears to the US portion of the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE) and surrounding areas and designate the population as a nonessential experimental population (NEP) under section 10(j) of the ESA. I have significant family in and around the NCE and am a repeated visitor to the area. I believe grizzly bears are a part of the cultural heritage of the NCE and belong back in the ecosystem. Although I have sympathy for Alternative B, I believe Alternative C would be more practical and represent a fair compromise with those who may have some apprehension over grizzly bears being restored to the area. I believe that the NCE is a viable habitat and terrain for grizzly bears, and I do not believe their reintroduction would negatively impact tourism or the economy of the surrounding areas in any material manner. I support FWS having the tools to engage in adaptive management and to work with other stakeholders, including the WDFW and Tribes, to manage the new grizzly bear population and hopefully reduce conflict. I would encourage FWS to pursue non-lethal methods to haze bears and mitigate the risk of conflict and depredation if at all reasonably possible, although I understand that hard decisions may occasionally have to be made. Once again, I respectfully support Alternative C to restore grizzly bears to the NCE as a NEP under Section 10(j) of the ESA. Thank you for your team's very hard work on this project to date - I'm excited for what's to come.

Correspondence ID: 93Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98119
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 17:08:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support Alternative C of the Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan. Grizzlies belong in their historic range in the North Cascades. Humans caused their disappearance from this range and it is only right that we help restore them. The grizzly is a symbol of the American west, as well as having ecological, ecosystem benefits.

Correspondence ID: 94Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98107
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 17:10:37

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Bring back the grizzlies! The national park service is supposed to be an organization that preserves the natural landscapes and wildlife within them. It is this wildness that brings people to enjoy their time in the parks. If the ability to bring animals back to their native habitats is possible, it makes sense to do it. Much of the North Cascades National Park is designated as wilderness, and as such, the wildlife that helps balance the ecosystem belongs in the park.

Correspondence ID: 95Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98112
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 17:11:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm for the 'Alternative No-Action' proposal in the document. Introducing Grizzly Bears into this area will only result in greater conflicts with humans and will reduce already struggling ungulate populations which the state has failed to manage properly outside of the park. We should let Grizzly's repopulate naturally from Canada and the east.

Correspondence ID: 96Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Woodinville, WA 98072
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 17:11:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the return of grizzly bears to the North Cascade mountains.

Correspondence ID: 97Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 17:15:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I would like to offer my comment in opposition to the assisted reintroduction of Grizzly Bear into the north cascades ecosystem. I consider myself an environmental advocate and strongly support the protection of all endangered or threatened species. However, large and aggressive predators are unique species that create significant safety concerns for the millions of people that recreate in the North Cascades. Unlike much the rest of Grizzly habitat, the North Cascades are close to multiple large cities and the decision to reintroduce would have complex, permanent, and often negative implications for millions of people near the places they live and work. This is an remarkably poor use of our federal dollars in an era of destabilizing budgetary deficits. Please choose to prioritize other environmental protections.

Correspondence ID: 98Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Issaquah, WA 98027
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 17:16:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As an avid hiker and trail runner in the North Cascades, I would prefer grizzly bear NOT be reintroduced to the North Cascades.

I have spent a good amount of time in British Columbia, Montana, and other areas of Grizzly habitat, and it always makes it more difficult for myself, as well as other animals, to enjoy freedom in the mountains. We already have multiple predators such as Cougar and Wolves, so I do not believe we need it for balance in the ecosystem.

With populations in Canada, Montana, Wyoming, and Alaska, Grizzly bears are not believed to be in danger as a species, so I do not believe they need to be on a historic range and will ultimately cause more human/bear contact. Also, being so close to a major metropolitan area with many unexperienced hikers, I believe you will see a much smaller percentage of outdoors people taking necessary precautions such as carrying bear spray and/or sidearm, making noise, and properly storing food. A large population of black bear in Washington has already not triggered these precautions in many, and with the elimination of spring bear, that population is likely to increase as well.

If you do move forward, please do it as an experimental population so if we do have the inevitable, unfortunate bear/human conflict, we are more able to readily remove trouble bears from the landscape.

Thank you, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 99Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 17:18:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I would support the following reintroduction strategy

One option outlined in the plan would allow grizzly bears to be managed as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act, and only permit some to be captured, moved or killed under specific circumstances, like the defense of life and scientific or research activities.

Correspondence ID: 100Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Sedro woolley, WA 98284
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 17:19:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I oppose adding more grizzlies to the North Cascades. I do not think this is beneficial from an environmental or social aspect.

Correspondence ID: 101Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Shelton, WA 98584
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 17:20:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please, NO!. Let the Grizzly bear population return naturally - we don't need human inference into a natural process. It becomes a waste of resources to track and monitor the success or lack of success, The NPS has other needs with much higher priorities, like a massive maintenance backlog. It appears you must have too many employees dreaming up something to make themselves relevant. With your logic we should reintroduce Smallpox and Polio since it was here naturally at one time.

Once again, please do not introduce a Grizzly population to the North Cascades.

I hope you're listening,

Correspondence ID: 102Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 17:22:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please restore/repopulate the grizzly population in the North Cascades National Park. I fully support this action.

Correspondence ID: 103Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Ardenvoir, WA 98811
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 17:22:47
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Yes, bring the. Back. Restore the ecosystem. The wilderness is not complete without that apex predators. I hike. Camp, hunt and fish in the north cascades, and I have worked, camped. Fished and hiked extensively in Alaska and Montana. As long as people respect the bears the danger is very minimal.

Correspondence ID: 104Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98109
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 17:23:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please reintroduce Grizzlies to the North Cascades and manage them under the Endangered Species Act. Grizzlies are vital to the ecosystem of the North Cascades and they have a right to thrive there.

Correspondence ID: 105Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Stanwood, WA 98292
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 17:25:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am concerned to hear that the NPS is considering restoring the Grizzly bear population in the Northwest. The communities that have settled in the north cascades are not equipped to deal with the issues relating to grizzlies. I believe repopulating grizzlies into the north cascades will increase the level of fear surrounding grizzlies to a public that is not used to them and make for misunderstandings more common. I am concerned that if these misunderstanding occur enough that people in general will stop wanting to explore the trails of the north cascades as frequently causing a larger negative impact.

Correspondence ID: 106Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Vancouver, WA 98661
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 17:29:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: No

Correspondence ID: 107Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Shoreline, WA 98155
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 17:29:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Good day,
Efforts to restore and "rewild" our ecosystems is crucial to their preservation and balance.
I would support any effort to return the original harmony to these vital ecosystems that we are also a part.
From bacteria to bear, it is all part of the amazing mechanics.
Thank you for your time

Correspondence ID: 108Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Sedro-Woolley, WA 98284
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 17:33:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Strongly in favor of reintroduction of grizzlies to their native habitat. It is an ecological niche that has been missing for too long and is culturally important for the first peoples of this area. They should be reintroduced and fully protected under the ESA.

Correspondence ID: 109Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98112
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 17:35:58

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please bring back grizzly bears to the North Cascades. Grizzly bears lived in the region for thousands of years before humans nearly hunted them to extinction. The Upper Skagit people of the North Cascades, who coexisted with the bears for thousands of years, fully support the reintroduction of grizzlies to the region. Additionally, the excitement from seeing a grizzly in the wild in national parks such as Glacier is truly amazing. Please make sure the national park is properly staffed to train hikers proper food storage and behavior to avoid endangering the bears. A fed bear is a dead bear.

Correspondence ID: 110Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Snohomish, WA 98290
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 17:39:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzlies are not only dangerous to humans in this heavy use area but will compete with the black bears for territory. Want to see Grizzlies go to Yellowstone or Alaska. I don't want to carry a gun for safety when I hike. Dumb idea, not only no but hell no!

Correspondence ID: 111Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Renton, WA 98058
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 17:40:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I don't understand why we would do this? Our deer and elk populations are already dwindling due to predators not being managed properly. Why would we need to add more predators when we already have an exploding bear population with no potential to manage due to reduced hunting seasons. Population control of other animals can be done by black bears and humans. We don't need to add more predators to the system.

Correspondence ID: 112Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Everett, WA 98208
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 17:43:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Reintroduce the grizzlies as an endangered species

Correspondence ID: 113Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98106
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 17:46:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Yes, please relocate grizzlies to the North Cascades! Top predators create a healthy and balanced ecosystem.

The North Cascades are remote and wild enough to support a good sized population. I've been excited to read about wolverines and wolves in the area, and I can't wait to read about how grizzly bears fit in.

Correspondence ID: 114Project:112008Document:132104

Address: seattle, WA 98118
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 17:48:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Yes let the grizzly back on their home turf. A balanced ecosystem is a healthy ecosystem. There is ample evidence of what happens when you remove predators. Example, the effect on wildlife and rivers and land with the removal of wolves. Deer and elk proliferated. They over grazed the land causing rivers to heat up due to lack of trees, As stated by others, the indigenous peoples learned to co exist with these predators. We need to learn from them. Mother nature knows what she is doing. Stop tinkering with wild life because you "know better"; You don't

Correspondence ID: 115Project:112008Document:132104

Address: SEATTLE, WA 98117
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 17:49:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Don't black bears give the ecosystem the same benefits without the drawbacks of grisly deaths of hikers in the north cascades range? I'd vote no to introducing grizzly bears to this region.

Correspondence ID: 116Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Anacortes, WA 98221
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 17:51:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears should not be reintroduced into the north cascades. There are increasing numbers of people recreating in the national park including hikers, campers, climbers, and tourists. The risk to people will increase as the population of both people and bears increases in the future decades. The risk to life and health to people in the park is not worth the ecosystem advantages. Even if the risk is low, there is also a psychological risk to people worried about a grizzly encounter. People go into the wilderness to reduce their worries not increase them.

Correspondence ID: 117Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lynnwood, WA 98036
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 17:54:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm opposed. Please withhold personally identifiable information from public review.

Correspondence ID: 118Project:112008Document:132104

Address: SUQUAMISH, WA 98392
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 17:57:01

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a hiker and outdoor recreation enthusiast, I am opposed to the re-introduction of Grizzly Bears to the North Cascades. The risk/benefit reward skews too far toward risk. My response is NO.

██████

Correspondence ID: 119Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bonney Lake, WA 98391
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 17:58:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Fuck no. Stop fucking with the current eco system. Cougars with their over population are hunting in families of 3 to 9. I have pictures. Devastating the elk and deer its not Yellowstone fire the person with these dumb ideas.

Correspondence ID: 120Project:112008Document:132104

Address: San Jose, CA 95129
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 18:00:12

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Short answer: Grizzlies belong in the Northern Cascades!

Long answer: Before people pushed grizzlies out, grizzlies thrive on the land. It was their home and because of that they were respected by the tribes living in the area. The agendas of people, ie: farmers should not be allowed to hijack the natural order of things. Doing so destroys our ecosystems and the spirit of humanity and nature, in this case, grizzly bears co-existing respectfully in an area large enough for both to thrive. We harm other beings out of our own fear and agendas and that is not something to be proud of or a message worth teaching anyone. Our children and their children deserve so much more. Trump is also to blame for much of this destruction. He is toxic to all living things. This is not a political decision. This is about advocating for the voiceless and supporting nature: animals' right/climate/ecosystem, in a way that respects and restores the natural order of things. Thank you for listening and considering the public's opinion. That's incredibly refreshing.

Sincerely,

██████

Correspondence ID: 121Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America

Outside Organization: self-employed writer Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 18:00:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Yes they should be restored. They were here and this was their home.

Correspondence ID: 122Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 18:03:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please bring back the grizzly! Our ecosystem needs apex predators to be healthy and in balance.

Correspondence ID: 123Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98106
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 18:06:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The thought of reintroducing grizzlies to the cascades goes against nature. Natural selection removed them for a reason. Don't drop bears into an environment they intentionally left. We have far too many hikers and outdoorsmen around here that will encounter them. The first injury or death of a person or a bear is the fault of the party who decides to approve this. Who wants that blood on their hands? Keep the bears where they have decided to be.

That's my two cents,

Thanks,
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 124Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 18:07:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear NPS,

I do not support the reintroduction of the grizzly bear into the North Cascades. As someone who has recreated in areas with grizzlies the steps to prevent conflict are difficult to adhere to successfully in the presence of large scale human activity, similar to what we see here in Washington state, and most importantly are no guarantee of safety. Although it is unfortunate that grizzlies do not roam their natural ranges, human injury and death are guaranteed outcomes with their introduction into the Northern Cascades. As someone who recreates in this area I personally do not want to have carry bear spray/fire arms; it is also worth mentioning that the production to equip everyone who frequents these areas will have substantial ecological impact. The status quo is a stable equilibrium and I please hope you do not disturb it!

Best,
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 125Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Glacier, WA 98244
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 18:08:19
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I live in Glacier and would love to see these majestic bears return to our mountains. I spent two summers in Yellowstone and have had several peaceful encounters with Grizzlies. I look forward to the day that I see them in the Nooksack Valley. The ecology and the spirit of the entire area will benefit from their presence.

Correspondence ID: 126Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Sultan, WA 98294
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 18:13:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: No reintroduction of grizzly bears in North cascades. They are highly aggressive bears that cannot coexist with humans and humans who hike especially. Extended hunting licenses can take care of an over population of deer and

other wildlife that over populate. Birds have no problem distributing seeds. To release these deadly bears on purpose, who can travel miles and into human areas is playing with fire and with human lives. I know people want to save the planet n all but super monsters like grizzlies is putting countless people at risk. I vote no. It makes me and my family feel totally unsafe.

Correspondence ID: 127Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Yakima, WA 98908
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 18:14:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Yes! Absolutely restore a Grizzly Bear population, please.

Correspondence ID: 128Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Renton, WA 98058
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 18:14:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzly bears and other large, dangerous predators should not be re-introduced or given special protection in Washington State. There is plenty habitat for them in Canada, and in Alaska and other states foolish enough to give them free reign.

The animals are not particularly endangered by climate change, and can be a severe, even if rare, danger to humans. Their increased presence would have a chilling effect on human recreational use of forests and parks as well as present a danger to local communities and human residents.

Humans fought hard to eliminate many dangerous animals that can harm our species over millenia, please don't be naive and purposely re-introduce them.

Correspondence ID: 129Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Port Angeles, WA 98362
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 18:16:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am opposed to reintroduction of Grizzly bears to the North Cascades. This is prime recreational hiking country. I don't want to have to think about how to protect myself from these predators when human beings are sometimes on the menu. There are already enough grizzly in Canada, Idaho Montana and the Dakota to ensure their survival.

Correspondence ID: 130Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Lacey, WA 98503
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 18:16:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do not reintroduce grizzly bears, look at what California did. They release said grizzly bears in the wild and they killed people and had to kill the bears.

Correspondence ID: 131Project:112008Document:132104
Address: SHORELINE, WA 98155
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 18:25:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Yes. Yes they should be restored as part of our natural forest ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 132Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Snohomish, WA 98290
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 18:27:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please allow the reintroduction of grizzly bears in the north cascades. Thank you

Correspondence ID: 133Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98144
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 18:28:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Yes, please bring them back.

Correspondence ID: 134Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Stehekin, WA 98852
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 18:30:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I believe Grizzly bears should be reintroduced to the North Cascades National Park Complex. Initially they should be introduced as an experimental species for an initial period (10 years?) whereupon they should be given full protection under the Endangered Species Act.

I would also suggest they be initially introduced to area of the park north of Washington State Highway 20 and east of Ross Lake and have them expand from there.

While the grizzly bear does pose more of a threat to humans than the black bear, the risk would be significantly less than what a visitor to the park would encounter on their drive to the trailhead.

I live in Stehekin, WA, which abuts the North Cascades National Park, and have hiked hundreds of miles all over the park.

Correspondence ID: 135Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Tacoma, WA 98422
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 18:30:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The North Cascades and Washington have certainly changed over the last 50 years. One of greatest changes is the amount of people who are wandering around in the wilderness. I see the assertion that grizzly introduction will benefit the ecosystem. Could we hear more about the specific benefits? I think they would have to be sizable and compelling to outweigh the risk to human life and the fear of going out at dusk and dawn (as residents near Yellowstone would testify). Until then my vote is no.

Correspondence ID: 136Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tacoma, WA 98466
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 18:32:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am 100% in support of this plan. The land is vast and remote to allow for grizzly bear recovery with minimal human interaction (why come into a populated area if you have enough wilderness). I think people are worried for nothing--grizzlies coexist with people in many other places. Let's give the bears a chance to reclaim their native territory and thrive. It will be better for the ecosystem (and the bears!)

Correspondence ID: 137Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98107
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 18:32:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: North cascades national park service
Grizzly planning

To home it concerns:

I fully support the re-introduction of a healthy grizzly population to the North Cascades national park . I've hiked there since the 1970s and met some grizzly researchers who were studying the population in the early 1970's. At that time they thought there were 12 grizzlies roaming between Canada and the park. They were radio tagging the Bears. I recently read there are only two grizzlies between 2005 and 2015 documented in our park. The North Cascades is one of the few places in North America that could support a diversified grizzly population. This mountainous region combined with the British Columbia Manning Park should be ample room to grow the population.

It is our responsibility to ensure that wildlife exist for future generations. We just need to be smart around, grizzlies by using bear canisters, and keeping food away from our camps while hiking.

I know that ranchers have concerns about loss of livestock,, but if just like the wolves, they would employ a cowboy, and dogs encounters with bears would be few. The value of a domesticated animal like a cow can be paid for. You cannot pay for it a species that gets wiped out because of lost habitat and antiquated policies.

Sincerely,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 138Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lake Stevens, WA 98258
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 18:34:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I believe this project is more important than ever as Grizzly Bear habitats continue to decline and disappear. The North Cascades are a perfect environment for them and history has shown that to be true. Please help this amazing animal return to its home!

Correspondence ID: 139Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98125
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 18:34:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Lets GOOOOOOOO. I love nature, I love bears...let's make it happen!

Correspondence ID: 140Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Vashon, WA 98070
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 18:36:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzlies should be reintroduced to the North Cascades. Whichever method is safest for them.

Correspondence ID: 141Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Port Townsend, WA 98368
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 18:38:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I write in support of Alternative C, reintroduction of grizzly bears in the North Cascades as a nonessential experimental population. I look forward to a day when there's a self-sustaining population of grizzlies in the North Cascades. I believe the best way to get there is through the management flexibility available under ESA sec. 10(j). That flexibility will allow for greater public support and cooperation with other agencies.

I am a Washington resident, I backpack the backcountry of the North Cascades often, and I look forward to a day when I might see a grizzly bear in my state in its natural habitat. I don't think I should have to travel to Idaho or Montana to have that opportunity. I am reminded of the words of the great American conservationist Aldo Leopold, who said: "That there are grizzlies in Alaska is no excuse for letting the species disappear from New Mexico. ...Relegating grizzlies to Alaska is about like relegating happiness to heaven; one may never get there."

Correspondence ID: 142Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Port Townsend, WA 98368
United States of America
Outside Organization: none Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 18:38:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I used to hike in the Cascades a lot. I followed the rules about storing food, etc and was careful but never too worried. I was pretty relaxed. However I used to troll for salmon in southeast AK and when I went into the woods up there for berries, exploring, bird watching, I was not relaxed. I knew better. I knew to avoid the streams when fish were in them. I tried to stay in more open areas so I could sense what is happening and if I saw tracks I changed course. I was always on the lookout and listening.
I don't think hikers down here can adjust to that. If it was really remote, maybe. And only a small number bears and let that be and reassess in the future.
I also realize way too many cougars are having to be put down here because of interactions with hoppy farmers. It is not fair to the cougars and it wouldn't be fair to the grizzly bears.

Correspondence ID: 143Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Lynnwood, WA 98037
United States of America
Outside Organization: NA Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 18:42:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in favor of reintroducing Grizzly bears to the North Cascades region of Washington State.

Correspondence ID: 144Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 18:44:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Bring on the grizzlies! More bears everywhere please.

Correspondence ID: 145Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98118
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 18:46:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzly bears are an essential species and should be reintroduced and protected.

Conflicts with livestock should nev be considered in the decision to reintroduce any species to any area.

Correspondence ID: 146Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Sumas, WA 98295
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 18:46:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am opposed to reintroducing grizzlies to the area. We already have a hard enough time keeping cougar and black bear out of neighboring cities and keeping them from killing livestock. I don't even want to imagine what could potentially happen to children in eastern whatcom county.

Correspondence ID: 147Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 18:46:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Deer and (invasive, I should add) coyote populations need to be controlled, and I wholly laud the idea of a native apex predator being reintroduced.

Correspondence ID: 148Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Buffalo, MN 55313
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 18:47:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Iam in full support of grizzly bear reintroduction. Restoring grizzly bears to the North Cascades will enshrine the wild character of the park, and honor our shared commitment to coexist with all creatures, big and small.

Correspondence ID: 149Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98116
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 18:54:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not reintroduce grizzlies to the north cascades. I recreate regularly in the area and don't want the additional concern for our safety if grizzlies are present. As a hunter, I'm aware of the potential of attracting grizzlies when harvesting game and the issues around that. I realize they are different and are not an 1 to 1 substitute, but black bears are present in the area and do fill the niche to a degree. Black bears are omnivores, uproot the soil, eat similar foods, etc, and I would think the grizzlies would supplant a portion of that population as the carrying capacity of the area can only hold so many bears. It is already quite common for black bears to make their way into cities and towns, adding grizzlies would just make that worse. If grizzlies make their way back on their own I'd accept that, but I definitely don't want them transplanted to the area.

Correspondence ID: 150Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98125
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 18:59:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have done 19 six day solo backpacking trips in the North Cascades, I encountered many bear. If grizzly bears were in the population, the nature of my trips would have been compromised.

Correspondence ID: 151Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bothell, WA 98012
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 18:59:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think the effort to reintroduce a native species back into an environment where it was removed at the hands of humans is the right thing to do on many levels. As already noted, it's healthy for the forest and the fauna, and likley things we are not aware of. I realize that some people may claim it makes the outdoors more dangerous, however that is the animals rightful home and not ours - when you decide to go into thier home, you have to accept you are there on natures terms and not yours.

Correspondence ID: 152Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Silverdale, WA 98383
United States of America

Outside Organization: Myself Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 19:03:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bear should be in the north cascades. Having hiked in glacier national park and in Yellowstone I am aware that care must be taken. However grizzly are a positive symbol of wilderness. The north cascades are wild and will be a better place with grizzly bears

Correspondence ID: 153Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Roslyn, WA 98941
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 19:03:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We do not need to add grizzly bears in an environment where many humans spend time and enjoy nature. People will get hurt. Reintroducing grizzly bears is itself an artificial act. Bears likley were present throughout the puget sound lowlands as well, but we don't consider reintroducing there because that is where the folks promoting this topic live.

For those of us who spend time in these mountains, we don't need to add the threat of aggressive wildlife as an ever present threat. There is plenty of territory for bears to roam in Alaska and Canada where they face fewer interactions with people.

Correspondence ID: 154Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Los Angeles, CA 90035
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 19:03:31

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think restoring grizzlies to this habitat is important and should be attempted. Caution must be exerted over human and wildlife conflict but I think its really important to re-wild this area.

Correspondence ID: 155Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98177
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 19:06:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in support of restoring the grizzly population in the North Cascades. I am an avid hiker and climber and believe that with education we can safely co-exist.

Correspondence ID: 156Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 19:08:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Bring back grizzlies to the North Cascades, they are a critical part of the habitat!

Correspondence ID: 157Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lynnwood, WA 98087
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 19:08:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I wanted to voice my support as a resident of WA state and also as a constituent of the region as well as environmental advocate. Their return as a key stone species will be just as vital as the wolf reintroduction that occurred in Yellowstone National Park. The ecosystem that environmental enthusiasts, tourists, and hunters a lot gain the benefits that these restorations bring. You have my support. Thank you for the ability to comment!

Correspondence ID: 158Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98112
United States of America

Outside Organization: N/A Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 19:11:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please move forward with the plan to reintroduce the Grizzly Bear back into the North Cascades in my state. Saving as many species as we can needs to be of utmost importance with our endangered environments. This is their home and we pushed them out. It is time to make reparations!

Thank you,


Correspondence ID: 159Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Monroe, WA 98272
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 19:12:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the return of the Grizzly bear to the North Cascades. Thanks.

Correspondence ID: 160Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Marblemount, WA 98267
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 19:16:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am speaking as the owner of a cabin in Marblemount and a person frequently exploring the high country of the North Cascades off trail.
I do understand that grizzly bears are potentially dangerous to humans and I'm a little apprehensive about the prospect of encountering one in the wild. But they are just one of many dangers one can encounter in the backcountry.
The bears have been there for thousands of years before humans hunted them to extinction in the North Cascades. So I would support a re-introduction effort by the USFS or NPS as long as bears who have shown unprovoked aggressive behavior towards humans are removed by wildlife officials.

Correspondence ID: 161Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98177
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 19:16:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzly Bears should be in the north cascades. The reason they are not, humans. We cause the extirpation of grizzly bears. We need to fix our previous errors by helping to balance an important eco region within Washington state. It is the right thing to do. Please stop debating an issue which previous public comment has been in support of. We need to help ecosystems which we have damaged return to their natural state.

Correspondence ID: 162Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Shoreline, WA 98133
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 19:16:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Yes, restore the grizzly bear to Washington state. As a person who's lived on both sides of the mountains, I think this would be very helpful to the environment to have the grizzly bear return. I definitely would be willing to pay more taxes for this to occur. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 163Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Sandpoint, ID 83864
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 19:16:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I fully support the preferred alternative as described in the draft restoration plan EIS. I have confidence that the FWS and NPS can manage the introduced animals in a way that benefits the greater ecosystem and nearby populations of humans. Ultimately, the benefits of re-introducing these creatures into the North Cascades Ecosystem far outweigh any potential negatives.

I personally am excited for the opportunity to one day observe a grizzly in some of the most beautiful areas in Washington!

Correspondence ID: 164Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98144
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 19:20:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am commenting as a regular user of the North Cascades Park complex, including hiking, camping, backcountry camping, and visitor at lodges in Stehekin and Ross Lake.

I support the adoption of Alternate 3 (reintroduction of additional grizzly bear population with monitoring and expanded management options). I think this allows for the opportunity to restore the ecosystem to perhaps a more sustainable population of bears, bring back grizzly bears to the west coast mountains where they once roamed broadly but have been essentially eliminated. I have hiked and camped in the Northern US Rockies and Canadian Rockies and have seen firsthand that with proactive engagement tourists and local populations can co-exist with grizzly bears.

Correspondence ID: 165Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Carnation, WA 98014
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 19:22:37

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm writing in to oppose this proposal as written. Suggesting the recovery will be limited to the North Cascades (ie North of HWY 20) is misleading. The cascade mountain ecosystem is a continuous corridor running the length of the state. Grizzlies cross roads and expand their territory, and this reintroduction will lead to the population expanding throughout the Cascades. What would the public say if you messaged that bears may someday now be found at Snoqualmie Pass, Mt. Rainier, etc? I suspect you would get far more feedback - which is why you've chosen this selective scope. That is not an ethical stance for public land stewardship. You should be more transparent with their likely population growth and ranges and that this in effect reintroduces the species to the entirety of the Cascades. If you can't be that transparent, then it's the wrong choice.

Correspondence ID: 166Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98122
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 19:23:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The comment is short. Grizzlies belong in the North Cascades. The more we learn about apex predators the more we realize how important they are to the health and sustainability of ecosystems. Further, there is a psychological, emotional and spiritual benefit to humans of having wilderness be at least somewhat "wild". I am a lifelong hiker and climber and have spent many days in the North Cascades. There I've seen black bears with their cubs, moose with their young, cougars, rattlesnakes and all sorts of other animals that I feel are much more enriching to my life than any threat to it. For even a modest sustainable grizzly population in the North Cascades, they need federal protection as the a threatened species and in the event of "conflict" with humans, the balance needs to be in the grizzlies' favor, to help undo, at least a little, the centuries of the opposite balance. Thank you for your consideration.

Correspondence ID: 167Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Tonasket, WA 98855
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 19:28:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I want to support this project but I am concerned that the reintroduction of the Grizzly is being considered too hastily. I would rather see improved efforts and more resources supporting rehabilitation of the Salmon population in the target area long before reintroduction of the Grizzly.

Correspondence ID: 168Project:112008Document:132104
Address: SEATTLE, WA 98122-4665
United States of America
Outside Organization: [REDACTED] Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 19:28:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: No to grizzlies in North Cascades. I don't want to be mauled.

Correspondence ID: 169Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Blaine, WA 98230
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 19:34:47
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support grizzly reintroduction.

Correspondence ID: 170Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Black Diamond, WA 98010
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 19:40:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do not introduce grizzlies back to the North Cascades. We should limit additional damage and protect them should they naturally rehabitate the area but it would not be good.

Correspondence ID: 171Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellevue, WA 98007
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 19:41:49
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: If the government restores grizzlies it's going to lead to lots of bear encounters in a growing Washington State and that is going to lead to hurt people and bears in the long term. Bears will get habituated to trash in cities and towns, hikers will carry bear spray and guns, and I fear the park will use it as an excuse to limit access to humans

Correspondence ID: 172Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Running Springs, CA 92382-2702
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 19:43:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As an avid visitor of the National Parks and a resident of another area where brown bears suffered human caused extirpation, I fully support the reintroduction of Grizzlies to the North Cascades and other areas.

Correspondence ID: 173Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Camas, WA 98607
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 19:44:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am for introducing Grizzlies back into the North Cascades and managing them under the ESA.

Correspondence ID: 174Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 19:45:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzlys belong in the North Cascades.

Don't have much to add.

Correspondence ID: 175Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98229-8974
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 19:45:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I wholeheartedly support the reintroduction of Grizzlies in the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 176Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 19:46:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not attempt to bring back the Grizzlies in the North Cascades. It's one more thing to worry about when hiking. The money could better be spent elsewhere, there's plenty of existential issues out there.

Correspondence ID: 177Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lake Forest Park, WA 98155
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 19:46:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not release Grizzly bears into the North Cascades. We do well with the current bear population, I fear that Grizzlies would be too dangerous.
Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 178Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kirkland, WA 98034
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 19:48:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I don't think Grizzly Bears should be introduced into the N Cascades. We have plenty of apex predators already. Why complicate life for farmers & ranchers? This is going too far.

Correspondence ID: 179Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Renton, WA 98059
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 19:49:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We should take all reasonable efforts to restore a grizzly bear population to the North Cascades. Our impact on wildlife is abundant and when possible we should aide it in its recovery. A program for ranchers should be made easier to navigate when their livestock is harmed. However, at the end of the day grizzly bears should be back on the landscape.

Correspondence ID: 180Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Sequim, WA 98382
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 19:50:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I prefer the do nothing option. While grizzly bears may wander in from Canada, the fewer grizzly bears the better while I am hiking and backpacking in the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 181Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Shelton, WA 98584
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 19:51:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I feel the Grizzly population has just as much right to the North Cascades as anyone else. More so is most likely the truth of it.....what right did we have to drive them out to start with? When we as a people decide we are entitled to take what is not ours, it doesn't seem to stop our growth and theft of others right to live! Just ask any Native American what they think of us, or do we have the brass? Give the North Cascades back to the bears! Signed, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 182Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Kennewick, WA 99337-2731
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 19:54:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Yes, grizzlies belong back in the Cascades; more do than humans. They were here first. We need to stop screwing with Mother Nature.

Correspondence ID: 183Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Anacortes, WA 98221
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 19:59:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We live in Skagit County and strongly support the plan for reintroduction of grizzly bears into the North Cascades

Correspondence ID: 184Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Oak harbor, WA 98277
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 19:59:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I fully support reintroduction if there's sufficient evidence the current climate and environment can support a grizzly population (enough food, habitat,etc). Risk of fire or drought hurting introduced bears is only concern. Therefore, ideally introduced from an area with similar risk of fire/drought

Correspondence ID: 185Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98125
United States of America

Outside Organization: University of Washington School of Medicine University/Professional Society

Received: Sep,28 2023 20:01:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As someone who routinely enjoys many of both the easily accessible and remote areas of the North Cascades, I would very much like to see these native members of the ecosystem restored.

We are losing many of of natural wilderness treasures to non-natural forces including recession of glaciers, wildfires due to climate change and decades of fire suppression and factors related to overuse in some places. Although perhaps not as recent in personal human memory, grizzlies were a part of the ecosystem of the North Cascades for vastly longer than they have been absent due to well-established human factors. Their re-introduction is a relative small piece of a larger problem of human impact that we have a near term tangible and logistically realistic way to correct in a science-based manner.

I find both options B and C reasonable, but favor option C, which strikes me as a thoughtful and balanced means of giving appropriate and reasonable additional tools to the experts involved in this effort to facilitate its smoothest possible achievement. I appreciate the soundly reasoned proposal and detailed research, planning and logic that went into the published document. It is a document written by scientific experts and gives me ample confidence to put my trust in their recommendation.

While I would consider myself and my family in a higher-than-average-risk category of impact from encounters, I also know that we are high risk from encounters to a less wild or healthy ecosystems. I certainly don't wish to be harmed by a bear, but I know the odds of such with basic risk mitigation efforts I can (and do) take when in shared territory with bears bring these risks to an exceedingly low level compared to other hazards most of us tolerate already with little thought. Americans have a roughly 1% lifetime risk of dying in a motor vehicle accident, for example. The odds of similar from backcountry encounters grizzlies in established population areas elsewhere in the United States and Canada are vastly lower than the mortality risk of simply driving to the trailheads of these locations.

In sum, I favor option C. I am an advocate for making best efforts to restore, and reduce ongoing harms, to as much of the natural world as possible. I am similarly a strong proponent of science and listening to the collective wisdom of those who have spent decades learning and working to become shepherds of this knowledge (I.e. our scientists).

Correspondence ID: 186Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Carnation, WA 98014
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 20:03:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: No, we should not endanger hikers, hunters, or others that frequent the forest in the North Cascades. As we can see from Yellowstone park, there have already been problems with the reintroduction of the Grizzlies. There are many predators already in the forest keeping balance in this area for many years, and there is no need to unnecessarily increase the odds of a fatal encounter with humans by putting one of the largest predators back into close proximity with humans. As a hiker that frequents this area, it would give me great pause as to my safety with Grizzlies roaming. You just need to remember what has happened recently in Yellowstone and also similar issues in Alaska with hikers or runners to see why this is a concern

Correspondence ID: 187Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Maple Falls, WA 98226
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 20:04:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: PLEASE do NOT add Grizzly bears back to this area. We already have a ton of problem bears that are causing all kinds of problems in the Maple Falls area and nobody is doing anything about them! Now you want to add another top predator to the already challenging situation? No thank you! I have a small cabin near maple falls... I feel like i have a good pulse on the wildlife around me... I can tell you now there is NOT enough food for them to eat! In the past two years I have seen maybe a handful of deer and even less of anything g else! The ONLY thing we see in our area are bears causing all kinds of problems because they are hungry and very little being done about it!

Correspondence ID: 188Project:112008Document:132104
Address: tumwater, WA 98512
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 20:07:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please reintroduce grizzlies whether it's plan 2 or 3. Do not just do nothing.

Correspondence ID: 189Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98109
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 20:09:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: From Environmental Impact Statement, the grizzly hasn't been a major present in the cascades for more than a hundred years, I don't see why tax dollar should be spent on bringing them back now, there are more important things that need effort and money.

Plus, there will definitely be hikers and climbers to be killed by the grizzly. The only benefit I see is bringing them back for the sake of bringing them back, to restore the historical status. By the same logic we probably should bring small pox back in order to preserve natural and cultural heritage and raise public awareness of bio hazards in real life.

Correspondence ID: 190Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 981257
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 20:10:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Yes, I think grizzly bears should be reintroduced to the North Cascades as soon as possible. They were an important part of the ecosystem and would enhance its health again. Fear of grizzlies and indeed all wild animals should be handled with public education.

I would like my personal information to be withheld from public review.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 191Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Livingston, MT 59047
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 20:12:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I fully support introducing Grizzly Bears back into the ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 192Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bainbridge Island, WA 98110
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 20:12:49
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: No thanks. NC are perfect the way they are. No need to intervene.

Correspondence ID: 193Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Maple Falls, WA 98266
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 20:14:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I would love to have them back but I'm afraid the gun guys will kill them. They're already pretty trigger happy about the black bears.

Correspondence ID: 194Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Fox Island, WA 98333
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 20:14:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am not in favor of reintroducing grizzlies back into the North Cascades NP. I believe we should leave them alone where they are now and not mess with nature.

Correspondence ID: 195Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mountlake Terrace, WA 98043
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 20:16:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I'd like to say I'm a staunch supporter of this plan. I'm of the belief that since we are the ones that essentially extirpated them from the area, we ought to be the ones to help their reintroduction. It's silly to say "let nature handle it" when it wasn't nature that screwed it up in the first place.

That said, while I would like for Alternative B to be the option chosen, I feel like that would be detrimental overall. Alternative C, I think and hope, would make for a more receptive population in general, and other interested parties (particularly ranchers) specifically. I think having all tools at your disposal would be nice to have in case of any event. They haven't been in that area since the mid-19th century so there's no telling what might happen. So it's best to be prepared.

I realize that this is an incredibly divisive topic, and I know this has been floated before. I'm so happy that this might become a reality, and I sincerely wish you won't back down to special interest groups and certain politicians.

Correspondence ID: 196Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 20:17:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support Alternative A: No Action

Thank you,

A WA hiker who wishes to remain anonymous

Correspondence ID: 197Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Fircrest, WA 98466
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 20:18:03

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a frequent hiker in the North Cascades, and I know many others who are, I oppose the reintroduction of grizzly bears into the area. According to statistics, the last time grizzly bears were confirmed in the area was 1996. Leave the current ecosystem as it is. There is no need bring in wildlife that have been absent for almost 30 years. I also think it would be dangerous for recreationists who frequent the area. Recently, a runner was mauled by a grizzly near Yellowstone. I think it would impede people from visiting and enjoying the area. I know that I would think twice about hiking the North Cascades if I knew grizzlies were around.

Correspondence ID: 198Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98116
United States of America

Outside Organization: Citizen Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 20:19:31

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I favor restoring Grizzlies to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 199Project:112008Document:132104

Address: ELLENSBURG, WA 98926
United States of America

Outside Organization: [REDACTED] Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 20:24:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am opposed to the plan to reintroduce grizzly bears into North Cascades National Park.

1. It is illegal and against Washington State Law to bring grizzly bears into the state to release. Typical to the National Park Service, they feel they are above state law and don't recognize anything but their own authority. The so-called inclusive process the Park Service uses is disingenuous and patronizing. The majority of local people in and around the park don't want

grizzly bears, it is against state law, and the park can't answer many of the questions about bear management, but the Park Service will do whatever it wants anyway regardless of "input". The Park Service has a radical agenda and state's rights be damned.

2. Park managers will use grizzly bears as a tool to close hunting in the Ross Lake Recreation area and Lake Chelan. Park managers at North Cascades and their staff have always wanted to eliminate hunting in the Recreation Area. This will be a perfect tool for them to use to first restrict and then "need" to eliminate hunting altogether in the NRA. State hunters already have to take a grizzly bear test to hunt bears in GMU 426, but that won't be enough for park staff. Their agenda is to eliminate hunting in the NRA. They will lie and say it isn't but in the end, they will strongly lobby to stop all hunting in any areas they can.

3. Park managers will close vast areas of the Park and Recreation areas whenever a grizzly bear is seen, tracks are seen, or one of the park rangers or biologists sees bear scat. Park managers have a long record of simply closing any area they want to because a bear, wolf, or cougar has been seen or behaved badly. At this writing parts of North Cascades are closed for the season due to "bear activity". A cougar attacked a child in Olympic Park and the park managers "closed the area for several weeks" instead of removing the cat. I must repeat that park managers are poor wildlife managers. The state is trained and staffed to manage wildlife, not the Park Service. But again, the Park Service feels they are superior in every way to state laws and state wildlife managers and they simply know better than anyone else, even though they have far less (if any) experience, training, and basic knowledge about any wildlife. It appears a fancy uniform is all they need as credentials to be the experts.

4. The population, if established, will be forever fragile and always need more funding, more closed areas, more closed hunting, less backcountry use, and there will be a call to "manage" areas outside and adjacent to the park (Mt. Baker NF, Pasayten Wilderness, etc.) which translates into closed areas and limited everything from cattle and sheep grazing to fly fishing. The park service is and always has been a poor manager of bears, and carnivores in general. Park managers are people managers, not wildlife managers. The biologists they employ are often agenda driven and don't take responsibility for the obvious issues that occur when mixing carnivores and people in parks. The solution to every problem regarding wildlife and people in a national park is to close the park and greatly restrict access to vast areas of the park.

5. Finally, the plan presented and if adopted will not be followed, or it will only be followed in part. There will be no oversight or authority to follow the plan and no penalty for not following it. Any assurances in the plan will not be honored, and "adaptive management" will be the excuse used to change the plan to fit the radical agenda of park managers and their staff. In the end, ESA listed grizzly bears will be the Trojan Horse that radical Park Service managers use to get whatever they want at North Cascades and change it to fit the radical, peopleless place they want it to be where only elite park managers are allowed to visit and make decisions about its use.

Correspondence ID: 200Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Renton, WA 98058
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 20:24:37

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am a white Native American (not registered with a tribe) and I believe these grizzle bears should be reintroduced into their original native habitat. I do hike and I don't feel threaten by these animals. Of course we need to ensure this is plenty of food for them to thrive before making a final decision. Perhaps the location would be where the wolves are currently flourishing.

Correspondence ID: 201Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Buckley, WA 98321
United States of America

Outside Organization: None Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 20:25:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have spend a fair amount of time hiking and climbing with in the north cascades and would love to see grizzlies restored to this amazing landscape. I travel to Montana Wyoming Alaska as well as Canadian Rockies with with my wife and 2 kids and 1 of of the many things I love about these places is that is a intact complete ecosystem not altered by humans. These Animals have great power and certainly are more aggressive than many and that has not swayed me or my family's enjoyment of such an animal. It's there power and mere presence that draws me to them. There aggression is easily solved by proper education and understanding, by teaching proper food storage, hike in groups and carry bear spray in grizzly country. Me and my family have enjoyed hundreds of shared time with the bears.

Lastly. Long ago grizzlies roamed this area and we "humans" decided they didn't belong. This is a chance for us to rectify that choice that was made long ago.

Correspondence ID: 202Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Monroe, WA 98272
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 20:33:47
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Focus on rehabilitating and conserving the ecosystem. Bears will return on their own when the area can support them. If any proactive measure should be taken, it should be the addition/expansion of wildlife corridors and wildlife crossings.

Correspondence ID: 203Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Ellensburg, WA 98926
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 20:39:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Absolutely, NO

That you would considering reintroducing this animal is absurd to me. We have a long history in this region of safe use of our forests free from the threat of animals attacking us. My family has hunted and fished, hiked and ridden in Washington forests for generations and never once had to do so with significant fear of animal attack.

On the other hand we have had occasion to do the same in Montana grizzly country and the difference is stark and unsettling. That we would choose that is absurd. This would literally lead to people dying. We work constantly to stop people dying on thr roads but would choose to increase them among those who recreate in our woods.

This serves no reasonable purpose, will lead to deaths and is stupid in a state where millions enter the woods, have built their homes, and learned to be outdoors without the skills needed for grizzly country.

Do not waste my money doing something so obviously a fringe idea from those living in cities.

Correspondence ID: 204Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Kirkland, WA 98034
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 20:42:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: No need for the bears. Keep them in Montana. The north cascade is fine with out the Grizzly Bears.

Correspondence ID: 205Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Granite falls, WA 98252
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 20:44:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Rally smart, let's cancel Predator hunting and bring grizzly bears over to completely wipe out the deer and elk population

Correspondence ID: 206Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98125
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 20:46:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Need more grizzlies

Correspondence ID: 207Project:112008Document:132104

Address: la center, WA 98629
United States of America
Outside Organization: [REDACTED] Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 20:46:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Why does the government think they can control nature. Don't turn our parks into a zoo. If grizzly bears wanted to be in the cascades they would be there. They were not hunted to extinction human activity moved them north they went on their own. Why would you take a bear that clearly didn't want to be around people and make them be around people. Does the bear not have a say in this. Where are the bears rights. Why are we scooping them up and putting them somewhere they don't want to be? This is the most horrible proposal I have ever heard!!!!

Correspondence ID: 208Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sultan, WA 98294
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 20:47:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: With the proximity to nearby agricultural towns such as Mazama grizzlies would likely be proactively and senselessly killed by farmers, shot by illegal trophy hunters, or become pests as they raid nearby homes and campsites for food. Furthermore, many hikers and WA natives don't know how to deal with grizzly encounters or even how to identify one - educating the public on what to do would be expensive and time consuming.

There's no sustainable outcome to reintroducing them to the North Cascades when the people have forgotten how to live with them. Perhaps set aside a small and especially remote corner of the park that's well away from homes, ranches, and hiking trails and introduce a much smaller tagged and monitored population?

Correspondence ID: 209Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lacey, WA 98516
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 20:51:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am in favor of re-introducing grizzlies to the north cascades. Grizzlies are a keystone species and should not have been wiped out by hunters, but they were. Because of their status as predators, they can keep other animals under control, and should be re-introduced into their native habitat.

If humans are educated on not leaving food and their garbage open with easy access for bears and other wildlife to get, it will be an easy transition. Education needs to come first and ranchers should not take precedence over native wildlife. Let's allow nature to have its symbiotic eco system intact rather than slicing it into tiny parts; then also, there must be protected wildlife corridors along with reintroduction.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 210Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lynden, WA 98264
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 20:56:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am responding to this proposal as a resident of Whatcom county, I don't think Grizzly bears should be reintroduced. We have wolves and cougars both, have created issues for people resulting in individual animals or in the case of wolves an entire pack, in one case being exterminated due to their propensity to kill cattle. Recently a sow black bear was killed due to her roaming neighborhoods here in the county. She had cubs at the time of her death. It makes no sense to introduce another apex predator.

Correspondence ID: 211Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98513
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 20:57:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not put grizzly bears in the north cascades, the wolf populations in ne Washington have been very troublesome and they are less deadly to human encounters.

Correspondence ID: 212Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98125
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 20:57:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is the historical range of Tyrannosaurus Rex and other dinosaurs so using that justification, both they and grizzly bears should be reintroduced to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 213Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Renton, WA 98057
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 20:58:45

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I would implore the Park Service to continue the current situation by rehabilitation of the land in the North Cascades. If the bears have not returned on their own yet then the habitat may not yet be suitable for their return. By continued rehabilitation of the existing habitat the bears can return on their own from ranges to the North in Canada.

Correspondence ID: 214Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ferndale, WA 98248
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 20:59:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: These animals pose a threat to not only us as humans but also to themselves and the ecosystem we have in here in the PNW. They will hunt and kill everything to a point where deer, black bear, elk and other small game become threatened to the point of endangerment. This reintroduction program is being provided by people whom have ZERO knowledge on nature and the rolls and impacts that each species of animal plays, in the animal kingdom. I do not want these animals extinct but I do believe that the areas in which they reside across the USA and other countries are where they thrive and where they should stay. If we reintroduce mtn grizzlies back to this area, we will regret it.

Correspondence ID: 215Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 21:00:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: They dont need to do that,the grizzlys our already up there

I know the north cascades and paysatens very well

That is not a good idea,let them come down from canada on there own. Its very dangerous to bring the grizzlys into the park, A bear can suffer from PTSD just as people can

Lets do it the safe way. We have moose and wolfs that have made there way down from canada and yes the grizzly is already up there and more will be coming

Correspondence ID: 216Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Snoqualmie, WA 98065
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 21:08:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support alternative B, reintroducing grizzlies will benefit the area.

Correspondence ID: 217Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ferndale, WA 98248
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 21:09:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm not sure this is a good idea with the grizzle's, you just removed a black bear and cub a few days ago harassing people. These guys are a different breed.. they will wander from the hills to the lower reaches, like the black bears do. If they would stay in the higher mountains maybe. For what reason are you doing this, we haven't missed them. Thank you [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 218Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98199
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 21:10:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We must restore the apex species to the ecosystem. Bears and people coexist all over the continental US and in Alaska. Grizzlies will help moderate other mammal populations.

Correspondence ID: 219Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Clinton, WA 98236
United States of America
Outside Organization: [REDACTED] Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 21:11:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I fully support the reintroduction of the grizzly bear into the Cascade mountains. This apex species belongs in the mountain environment, and will help to bring balance to a complex and interrelated ecosystem.

[REDACTED]
Professional Forester

Correspondence ID: 220Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 21:12:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzlies are an apex predator that should be returned to the landscape for the health of the ecosystem. Raising cattle on the national forests is a privilege, not a right, and should not be allowed to take precedence over the survival of a species.

Correspondence ID: 221Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Belfair, WA 98528
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 21:16:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: There is no good reason to reintroduce Grizzly bears into the North Cascades. The danger to hikers and campers is too great.

Correspondence ID: 222Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Woodinville, WA 98072
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 21:16:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I believe it is important for us to restore and see the return of grizzly bears to the North Cascades! Just like I feel we should be more proactive about our wolf population!
What I don't want to see is reintroducing and then killing them all due to a small faction of ranchers or hunters who don't want them for whatever reason.
But I emphatically support reintroducing grizzlies!!
Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 223Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Des Moines, WA 98198
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 21:18:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Execute Alternative A: Take no action. Leave the brown bears where they are and let them move naturally. Do not reintroduce them into areas in the PNW. There are active predators in the area already in the form of black bears. And black bears do not threaten human recreationalists like brown bears do. It has been a great pleasure as a life time hiker to enjoy the PNW without the threat of brown bears. Do not take this away from us. It is a peace of mind that few other places have.

Correspondence ID: 224Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Edmonds, WA 98020
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 21:19:49
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Do not reintroduce grizzly bears to the North Cascades National Park.

Correspondence ID: 225Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bothell, WA 98011
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 21:21:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: This plan is crucial to maintaining the unique and awe-inspiring ecosystem of the North Cascades. I wholeheartedly support the reintroduction of grizzlies and have been following this since I was a young boy and that alleged picture of a grizzly was published in the Seattle Times. I instantly looked up restoration endeavors and discovered Conservation Northwest. Ever since, I've been enamored with these creatures and the key role they play in their environment. We must bring them home.

Correspondence ID: 226Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Port Orchard, WA 98367
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 21:23:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am very against reintroducing the Grizzly bears to the North Cascades. This area is so well known for it's hiking, and back country camping. Most of us have come across a black bear out on the trail, and most have been lucky enough to not have any run ins with a cougar. However, I feel the people of Washington state are extremely unprepared for knowing how to handle a Grizzly encounter. This is a National Park, so firearms to protect yourself are legally not allowed. I think its just an awful idea. Someone is going to get hurt. I would like to continue to enjoy Washington without constantly feeling like I have to watch my back. If I want bigger bears, I will head to Alaska, Idaho, or Montana. No thanks! I'm not gonna put my life in the hands of a can of bear spray. Lol

Correspondence ID: 227Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bothell, WA 98011
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 21:23:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Bring back the grizzlies!

Correspondence ID: 228Project:112008Document:132104
Address: East Granby, CT 06026
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 21:23:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzly Bears should be returned to the North Cascades ecosystem an area part of their historical range.

Correspondence ID: 229Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Poulsbo, WA 98370-6814
United States of America
Outside Organization: None Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 21:26:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a lifelong backpacker and one who has hiked amongst grizzlies, I am ambivalent about this proposal. My wife and I once received the bad news that a couple had been mauled in Glacier National Park on a trail we had just hiked the previous day.

In the Olympic National Forest and National Park, where we have hiked for fifty years, we directly confronted black bears close-up many, many times without incident. I'm aware that black bear and grizzly bear behavior is vastly different, but believe that if North Cascades hikers were properly informed and equipped that grizzly attacks could be minimized.

After considering the benefits and liabilities, I vote yes for the Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan.

Correspondence ID: 230Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Kirkland, WA 98034
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 21:26:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Alternative A: No Action is the only appropriate choice.

Correspondence ID: 231Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Port Angeles, WA 98362
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 21:30:19
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support all efforts to allow Grizzly bears to repopulate their historical territories including that of the North Cascades. The NPS should make all reasonable efforts to facilitate this process including relocation of the bears into the N Cascades in order to establish a population there.

Correspondence ID: 232Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Stanwood, WA 98292
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 21:31:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I feel that we should bring back the Grizzlies to the Northwest. People just need more information on how to be safe. The Grizzly population is dying and we need to bring them back home.

Correspondence ID: 233Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Redmond, WA 98052
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 21:33:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I oppose the introduction of grizzlies in North Cascades. I am frightened of running into a grizzly bear(s) on a trail or at a campsite. They are just too dangerous and more likely to attack human than black bears. If we need predators, why can't we have more black bears? I will probably avoid visiting the North Cascades National Park if the grizzlies are imported.

Correspondence ID: 234Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Granite Falls, WA 98252
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 21:33:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am hesitant to state total opposition to the plan, but I do have concerns on the cost, the measurability of outcomes and measures, and the risks inherent with artificially inserting a species into an ecosystem. As the population of WA grows and habitat is impinged I worry about the bears we already have. Climate change is affecting berry yield in the high country, salmon runs may be depreciating, and living space is shrinking. I see emaciated cougars slinking close to homes, coyotes and bears in settled areas.

Correspondence ID: 235Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bend, OR 97701
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 21:44:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am very opposed to reintroduction of Grizzly Bears in the north cascades. Peaceful coexistence is a pipe dream. Hiking/camping and recreating in the cascades should not include the constant fear of a possible grizzly bear attack. Attacks are getting more and more frequent in the greater Yellowstone. Please do not bring that issue here

Correspondence ID: 236Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Blaine, WA 98230
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 21:45:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We have already heard about black bear recently and brown bear would not be good either. Keep the bears in Alaska where people wanly the trails with protection. At least there you are knowingly going into their home area.

How many people in Whatcom would freak out if they saw a person with a gun strapped to their side or chest for protection while on a hike?

Correspondence ID: 237Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98118
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 21:45:49
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Yes, I fully support reintroduction of grizzlies into the north cascades.

Correspondence ID: 238Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Chelan, WA 98816
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 21:45:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do not think it is a good idea to bring grizzlies into the North Cascades.. For numerous obvious reasons.

Correspondence ID: 239Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Ferndale, WA 98248
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 21:47:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: It will be a sad day when grizzly bears are reintroduced into Whatcom County. I have lived my whole life in Whatcom County and have hunted and fished our state and federal lands. We DO NOT need animals that can tear apart vehicles just to get at you if they choose to. These grizzly bears should not be brought back. I have been up close to grizzlies in Alaska while commercial fishing and they are a formidable animal. Our settlers and native Americans did us all a favor in hunting them out of this state long ago. The few stragglers that have shown have come down from Canada. They will continue to come from Canada without anyone's help. Do not waste our license fees or tax dollars bringing these dangerous bears back to our county let alone the rest of our state. We do not need a apex predator like this. It's bad enough that wolves have worked their way from Montana and Idaho into Washington and are now in Western Washington. We have cougars and black bears and wolves. We sure as hell do not need grizzlies. We have enough apex predators.

Please do not re-establish grizzly bears in my Whatcom County. It's the wrong thing to do. If they are suppose to be here they will wander across the Canadian border and come on their own. They sure as hell don't need any help. Let nature take its own course. If it was meant to be... they would be here already... don't make me not want to fish Baker Lake for the sockeye run or choose not to hunt our federal lands. I will never camp at Baler Lake again if grizzlies are a possibility. Grizzlies are just a stupid idea and not needed. We haven't missed them and they haven't actually been here in any numbers for hundreds of years. That's a good thing. Don't ruin exploring our federal lands for those who wish to hike and hunt those same lands.

Correspondence ID: 240Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98101
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 21:53:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am in favor of the reintroduction of grizzlies to their natural range in the North Cascades

Correspondence ID: 241Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellevue, WA 98007
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 21:56:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I believe grizzly bears should be reintroduced and managed as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act.

Grizzly bears disperse seeds, till the land, fertilize forests, and help to regulate prey species. They are an essential part of healthy, fully functioning ecosystems. Grizzly bears and the Upper Skagit people coexisted and thrived prior to colonization, and there is no reason we cannot follow their historical precedent and do the same.

Humans (colonizers) are the reason this keystone species was eradicated from their native range to begin with. We have a duty to correct our past mistakes; to conserve and restore grizzly bears to their native lands to the best of our abilities. To do anything less would mean we are complicit in continuing the violence of forebears.

Correspondence ID: 242Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sequim, WA 98382
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 21:57:15

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of the Grizzly to the Northern Cascades. It should be as an endangered or at least threatened species, one that co-existed here with the tribes for centuries. They should not be sacrificed to grazing rights for the masses of bovines that everyone knows aren't good for us or the planet. The grizzlies are worth more than a cheap burger.

Correspondence ID: 243Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Blaine, WA 98230
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 21:57:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is a scary proposition given this State's desire to limit our ability to protect ourselves with appropriate firearms. Much more consideration needs to be given to this matter so that all of our county residents can remain safe.

Correspondence ID: 244Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bonney lake, WA 98391
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 22:00:45

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not bring Grizzly bears in. We are having enough problems with the wolves you have brought in. There is a good reason the bears were hunted out of their.

Correspondence ID: 245Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lake Forest Park, WA 98155
United States of America

Outside Organization: Systems Interface Inc. Business(Official Rep.)

Received: Sep,28 2023 22:04:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please don't relocate any Grizzlies to the North Cascades. Let them migrate on their own from Canada ... naturally.

Sincerely,

██████

Correspondence ID: 246Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98112
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 22:05:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I was initially skeptical of the preferred option C as I was reading about this initiative, but seeing the tools it offers to allow management of bears and human coexistence makes it seem like a clearly correct choice. What a wonderful plan to bring grizzlies back to this habitat. I look forward to reading about their recovery in our mountains for decades to come. Yellowstone is a place my family loves and we have been lucky to observe grizzly bears there many times, and also see the change over the last 30 years of ecological rebalancing and population growth as bears and wolves help to center the whole ecosystem in which they participate.

Correspondence ID: 247Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98116
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 22:11:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the plan to reintroduce grizzly bears into the North Cascades ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 248Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Silverdale, WA 98383
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 22:12:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly support the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades. Having grown up in Bellingham, I have recreated in the NCE for many years. I have also spent time in grizzly territory in BC, Idaho, and Montana. I understand the additional challenges and concerns that grizzlies can add for people living, working, and recreating in wilderness areas. I think these challenges are surmountable, and in many cases the precautions and education that come from grizzly awareness can lead to more responsible, safe, and sustainable use of our natural spaces.

Correspondence ID: 249Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tacoma, WA 98405
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 22:12:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: After reading through the document, I believe that the bears should be introduced and maintain their endangered species status until the goal of 200 bears is reached. I don't believe it is right to categorize them as an experimental species because the bears are not the subject of an experiment, they are merely being reintroduced to live in their natural range.

Correspondence ID: 250Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Everett, WA 98208
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 22:13:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support option B (reintroduction via the endangered species act) This is the bear's ecosystem and they play a crucial role in it. They're not so long gone that reintroduction is a paradigm shift. Personally? Bears frighten me; but it's my job as the invasive species in the woods to respect their right to it and be smart about my own safety, not the other way around.

Correspondence ID: 251Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lynnwood, WA 98087
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 22:13:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I love bears. I spend a lot of time in black and grizzly country. The North Cascades are absolutely an ideal habitat for them, however, WA state isn't ready. We aren't able to contain or wolf and black bear populations that have seen rapid expansion. While this is amazing from an ecological point of view, we are a human growing population with less forestry than Montana or Alaska. If we're in a constant battle with black bears coming into our towns due to lack of wilderness resources, what's going to happen when we introduce grizzlies? It's not hard, more black bears, cougars and coyotes and probably grizzlies making unacceptable and inappropriate human contact. Humans can't even figure out how to act in Yellowstone, and Wa will not be an exception. Quite frankly, I don't want to see more innocent animals shot by Fish and Game because we aren't responsible with managing population. I will submit that if hunting laws change to reasonable levels than it might be acceptable to introduce another predator. I also believe more support will need to go into bear, cougar and wolf rescues. The state has plenty and they could use expansion. I shouldn't have to explain why that'd be needed. Lastly, I would also consider more focus and budget in protecting the trying to but sparse returning wolverine populations to mt. Rainier before worrying about grizzly relief.

Correspondence ID: 252Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 22:15:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly support the plan to reintroduce grizzly bears to the north Cascades. This park is a national treasure, and keeping it a viable habitat for our iconic bears is important for all of us!

Correspondence ID: 253Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Port Orchard, WA 98366
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 22:15:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzlies have been here longer than humans have. They have been removed from their natural lands by unnatural predators (humans). We should respect their native homeland the way we respect our own peoples homelands. The ethical reason aside, the ecological benefit is that the grizzlies are a key part of the ecosystem. In the same way that wolves reintroduced to Yellowstone changed the behaviors of grazing animals and led to positive changes in the landscape, I believe grizzlies will have a similar impact in the cascades. Realistically, my only concern is that, given the range needed for grizzlies, I worry that human activity will cause them to retract their domains more and more, and led to more fighting for hunting grounds. Down the line, I worry they will face the same uncertain future as the tigers in India. These animals need all the help and reparation they deserve from us.

Correspondence ID: 254Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Everett, WA 98204
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 22:18:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The obvious choice is option B due to its focus on restoration and ecosystem health.

Also, option C is untenable because it puts industry and the cattle industry ahead of ecosystems services. Due to the desperate need to restore our environment to aid in combating climate change, ecosystems services should have priority of cattle and

sheep, which are known contributors to climate change, and an unsustainable source of food for local communities.

Remove cattle, reintroduce predators, and reestablish natural grazzers.

Get cattle out of these ecosystems. They are harmful to the environment.

Correspondence ID: 255Project:112008Document:132104
Address: kirkland, WA 98033
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 22:19:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We absolutely should return Grizzly Bears to the region.

That's all I have to say.

Thanks

Correspondence ID: 256Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Concrete, WA 98237
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 22:20:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Bring the grizzly back, but many people have fear of just brown bears going through their trash hate to see how they would react to a grizzly....

Correspondence ID: 257Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Long Beach, CA 90806
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 22:23:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I like option A of letting the bears repopulate the area by migrating on their own. Based on what little knowledge I have, I think that people try to react to their own altering of ecosystems by altering ecosystems and that often causes more problems than it solves. The focus should be on naturally repairing forests by regulating usage more strictly, which will hopefully create an environment that bears acan live in and they will naturally come back.

Correspondence ID: 258Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Spokane, WA 99258
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 22:25:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of grizzlies into the Northern Cascades

Correspondence ID: 259Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Everson, WA 98347
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 22:28:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I was interviewed by some folks working on this for the North cascades a number of years back. They asked if I thought that man and grizzlies could co-exist.. I said, well, if we could, there would probably be more of them. So, terrible waste of time and money - please find a better pet project (pun intended). Oh, not wolves please either. How about more wild honeybees? That would be cool. Or woodland caribou, that would be epic!

Correspondence ID: 260Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellevue, WA 98006
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 22:29:37

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support active reintroduction of grizzlies into the North Cascades - restoring the population of up to 200 grizzlies as quickly as environmentally feasible. Most importantly, they should be managed as a THREATENED SPECIES under the Endangered Species Act, and should only be allowed to be captured, moved or killed under specific circumstances, such as the defense of life and scientific or research activities. Also critical: anyone seeking a bear's moving/removal/killing must demonstrate they have done everything possible to address a situation prior to capture/moving/killing of the bear. We must develop a culture that allows that creatures such as grizzlies have a right to exist, and a right to habitat.

I strongly reject the option that grizzlies should be reintroduced as a nonessential experimental population under the Endangered Species Act.

Correspondence ID: 261Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Allyn, WA 98524
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 22:32:10

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please continue with your plans to reintroduce Grizzly bears into the North Cascades! They belong there! I trust the research and careful consideration this proposal has entailed to this point, and moving forward! Thank you,

Correspondence ID: 262Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Port Orchard, WA 98366
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 22:33:58

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in favor of reintroducing grizzlies to North Cascades National Park and treating them as threatened under the Endangered Species Act. I look forward to visiting the park again soon and would love to some day be able to view (from a healthy distance, of course) grizzlies restored to their historical range in our beautiful state. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 263Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lake Forest Park, WA 98155
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 22:37:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly Bears are special animals. The truth is that in a now human dominated continent they cannot survive and thrive everywhere and they should not be introduced just anywhere. However if there is a place where we as humans should right some of our historic wrongs and mend some more of the natural ecosystem, it has to be the North

Cascades of Washington. A rugged and beautiful landscape made even more wild by the reintroduction of grizzlies is exactly what can lift the spirits of Washingtonians and Americans and something we can look back on and say we did something right. Please go through with the reintroductions, thank you.

Correspondence ID: 264Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Burien, WA 98146
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 22:41:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I'm a hiker, because I love and value nature. Grizzlies belong here. Bring them back.

Correspondence ID: 265Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Lynden, WA 98247
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 22:42:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Yes, please bring back the grizzlies!

Correspondence ID: 266Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98126
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 22:46:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Yes, grizzlies should gradually be reintroduced to the Cascade Mountains region.

Correspondence ID: 267Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Redmond, WA 98053
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,28 2023 22:53:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Respectfully, I am opposed to the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades.

There are many points-of-view that will be shared; mine is from the recreation perspective... hiking, backpacking, camping, and other family activities. While there are well-prepared, adventurous people who enjoy these activities in areas where grizzly bears exist today (Montana, etc.), I believe there is a much larger proportion of the population who will avoid recreating in areas with grizzlies, myself included.

The National Parks of Washington state are incredible natural resources that can be enjoyed without concern of grizzly bears.

The Purpose & Need highlighted in the Scoping Document on this topic is 50% focused on putting grizzlies in the NCE "because they were there before" & for their "long-term survival there". These are not compelling reasons. Just because you "can do something" (re-introduction of grizzlies), does not mean that you "should do something".

The other 50% of Purpose & Need address future removal from a Federal List & enjoyment by future generations. Increasing grizzly populations where they already exist, can accomplish removal from the Federal List and having a grizzly-free National Park is much more enjoyable for future generations.

Most importantly, while it may take 100 years to re-establish grizzlies in the North Cascades, the time to make a decisive decision is prior to re-introduction.

I appreciate the opportunity to share my comments & will be interested in other's points-of-view.

Correspondence ID: 268Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tacoma, WA 98422
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 22:59:48

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: During the summer and fall, I hike in the North Cascades and surrounding areas in the Okonogan-Wenatchee Forest nearly every weekend. I love being there and getting to experience the wild beauty of that area. Grizzlies were an important part of the region until relatively recently; their disappearance from north-central Washington was an aberration that should be rectified. Grizzlies pose little danger to humans, or at least no more than the black bears already in the national park and national forest. When missing apex predators are reintroduced to their natural habitat, the entire ecosystem improves. Moreover, the plan laid out to actually reintroduce the grizzlies is well-thought out and will take place responsibly and slowly. I support reintroducing grizzlies to the North Cascades National Park.

Correspondence ID: 269Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tonasket, WA 98855
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 23:01:24

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: NO! NO! NO!

Are you people all freaking stupid?

What are the grizzlies, the largest predator in North America, supposed to eat when they come out of hibernation?

Our ranchers are having a hard enough time with the damn wolves you all decided we needed more of here in North Central Washington.

We had wolves, we have grizzlies, we don't need anymore.

There are thousands of people living in the North Cascades.

Every year thousands of visitors visit the North Cascades to hike, fish, hunt, snowmobile, snowshoe, and ski; With this plan, you are endangering all of these people.

Or is that the plan? Get rid of all the people. Endanger their food sources, endanger their lives to the point where they have to leave or they die.

NO! NO! NO!

Sincerely,

██████████ Citizen who lives in the North Cascades foothills.

Correspondence ID: 270Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98122
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 23:05:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I recreate in the north Cascades frequently. One of the things I really like about Washington is not having to worry about an apex predator like a grizzly mauling me in my sleep, or turning the corner of a trail and running in to a mama with cubs.

I like having one less thing to worry about out there.

Correspondence ID: 271Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Washougal, WA 98671
United States of America

Outside Organization: Self Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 23:13:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Washington doesn't need anymore unmanaged predators decimating it's deer and elk herds. Nor do ranchers who can ill afford to lose their cattle, sheep, etc. to another apex predator. Grizzly bears roam and travel great distances so trying to keep them in wilderness area's is not possible.

Thank you

Correspondence ID: 272Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Snohomish, WA 98296
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 23:18:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Fully support reintroduction of the grizzly population.

Correspondence ID: 273Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 23:20:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support reintroducing grizzly bears to the North Cascades protected as an endangered species.

Correspondence ID: 274Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sequim, WA 98382
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 23:24:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am opposed to the reintroduction of Grizzlies in the north Cascades of Washington State. I believe that such a reintroduction would put the safety of hikers/campers at risk.

Correspondence ID: 275Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 23:24:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a wildlife biologist I welcome the reintroduction of this areas apex predator. It could help mitigate some impacts but my only concern is reintroduction with our a healthy salmonid population. Other than that let's do it!

Correspondence ID: 276Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Silverdale, WA 98383
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 23:26:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Watching the bear human conflicts in Montana this summer

To bring grizzlys back in the north cascades is not without danger for any outdoor recreational activities in the area

Also ungulate herds are at lowest population in years

The range cattle grazing will suffer causing damage payment's to cattlemen

And we already have plenty of predator problems in this state

Correspondence ID: 277Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98136
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 23:30:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support reintroduction of grizzly bears under the endangered species act. These bears are naturally a part of the Cascade ecosystem and would help enrich and rewind the area for other animals and plants. They belong here.

Correspondence ID: 278Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Battle Ground, WA 98604
United States of America

Outside Organization: House Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 23:37:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hi, I and my family are outdoors people and have experienced how healthy it is both physically and mentally get out into the backcountry. We spend time on summer backpack camp trips and hunting in the fall. I have children that have yet to experience it and I look forward to the time when they get of age and experience enough to get out there. I have read articles about the many grizzly bear attacks against humans mostly in Montana which sadly happen every year. I do not want you or anyone to reintroduce grizzly bears to the North cascades. Not now, not ever in Washington. We as humans are capable of managing the wild game that we can benefit from. Please consider this serious.

Correspondence ID: 279Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Shoreline, WA 98155
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 23:39:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As someone who regularly trail runs and hikes alone on remote trails, I am NOT supportive.

Correspondence ID: 280Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Yakima, WA 98908
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 23:46:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Are you fucking nuts?
First off, do you not understand how stupid people are in this state.
Secondly, there is a reason we ran them out of the west coast entirely.
You motherfuckers can't even manage the horse population and end up having to drop them by the thousands.
What makes you think that you're going to manage this properly?
Didn't you just shoot a brown bear a few months ago because it was walking around a business complex and elementary school?
And then what happens when a they/them gets fucked by one of these? Are we just going to shoot them at that point.

Why don't you focus on increasing the big game population for more hunting possibilities.
Or why don't you go through the large mouth bass records in CA and remove unverified lake records. How about you start with Mike Long's records?
That should be an easy one for you. Start with that before you fuck up more shit.

Correspondence ID: 281Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98136
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 23:47:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: While I appreciate the intent of bringing a species that once roamed back, the reality is it will disrupt the important connection between nature and humans, and introduce fear. I would no longer feel comfortable taking my child backpacking with grizzly bears in the area. This would be a huge loss, things are different now, we should embrace the change.

Correspondence ID: 282Project:112008Document:132104

Address: EDMONDS, WA 98026
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 23:54:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not introduce Grizzly bears into Washington
I enjoy hiking and backcountry hiking. I have hiked and camped in Motana where you have a hard sided vehicle to sleep in and areas that are closed because of bear danger. We do not need that here.

Correspondence ID: 283Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Monroe, WA 98272
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 23:58:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: 2 points. 1 Grizzly bears avoid repopulating naturally because it's not safe due to population density, crossing highway/interstate/roads (ever increasing traffic) and the food supply is depleted i.e. insufficient elk population. The range of an adult male bear of breeding age is about 300 miles, so when they start killing children in Issaquah, Resmond or Union Hill remember this comment as you try to explain away known hazards to grieving parents since we have cases where black bears have preyed on children in rural/urban zones

Correspondence ID: 284Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sammamish, WA 98029
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 23:58:03

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Do not restore Grizzly Bears in the North Cascades. The influx of population growth in the Seattle Metro area and Washington state in general, and the resulting influx of people (many new to the outdoors) hiking, backpacking, camping, etc in the mountain range would be disastrous. Quantitatively, more people would be attacked, and the grizzlies be put down anyways. Not worth it. Keep them contained in the Selkirks.

Correspondence ID: 285Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Port Hadlock, WA 98339
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,28 2023 23:58:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in favor of reintroducing grizzly bears to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 286Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kenmore, WA 98028
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I believe the reintroduction of Grizzlies to the North Cascades is vital. A healthy ecosystem that includes an apex predator will help to keep our vital cascade range healthy.

Correspondence ID: 287Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in favor of option B to reintroduce grizzly bears under the Endangered Species Act to the North Cascades and am excited that these amazing creatures can once again return to this area.

Correspondence ID: 288Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Carnation, WA 98014
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No!! I would never want to go and enjoy the trails that this area has.

██████

Correspondence ID: 289Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98122
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the measure to allow Grizzlies to be managed as a threatened species. With wildlife facing unprecedented levels of habitat intrusion and extinction, it's important to protect apex predators like the Grizzlies. Experts, indigenous tribes, and conservationists all agree on this. It's important to grow the population of Grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 290Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98126
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The Grizzly bear should be reintroduced to the cascades. They were hear before humans destroyed their habit.

Correspondence ID: 291Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Spokane, WA 99001
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Let the bears come back. They can live in peace. 🐻

Correspondence ID: 292Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Yacolt, WA 98675
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I feel like bringing grizzly bears into this area is going to be detrimental to our game populations that us as a public enjoy hunting. Elk and deer populations do not seem to be thriving in Washington state. Maybe the public would like to see our game populations looked at a little more in depth in how we can get these populations up. I guess i don't see the benefit of bringing grizzly bears into this area even if they used to be here. Whoever is voting for this can have the grizzlys moved into their property and they can live with them.

Correspondence ID: 293Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Snohomish, WA 98290
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Even as an experienced, avid hiker in the Cascades, fears of negative encounters with wildlife have already kept me away from many trails. Because of my physical build, I would unfortunately be a sitting duck for a grizzly if an interaction were to go wrong, however unlikely. I understand the benefits of reintroducing grizzlies into the Cascades, but I have to speak in favor of Alternative A so myself and others like me can continue to enjoy the outdoors without fear. If there is overwhelming support for reintroducing grizzlies, alternative C would be preferable as it seems to afford greater flexibility.

Correspondence ID: 294Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Wenatchee, WA 98803
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 01:09:19
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Restore the grizzly bear population in the North Cascades. It belonged to them before we took it from them.

Correspondence ID: 295Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Monroe, WA 98272
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 01:10:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I really do not think the state needs another top of the food chain predator introduced. People in the city vote these things through with absolutely no idea the danger and devastation predators have. If you're not out in bear country then you have no idea what an unmanaged population can do to an ecosystem. It would be one thing if they were managed but just like black bear cougars and wolves they won't be properly managed because people in the city don't want to come to grips with the fact that proper biodiversity of a ecosystem involves managing of predators. On top of that grizzlies are hyper aggressive. people always wanna say your chances of being attacked by a grizzly are the same as being struck by lightning... Yeah it is for the people on downtown Seattle, come out in the back country and your in counters with predators becomes 10x more likely. Our states ecosystems are already under attack by people who don't understand that if you ban predator hunting it's just going to cause a slow suffer and decay of deer and elk then the predators them self will starve out and die a slow death. State biologists should be listened to not these people with some utopian view that was learned from watching Disney movies. Overall I think releasing grizzly's would greatly effect deer and elk populations and but a lot of hikers and hunters in very dangerous positions. I really hope we do not add more of a predator problem to a already over saturated ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 296Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98108
United States of America

Outside Organization: N/A Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 01:14:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: For reintroducing the Grizzly, I heavily support either Option B or C. It would be wonderful to see these magnificent animals restored to their natural habitat.

Correspondence ID: 297Project:112008Document:132104

Address: DARRINGTON, WA 98241
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 01:15:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We enjoying hiking into the backcountry and do NOT want any encounters with grizzlies!!!

Correspondence ID: 298Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Redmond, WA 98052
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 01:34:10

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Yes, its time to reintroduce them to the North Cascades to provide them more habitat to maintain their existence as a species. There will be conflicts with people and domestic animals, so any reintroduction must allow for measures to control, limit and compensate for those situations. I would recommend the option that would designate the bears as a nonessential experimental population and give agencies "greater management flexibility should conflict situations arise."

Correspondence ID: 299Project:112008Document:132104

Address: seattle, WA 98133
United States of America

Outside Organization: fred hutch cancer research center Business
Received: Sep,29 2023 01:35:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hello,

While I recognize that there are many potential unfavorable interactions that grizzlies might have with humans in the north cascades, I think it's only fair to give nature a shot at what we have taken away from them. If this is their natural habitat it is our job as smart humans to be smart and be prepared in the north cascades. Please continue with the plan to reintroduce grizzlies in the north cascades and understand that there will be interactions between them and humans. As long as we're prepared to deal with the potential side effects of reintroduction, it'll be a benefit in the long run.

Thanks,

Correspondence ID: 300Project:112008Document:132104
Address: North Bend, WA 98045
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 01:56:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support reintroducing Grizzly Bears to the North Cascades part of their historic range.

Correspondence ID: 301Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 01:59:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the return of brown bears to the North Cascades as a nonessential experimental population.

Correspondence ID: 302Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Tacoma, WA 98407
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 02:16:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please reintroduce grizzlies!
If it is indeed illegal to reintroduce grizzlies, as stated by a State representative, that law should be changed. Grizzlies belong in their ancestral range and original habitats. Risks to humans are low and can be mitigated with good human behaviors to prevent conflict. Risks to livestock are lower than many people assume, though perhaps it would be fair to make sure any livestock losses are compensated somehow.
Thank you for opening this matter for public comment.

Correspondence ID: 303Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Vancouver, WA 98682-8184
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 02:19:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am very staunchly opposed to the reintroduction of Grizzly Bears in Washington state period. As a former resident of Alaska, I know first hand the horrendous problems these animals present with regard to public safety both in the wilderness as well as to adjacent populated lands. This is public endangerment on a grand scale to restore an animal

that serves no beneficial purpose to the Washington environment that our more docile and rational Black Bears already provide as apex predators.

Please abandon this insanity at once and leave Washington mostly Grizzly free!

Correspondence ID: 304Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Renton, WA 98057
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 02:26:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello. It's good to hear some action is being taken to bring back native animals to habitat they once roamed. Currently the area that is being studied is very remote, so remote only experienced outdoorsmen dare go into. Unfortunately some not so seasoned adventurers may wander into these areas too. This often leads to destruction of sensitive ecosystems and may even result in injury due to the inexperience of the hiker or adventurer. They often leave trash or destroy plant life by unknowingly destroying it in their journey. They may also introduce foreign insects into these deep forests from wherever they're from on their person. My concern is that there may be too many people barging into lands that are meant to be pristine and protected wild lands. The introduction of this apex predator will likely deter people from entering these protected places and perhaps slow the effects of human-made destruction along trails and trailheads. Having a reintroduction of grizzly bears may also boost the global population of this species. The land is there, the food is there, everything that once supported them is there. It's time for them to move back home.

Correspondence ID: 305Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Arlington, WA 98223
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 02:29:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am absolutely against the reintroduction of grizzly bears in the North Cascades. Anywhere along the range there are people not far in any direction. The deer heard are already low due to other predators such as wolves, cougar, and black bear. Who will take the responsibility of a grizzly attack on a human????

Correspondence ID: 306Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Snohomish, WA 98290
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 02:52:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Yes Grizzly Bears should be reintroduced as a threatened species under the ESA into the state of Washington.

Correspondence ID: 307Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America

Outside Organization: Life time citizen Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 04:11:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: That's just a bad idea (I think you know that)
Hunting down a grizzly that ate a child or even a small dog is not what we want to spend our resources on
Get real , come on now !

Correspondence ID: 308Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Albuquerque, NM 87105
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 04:23:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The North Cascades is one of North America's premier intact ecosystems, but it is incomplete without grizzly bears.

This is the second attempt by the agencies to restore grizzlies to the NCE after a 2015 process was halted by the Trump administration in 2020. At the time, more than 159,000 members of the public wrote comments supporting the reintroduction of grizzlies.

"The time has come for the grizzly bear to return to its habitat to take its place in the indigenous ecosystem," said Scott Schuyler, policy representative for the Upper Skagit Tribe, whose territory lies within the recovery zone. "The Upper Skagit successfully coexisted with grizzly bears for thousands of years, and we should once more."

The NCE is one of two federal grizzly recovery areas without an established population of bears, and natural bear migration is unlikely to repopulate it. Instead, based on decades of thorough research, wildlife biologists suggest safely relocating existing bears into the North Cascades. I fully agree

Correspondence ID: 309Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Maple Valley, WA 98038
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 04:56:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I don't know why you ask for public comments when you know you will not only ignore the requests of the public to keep these bears out of the North Cascades (which is my fervent request), but you also override the Washington State Constitution, which forbids grizzly bears in the state.

Grizzly bears are NOT an endangered species. There are tens of thousands of them in Canada and tens of thousands of them in Alaska. They thrive in the wilderness where there is peace and quiet and plenty of food for them. The North Cascades is teaming with people. Hikers and climbers walk over every part of these mountains and valleys. Conflict with bears is inevitable. If a bear mauls a human, the bear will suffer no consequences. Instead, the injury area will be shut to humans. The whole area is filled with black bears, which co exist with humans magnificently. Putting grizzlies where they don't want to be (they could easily walk down from Canada - they DON'T) and where they are not wanted excepting by some bear enthusiasts, is contrary to common sense, and is most certainly contrary to what the majority of citizens in Washington want.

But even though you open this to comment, you don't plan to listen to a whit of it. I am venting this complete common sense, but I know you will completely ignore it. This is just an exercise you do because the law forces you to. I wish fervently that the law would also force you to do what we ask.

Correspondence ID: 310Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Lfp, WA 98155
United States of America
Outside Organization: Seattle Mountaineers Business
Received: Sep,29 2023 05:18:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The controversial subject of grizzly re location is not going to establish a population f bears. Contrast the proposed re introduction with Wolf recovery which has successfully allowed wolves to re establish population in the

Cascades. I urge a "let nature" approach. Artificial releases of animals have failed. Best acclimate of animals is when the animal learns the environment. I'm urge nature release of Grizzlies in North Cascades

Correspondence ID: 311Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Cocoa, FL 32927
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 05:39:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Bears are a natural part of the ecosystems and must be protected.

Correspondence ID: 312Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Marblemount, WA 98267
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 06:04:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Nature requires our absence. Do not reintroduce any bears into any area. Leave nature alone and let it balance. This plan needs to be scrapped, and not re visited. Ever.

Correspondence ID: 313Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA, Lewistown, MT, WA 98199
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 06:11:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: During the 70s and 80s my mountaineering partners and I spend quite a bit of time in remote areas of the North Cascades. We never encountered a grizzly or any sign and really never thought about it. This despite being in areas where it felt like no human had ever been (pretty special). I'm older now but still enjoy the solitude of remote places immensely. In 2017 I got a small getaway place in Lewistown, Montana for the purpose of finding additional solitude. Being 110 miles from an Interstate highway in any direction, day trips are very feasible. During this very short period of time, just a couple of years ago grizzlies have begun to naturally repopulate the plains areas where they were formerly native. No matter how accomplished or experienced one feels they are in the wilds, going afield carrying bear spray is #1 an exercise in humility. It is not possible to treat a wild grizzly with disdain the way we commonly treat some of our fellow humans with disdain. Being aware that you just might have an encounter with a grizzly tempers everything that you do in the outdoors: the ways we treat human waste, food litter, campsites, and any outdoor activity be it hiking, fishing, hunting, bird-watching, photography, etc. Every outing becomes more special and we return to civilization with a renewed sense of wonder and, yes, that H-word again--humility. Let's bring this potential back to the North Cascades.

██████████
████████████████████
██

Correspondence ID: 314Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Cuyahoga Falls, OH 44223
United States of America
Outside Organization: The Ohio State University Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 06:14:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Yaaassss bring the grizzlies to Cascade

Correspondence ID: 315Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Baltimore, MD 21239
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 06:20:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have hiked 90 miles of the Pacific Crest Trail from Rainy Pass to Stevens Pass. The freedom afforded to hikers in that exquisitely beautiful terrain, without the worry of an attack from grizzlies, was undeniably important to me. I wouldn't even consider a similar trek in Glacier National Park for that reason. Family friends who live in Smithers, B.C. were forced to build a high fenced berm around their house just so their children could safely play outside while the mom washed dishes at the kitchen sink, watching them from the window. They go nowhere in the nearby wilderness without being armed because the threat of grizzlies is so high.

With all the violence American citizens face in our cities, please let us keep some beautiful sanctuaries where the threat is low and it isn't necessary to pull out some type of protection. Hikers may not have time to get the toggle turned on that bear spray can during a grizzly attack, and who wants to carry a gun in such a beautiful place? Not me.

Correspondence ID: 316Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Salt Lake City, UT 84108
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 06:27:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Although currently a resident of SLC, UT, we are looking to move to Bellingham, WA in the next 2 years - and are, therefore, an interested party.

We oppose the move to introduce grizzly bears into North Cascades. We like grizzlies and have seen them not only from the safety of our vehicles but also encountered them multiple times on the trails. While our encounters have been peaceful thus far, they have not been without risk. So, we know that the risk in human-grizzly encounters is essentially uncontrolled and sooner or later there are adverse consequences for the humans. Frankly, there is too much stress and risk associated with the encounters that we have slowly stopped visiting the areas with grizzly bear population.

We, therefore, think that keeping the grizzlies in their current habitat is preferable to adding them to North Cascades following such a program. As such, our preference would be to not proceed with this initiative.

Correspondence ID: 317Project:112008Document:132104

Address: North Bend, WA 98045
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 06:45:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I fully support this and can't wait to see their recovery in the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 318Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Monroe, WA 98272
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 06:49:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I myself would not like to see grizzly bears introduced. They don't stay in the park and there is not the type of food located here to sustain them. It hasn't changed since they first asked if the public wanted to see bears there. No the environmental groups hound and hound the Parks service until they get their way, Tell them NO

Correspondence ID: 319Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Marblemount, WA 98267
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 06:51:49
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: DO NOT introduce Grizzlies to the North Cascades. It will devastate the local population. See extensive damage by the non-native elk that is out of control.

Correspondence ID: 320Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Maple falls, WA 98266
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 06:53:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Plan a to do nothing is the best course of action. Why are we not looking into restoring elk in the north cascades. There is too much human activity in these areas.

Correspondence ID: 321Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Ingomar, PA 15127
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 06:54:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: YES! YES! YES! Restore this native species to an environment where they thrived before the interference of humans! Bring Back the Bears!

Correspondence ID: 322Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Ingomar, PA 15127
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 06:56:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support restoring the bears to this environment where they once thrived. Humans can and do live with the bears. It just requires some awareness and tolerance. Restore the Grizzly to the North Cascade Ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 323Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Olympia, WA 98501
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 06:59:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Yes, please restore the grizzly population in the North Cascades....thank you for all your efforts.

Correspondence ID: 324Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 07:03:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: More bears please!!!

Correspondence ID: 325Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98199
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 07:08:03

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I spend a lot of time during the summer in the back country of the North Cascades. Please do not try to reintroduce grizzlies to this region. If they want to be in this area, they will roam to fill it themselves. After reading the supporting materials I see no ecological advantage that trumps human life and safety.

Correspondence ID: 326Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spokane, WA 99228
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 07:13:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Yes please.

Correspondence ID: 327Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America

Outside Organization: Whatcom County Democrats Civic Groups(Official Rep.)

Received: Sep,29 2023 07:18:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am commenting as Chair of Whatcom County Democrats, in representation our over 900 dues-paying members. Our Platform, unanimously adopted, states, "State Legislature, Federal Government: Protect keystone and other species - such as orca, salmon, wolf, beaver, puma, and grizzly bear - and restore them to suitable parts of their former ranges to maintain a healthy ecosystem."

That explicitly includes restoring the grizzly bear to the North Cascades, much of which lies within Whatcom County.

In this time of severe climate change and threatened extinctions, it is essential to do all we can to restore and protect our native fauna. The grizzly bear is also emblematic of truly wild habitat that is everywhere under siege. It is also a draw for ecotourism.

Correspondence ID: 328Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Othello, WA 99344
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 07:25:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: It is important for us to do all we can to restore biodiversity in wild places where man's hand was the primary driver to extirpation. As a hunter, fisherman, and outdoor recreator in these areas I hope we can help restore grizzlies and also conserve any genetics from the original population through breeding with other bears along the cascade range further north. I also believe it to be important that we do the same for other populations of animals like beavers, moose, and elk in these areas.

Correspondence ID: 329Project:112008Document:132104

Address: BOTHELL, WA 98021
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 07:25:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears are an important part of the ecosystem. They should be restored to create needed balance. Scott Schuyler, policy representative for the Upper Skagit Tribe said, "The time has come for the grizzly bear to return to its habitat to take its place in the indigenous ecosystem," Many rural residents living in the North Cascades recognize that they are in grizzly bear habitat. We need to restore this important species to its habitat.

Correspondence ID: 330Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Anacortes, WA 98221
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 07:26:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The reintroduction of grizzlies will no doubt result in unnecessary human harm and suffering over an extended period of time. In my opinion the benefits of reintroduction are not a strong enough to justify the long term risks to hikers and backpackers. Grizzlies are beautiful and majestic creatures but you cannot recreate a long gone past, and in the context of a bold apex predator that has little fear of humans and, no doubt will be in conflict with humans, you should not try.

Correspondence ID: 331Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lakewood, WA 98499
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 07:28:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: It's time for equality and not with just humans. The superior role over once we discovered we need each other. we are one!! I vote Yes!

Correspondence ID: 332Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Marysville, WA 98270
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 07:35:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not bring back grizzly bears to the North Cascades or anywhere else. As a back country hiker I have seen the ecosystem work just fine without them, and they would pose a significant danger to people who are in the wilderness. We do not need to restore any animals that are dangerous to people. The forest will not die; cities will not be over-run with deer; and it will be much safer for people to enjoy the wilderness areas without the threat of being killed by a grizzly bear. Life has been just fine without them. And wolves are not necessary either.

Stop listening to all the tree-huggers and animal worshippers that think all animals are necessary and good. Those people are in the minority. The majority of wilderness users want to be safe when they venture into the woods, but also understand that there are certain natural risks when doing so. We don't need to increase the danger risk by restoring grizzly bears. Black bears and cougars can handle all of the necessary ecosystem duties that grizzly bears would.

Thanks for your time.

Correspondence ID: 333Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 07:42:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: This is grizzly bear land. They were here first. I support this grizzly bear plan of action.

Correspondence ID: 334Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Clarkston, WA 99403
United States of America
Outside Organization: HPE Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 07:42:49
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please bring back the grizzlies to the NCE! I am in favor of alternative C in the Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan.

Correspondence ID: 335Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Tacoma, WA 98406
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 07:50:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hurray for Grizzly Bears returning to their historic habitat in the North Cascades!
The Upper Skagit Tribe's territory lies within the recovery zone, and their representative, Scott Schuyler, stated, "The Upper Skagit successfully coexisted with grizzly bears for thousands of years, and we should once more."
This ecosystem is incomplete without the Grizzly.

Correspondence ID: 336Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Olympia, WA 98516
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 07:53:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Yes, of course you should bring back the bears!!!

Correspondence ID: 337Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Oak Harbor, WA 98277
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 07:54:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: First off this is a very bad idea. Leave them in Alaska or Canada there's too many people in the forest down here that are irresponsible and not able to take care of themselves let alone worry about a 1000 pound bear that will eat them. I say this from experience being Hey avid camper myself. I have had 4 Bear encounters with big brown bears 3 in California and one in Montana I am still lucky to be alive.. I don't mind the blackbears there a little more timid. If you bring grizzly bear's back there's gonna be too many people bear encounters and as people do not win against a bear. You bring grizzly bear's back and they start killing people 1 or 2 a year it's on you

Correspondence ID: 338Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Snoqualmie, WA 98965
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 07:55:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please focus efforts on environmental restoration and improvements. If we fix and manage human impacts the bears will come back naturally to a landscape that is fit for them. Simply adding bears back into the landscape is not a solution and continues to uphold how humans try to manage natural processes. Please consider alternative solutions.

Correspondence ID: 339Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98118
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 08:12:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Don't do it. Grizzlies aren't endangered but hikers will be. The North Cascades is so close to millions of people. The bears are fine living in Canada or wherever. They don't need to be this close to people. It's not the 1700s anymore.

Or consider the lawsuits that will be filed by mauled hikers and dead hikers' families. And for what? So there can be a few more grizzlies in the world? It's not like the bears know or care.

Don't do it.

Correspondence ID: 340Project:112008Document:132104
Address: ROCHESTER, WA 98579-9711
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 08:12:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do not support any grizzly "restoration" in the cascade range. If introduced they would be an invasive species. Much like the timber wolves brought down from up north wich never inhabited these lands. They decimated the deer,elk and moose populations everywhere they spread. We do not need another invasive predator species putting a strain on the ungulate populations. Grizzly bears are not endangered so why propagate the species? Restore the deer and elk populations and remove the wolves. Spend your time on projects the public supports. Not special interest projects that a handful of radicals support.

Correspondence ID: 341Project:112008Document:132104
Address: seattle, WA 98106
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 08:15:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: yes yes yes yes please reintroduce them!!! especially introducing them as an endangered species. the planet needs more protective thoughtful actions to "re-wild" our natural habitats.

Correspondence ID: 342Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Everson, WA 98247
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 08:18:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I live in Whatcom county and regularly hunt, fish, and hike in the North Cascades. I am against the reintroduction of grizzly bears into the North Cascades and am concerned about the ungulate population if they were

reintroduced. Blacktail deer on the western half of the reintroduction area cannot be surveyed and the Okanogan mule deer heard on the Pasayten side of the reintroduction area is already struggling. The addition of grizzly bears will not help either of these populations, and the impacts to these populations has not been studied enough to move forward with the plan. If the North Cascades was good habitat for grizzlies, why have they not naturally populated the area for Canada? This state already has a predator management issue, that the WDFW commission is actively trying to make worse through bad policy decisions. There is very little benefit in reintroducing grizzlies to the North Cascades, if they wanted to be there, they would have already come down and established a population from Canada.

Correspondence ID: 343Project:112008Document:132104

Address: BELLEVUE, WA 98006-3836
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 08:18:52

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello, I fully support bringing back grizzly bears. It is THEIR territory. Humans need to stay in our lane and allow nature to thrive.

Thank you,
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 344Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 08:20:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a avid outdoorsman i completely disagree with this. Grizzlies are known to be very aggressive, much more than our beloved black bears. Introducing these bear into areas where their will be hikers and campers will result in people being attacked. Is Introducing more predators in the ecosystem more important than the safety of people trying to enjoy the outdoors? Wolves have already been introduced into the state and the population is getting out of control. Livestock is being attacked. Elk and deer populations are decimated. They have migrated to the west side of the mountains, where they were never ment to be. Do you really think the Grizzlies will stay in the east cascades? What happens when they start popping up in populated areas? I sincerely hope you think twice before you do this.

Correspondence ID: 345Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Elk, WA 99009
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 08:20:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Absolutely NOT! Washington is already suffering the consequences of an over abundance of Apex predators! The wildlife is in decline due to the high number of wolves, cougar , bear , Bobcat, and coyotes . The last thing we need is MORE 600 lb grizzly bears . WDFW has already hurt this state by eliminating hound hunting , eliminating spring bear season , eliminated baiting bears . These were the 3 most successful ways to control the populations , it also was the best way to size up animals and assure they were older mature animals before harvesting them . Somehow WA state politicians have forgot that us humans are in fact part of the food chain , we should be at the top of the chain , but bad policy's have removed us , destroyed our resources and put us lower on the food chain . Stop the insanity !

Correspondence ID: 346Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Newcastle, WA 98059
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 08:21:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Yes, grizzly bears should be reintroduced to the North Cascades. This was part of their original range and their reintroduction will help to restore the ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 347Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bonney Lake, WA 98391
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 08:33:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Consider this a no, in the strongest regard possible. Learn from the re-introduction of Wolves into WA, which are now growing at a rate so fast, their population is having to be managed lethally in some instances. I stand against this idea in the strongest way possible.

Correspondence ID: 348Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Olympia, WA 98501
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 08:33:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of grizzlies into the North Cascades. Due to increased land development and other human interference, grizzlies are not expected to confidently return to these areas without help so I am in support of assistance to the bears over the next 10 years. I have traveled to lands in British Columbia where these bears are well populated and they pose little risk to humans if properly educated.

I see far more benefits in helping to reestablish populations of grizzlies in the cascades.

Correspondence ID: 349Project:112008Document:132104
Address: seattle, WA 98109
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 08:34:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent,

I am writing to express my vehement opposition to the proposed Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan for the North Cascades Ecosystem. While I understand the importance of preserving wildlife and maintaining ecological balance, reintroducing grizzly bears to this region is a misguided and perilous endeavor.

The potential risks and threats posed by an increased grizzly bear population cannot be understated. These animals, once reintroduced, will undoubtedly encroach upon human habitats, leading to an inevitable surge in human-wildlife conflicts. The safety of local communities should be of paramount concern, and it is irresponsible to jeopardize the well-being of residents for the sake of an ill-conceived environmental experiment.

Furthermore, the draft Environmental Impact Statement lacks a comprehensive assessment of the economic repercussions that may arise from this proposal. Local industries such as agriculture, tourism, and outdoor recreation are bound to suffer as the presence of grizzly bears raises legitimate concerns among residents and visitors alike. The potential decline in these sectors will have far-reaching consequences on the livelihoods of countless individuals.

It is disheartening to witness government agencies prioritize the interests of wildlife over the safety and prosperity of their own citizens. I urge you to reconsider this misguided proposal and focus on initiatives that prioritize the well-being of the

human population and the sustainable growth of local economies.

Sincerely,

Correspondence ID: 350Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 08:36:24

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I heartily endorse any plan that seeks to restore traditional and threatened species to our great outdoors. While it is always a challenge to manage the needs of people vs. the needs of nature, we all benefit from a healthy ecosystem and must remember that grizzly bears were here long before we were. They deserve a return to the North Cascades. Humans have been responsible for untold misery in the animal world; let's do the right thing here.

Correspondence ID: 351Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lynnwood, WA 98037
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 08:37:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Thank you for this opportunity to comment. I currently feel OPPOSED to any proposal to reintroduce Grizzly Bears into the Northern Cascades of Washington State. While I usually support all natural ecosystems & related reintroduction efforts (especially in my home state of Washington), I make a unique exception only for Grizzly Bears, for the following reasons:

- I backpack in the backcountry of the North Cascades, and it's a tremendous relief not having to worry about Grizzlies. (Black bears are significantly easier to deal with.)
- After Grizzlies' absence of more than a century, the ecosystem has already evolved accordingly - as have the expectations & lifestyles of surrounding communities and visitors (e.g., campers/hikers) to the area.
- The North Cascades already have apex predators (Black Bears and Cougars), which seem to provide balance?
- Unless there's a severe & compelling problem to be solved here (e.g., an egregious ecosystem imbalance), then I struggle to understand the rationale for pursuing the reintroduction of Grizzlies.

Thank you again for considering my input.

Correspondence ID: 352Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Birdsvew, WA 98237
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 08:37:55

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No do not re-introduce grizzly bears to the north cascades.

Correspondence ID: 353Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98177
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 08:38:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Having recently returned from glacier national Park, where we saw a beautiful grizzly bear from the trail I wholeheartedly support, the re-introduction of grizzly bear to the north cascades.

Correspondence ID: 354Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Crossville, TN 38571
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 08:38:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We need more wildlife diversity and native animals to be brought back to where they belong. As a biologist with a master's degree in environmental science, I am begging the NPS to sponsor and fund as many projects like this as possible. We need NPS and BLM lands to remove invasive plants and animals as much as possible as well. Allow grizzlies and bison to start in national parks and then spread to as much of their native ranges as possible.

Natural herbivores and carnivores will help with natural processes for plant life in the areas as well.

Correspondence ID: 355Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Yacolt, WA 98675
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 08:39:21

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not bring grizzlies to the North Cascades. I would very much like to continue enjoying our wild spaces without fear of attack.

Correspondence ID: 356Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98177
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 08:41:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My family has hiked and camped in large popular parks in Canada and Montana where grizzly bears are living. We have seen that they are majestic creatures who can coexist in proximity to informed humans exercising reasonable cautions. I wholeheartedly support reintroducing the grizzly to their native habitat in N Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 357Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bonney Lake, WA 98391
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 08:42:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I believe Grizzly bears should be re-introduced into the North Cascades. I think alternative C is the best way to manage the re-introduction.

The North Cascades "untouched" wilderness is a great asset to Washington state and the nation, and I would love to see it restored to it's natural state.

Correspondence ID: 358Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98116
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 08:47:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No one looks forward to encountering a bear in the back country, but everyone I know in the PNW who spends time in the Backcountry knows how to stay safe from bears (i.e. using bear canisters, keeping smell ables away). When we eliminate critical pieces of ecosystems that have been thriving for centuries or millenia, we start to destroy the very thing all nature enthusiasts wake up early to get out and experience.

The whole concept of national parks is to preserve the environment so that future generations can experience some of the magesty that we get to experience today. Restoring an environment to the way it was two generations ago feels like a great way to keep to that goal.

That said, I think we need more education for the casual day hiker on how to interact with bears. The North Cascades are on every trending TikTok for the most beautiful hikes in Washington, and people who have never gone in the woods before will be in this area. Let's set everyone up for success.

Correspondence ID: 359Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 08:50:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Bringing back the apex predators will benefit the ecosystem that has suffered from decades of human intervention! Bring back Grizzlies And Wolves too! Humans can adapt to them for a change. Lifelong hiker, ok with carrying bear spray and adapting to the presence of grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 360Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Marysville, WA 98270
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 08:55:08

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support Natural Recovery, transplanting grizzlies into the north cascades will harm already struggling ungulate herds in this area but impose risk to human life when they come out of the wilderness and into the valleys looking for food. Increase the deer and elk herds and the Grizzly Bears will come naturally.

Correspondence ID: 361Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Everett, WA 98201
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 08:58:21

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I wholeheartedly support the idea of reintroducing grizzly bears to the North Cascades National Park and managing them as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act, while allowing for limited capture, relocation, or euthanization under specific, carefully monitored circumstances. This approach strikes a balance between conservation and the safety of both bears and humans.

Grizzly bears are not just charismatic megafauna; they are keystone species that play an essential role in shaping their ecosystems. Their return to the North Cascades would help restore ecological balance, benefiting a wide array of flora and fauna.

Moreover, this initiative offers invaluable opportunities for scientific research and education, fostering a deeper understanding of these magnificent creatures and their impact on the environment. It can also promote responsible tourism, bringing economic benefits to local communities while ensuring the preservation of our natural heritage.

However, it's crucial that we prioritize human safety and community engagement throughout this process. Strict protocols for bear management, based on the best available science, must be in place to minimize conflicts and protect people's lives.

In conclusion, managing grizzly bears in the North Cascades as a threatened species under the ESA, with carefully considered guidelines for capture or euthanization when necessary, represents a responsible and ethical approach to conservation. It not only aids in species recovery but also enriches our understanding of the natural world, benefiting both the environment and local communities.

Correspondence ID: 362Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Naches, WA 98937
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 08:59:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: While i find humans negative impact to the grizzly bear population very unfortunate, i do not see it necessary to reintroduce them into the cascade mountain range. It would appear the cascades have gotten along just fine without the presence of grizzlies for the last hundred years. I am sure any number of deer, elk, livestock and even humans are alive today thanks to the absence of grizzly bears.

Correspondence ID: 363Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 09:01:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please don't reintroduce grizzly bears. It isn't working well with the wolves, and I doubt it would work with the grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 364Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Marblemount, WA 98267
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 09:03:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: NO. BAD IDEA. DONT DO IT. INSANE IDEA.

Correspondence ID: 365Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98133
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 09:05:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do NOT agree w/the Grizzly Bear restoration plan.

Camping and residences in the area are not practicing good bear hygiene with food and waste and this could quickly become a very dangerous situation. Waste handing would need to be overhauled. Too many out of state tourists who come to the area to camp would continue to cause issues w/tempting bears into campsites.

Correspondence ID: 366Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 09:05:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of the grizzly bear into the North Cascades. I have spent the better part of 25 years hiking, climbing, and skiing in the range, and I live just south of it. I support any and all action to support and restore the ecosystem there and believe reintroducing these animals is one part of doing so.

Correspondence ID: 367Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Renton, WA 98059
United States of America
Outside Organization: Woodland Park Zoo Conservation/Preservation
Received: Sep,29 2023 09:07:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We ABSOLUTELY should bring the grizzlies back to the North Cascades. Grizzlies were roaming here long before humans and deserve to have their home and habitat back. Grizzlies and brown bears are such an important part of a healthy ecosystem and a majestic symbol of our wild areas in the west. As stewards of the land around us, we must make decisions to conserve, protect, and enrich our environment. We can do that by welcoming grizzlies home and co-existing safely with them. I am completely in favor of the reintroduction of grizzlies to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 368Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98274
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 09:07:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I will support any bill that brings wildlife back to our area. Grizzlies and all wildlife should be allowed to roam freely. We have taken so much land from them that it truly breaks my heart. In my mind, animals deserve to live in their natural habitat, without the interference of humans..

Correspondence ID: 369Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Darrington, WA 98241-0242
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 09:24:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am against introducing Grizzly bears to the North Cascades. With the amount of hikers and recreation in the area I don't believe Grizzly introduction would be a good thing for human recreation or for the bears. Also it seems that places, like trails and roads would get closed down in the name of "Grizzly bear recovery". That is the last thing that we need with the expanding population of outdoor recreationalists. I vote no on Grizzly bear reintroduction in the North Cascades.

Thank you,


Correspondence ID: 370Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lynnwood, WA 98036
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 09:25:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Great idea and plan to get grizzly bears back to Western North Cascades National Park. What took so long! This is wilderness protected area and those bears belong there.

Correspondence ID: 371Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Camano Island, WA 98282
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 09:28:08

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am an avid outdoorsperson and I usually spend 2+ weeks per year in the backcountry in the North Cascades. One of the huge reasons that the North Cascades National Park is so special is its unique remote and wild character.

While I have enjoyed the luxury of playing carefree and not needing to think about grizzly bears, it's much more important that they return to their place in this intricate ecosystem. Conservation of truly wild places is very important to me and humans don't belong at the top of the food chain in the North Cascades.

I fully support the Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan Alternative C -- Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation -- for North Cascades National Park.

Thank you,
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 372Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Castle Rock, WA 98611
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 09:30:37

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think it's a wonderful idea! Let's keep moving forward on trying to bring more balance to nature.

Correspondence ID: 373Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America

Outside Organization: Mt Rainier Nordic Ski Patrol Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 09:39:10

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please restore these animals to the Northern Cascades towards a modicum of the original balance of nature in this area.

Correspondence ID: 374Project:112008Document:132104

Address: POULSBO, WA 98370
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 09:41:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am a hiker, and get up to the North Cascades area a few times a year. High on my list of hiking enjoyment ingredients is not having to worry about my safety - yes, taking due diligence for my safety is important, but your proposal to increase my risk of encountering bears is just plain unnecessary. I already have native risk from black bears and cougars - both of which behave differently than grizzlies. If I want to see a grizzly in the wild, I can go to Yellowstone or some other park (I like seeing them there - but I also don't hike there).

The idea of reintroducing them is just unnecessary. Equilibrium, after the grizzlies were removed from the area, has already long since been established, so they are not, and have not been for decades, part of the ecosystem. Yes, they were once a part

of it - but they are not now, and a new equilibrium exists. Leave it alone! Grizzlies do not sufficiently benefit the ecosystem so as to endanger hikers. I'm not saying there is no benefit at all - it's just not enough benefit to warrant the risk.

There are also better uses for Park Service funds than this, but that's not the point. The point is that reintroducing grizzlies is just not necessary and any benefits are not worth the impact to the recreational community.

Correspondence ID: 375Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Carnation, WA 98014
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 09:41:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do not reintroduce these apex predators to the Cascades of Washington State. With the vast number of growing outdoor recreationalists who do not know how to basically function in the outdoors, you are just asking for more fatal encounters with these animals. This will be detrimental to all.

Correspondence ID: 376Project:112008Document:132104
Address: White Salmon, WA 98672
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 09:44:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Yes introduce grizzly bears. Wildlife is awesome. Thanks

Correspondence ID: 377Project:112008Document:132104
Address: SEATTLE, WA 98103
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 09:45:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Sure, bring in the grizzlies. Not too long ago there were Grizzlies on Queen Anne hill here in Seattle until city closed the high school. Since I went the Queen Anne H.S., I was a Grizzly and have a tee shirt to prove it.

Correspondence ID: 378Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98116
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 09:45:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I favor the reintroduction of grizzly bears into the North Cascades. This is a vast area that, as the studies show, should support a sustainable population.
Perhaps 30 years ago we watched, thru binoculars from over a mile away, what appeared to be a grizzly, we'd like others to enjoy that experience in the future.

Correspondence ID: 379Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Everson, WA 98247
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 09:46:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We do not want Grizzly bears in Whatcom County or the State of Washington. As someone who has spent a lot of time in the mountains I do not want to see a dangerous bear introduced. Black bears will usually run away from you but grizzly bears will hunt you down . They will also kill deer and elk which are already being preyed upon by cougars and wolves. which the government has been promoting. I think it is a really bad idea. There is a reason why we got rid of the grizzly bears in other areas. They are a great threat to humans and other animals. Recently we had reports of a Mama black bear and her two cubs that were seen roaming all around whatcom county from South Pass road to Blaine. The game department finally had to trap them and euthenize them because they were getting into peoples garbage and they knew the bears would keep coming back. luckily no one got hurt, If this had been a grizzly bear people and livestock would have been in danger. Please do not reintroduce grizzly bears back into anywhere in Washington State.

Thank you,

Correspondence ID: 380Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98104
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 09:46:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Typing and spelling hard for bear, sorry if hard too reed. Internut hard to find in woods, too.

Bear name Grizzle Barrrr write this email to Pork Serbice and Farthest Serbice to say Grizzle like plan for mor bear. Bring Grizzle bear friend. Lots of bear friend! Rarrrr!

Thank yoo

GRIZZLE

Correspondence ID: 381Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Covington, WA, 98042, WA 98042-8257
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 09:50:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Restoring the grizzly to the Washington State Cascade Mountains is a dangerous waste of resources. With the very large populations and number of people recreating in the Cascades - many people WILL be hurt/killed if these predators are restored.

No clear imbalance is present in the ecosystem currently. These predators have been absent for a century. The case for recovery seems to be more about "they used to be here, so let's bring them back", Recovery of the grizzly here will not heal an ecosystem - it will only bring danger to residents.

No to recovery in Washington State. Just no.

Correspondence ID: 382Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Deming, WA 98226
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 09:53:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I don't see the point of reintroducing them here. Hikers and campers would rather be safe and not need to carry bear spray, and livestock could also be threatened. Leave the ecosystem as is by continuing to protect forest, but please don't meddle by introducing potentially aggressive predators. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 383Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Naches, WA 98937-944
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 09:58:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: NO-NO-NO-NO- do not bring them back here

Correspondence ID: 384Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Issaquah, WA 98027
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 10:01:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Yes. Please re-introduce the grizzly into it's historical habitat.

Correspondence ID: 385Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Snohomish, WA 98290
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 10:05:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: For the love of god please scrap this idea altogether. Sure, grizzlies once lived here. Emphasis on the past tense. Displacing a bunch of grizzlies into a new region as the alpha predator to create a domino effect to disrupt the entire food chain. What could go wrong? Oh, yeah. The same thing that happens every time us humans meddle with things like this. How many times do we collectively have to not learn our lesson here?

But sure you have some fanciful idea of what the state once was. Will you bring back the woolly mammoth too? How about you put your resources towards keeping our dwindling salmon population alive? That way everyone from environmentalists, to fishermen, to the already stressed animals and plants are happy. Last i checked the salmon are nearly wiped out in the north cascades, and you seriously want to add a predator notorious for hunting salmon? Great. Lose the animal every loves and replace it with one everyone is terrified of. What a trade.

Look, im not oblivious to bears. Im an avid outdoors adventurer. Ive seen over 50 bears in the wild. I'm more confident around these animals than 99% of the hikers and backpackers out there. When the only bear you need to concern yourself with is a black bear, its not a big deal. You follow good bear practices, have some bear mace, and use good judgment. When you have grizzlies, you bring guns. Big guns. Ask anyone in Alaska.

Your bear management BS will provide zero defense to the unprepared public trying to recreate. Particularly as the grizzlies are trying to figure out their food sources in a new spot. Hikers in tents may as well be bear tacos. What happens to the outclassed black bears? They'll get pushed out of their territory into the suburbs. A hungry desperate black bear is a dangerous black bear. Those are the kinds that attack people. So even if you have grizzlies deep in the wilderness, they dont just fold into the food chain. They push something else out of it.

Has it even been established that these bears can sustain themselves here? There's a reason they aren't here already. Its one thing in Montana or Alaska. But the cascade mountains let the wolverine's naturally re-establish themselves southwards. If it was viable, the bears would have already done the same on their own accord. Again. Stop meddling with nature.

What happens next summer when the wildfires wipe the habitat out again and push animals away and limit their resources? Where are the grizzlies gonna relocate to? Hint: You wont be in control of them.

This plan, boiled down to its constituent parts is simple: Insert chaos and danger using taxpayer dollars in order to make our prized parks less usable to humans for the sake of massaging someone's naive sensibilities about nature.

Correspondence ID: 386Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98133
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 10:14:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I fully support any adopted plan to restore Grizzly Bears to the North Cascades. The option to release 3 to 7 bears over 10 years adding 25 initially sounds promising. However the other options have my full support if they prevail. Thank you for the opportunity to voice an opinion on this crucial environmental issue.

Correspondence ID: 387Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 10:20:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzlies should be restored to the ecosystem. We have already seen how transformative the restoration of large predators can be to the parks with Yellowstone. We should do the same with north Cascades park as well.

Correspondence ID: 388Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lynden, WA 98264
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 10:21:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We have had encounters with grizzly bears in Montana and Alaska. They are not to be taken lightly! People are regularly attacked and killed in Glacier Park, Yellowstone Park, The Great Bear Wilderness and parts of Alaska. The terrain in both Montana and Alaska is not nearly as populated as in Washington State and the number of backpackers and horse-packers are not as numerous in the backcountry of Alaska and Montana. People will get killed by Grizzlies if they are introduced here. If the wild parts of Whatcom County were viable for grizzlies, they would have already migrated down from BC or from populations in the eastern part of the state, Idaho and Montana. This is a dreadful idea that does not value human life and safe access for people into the back country.

Correspondence ID: 389Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sammamish, WA 98075
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 10:21:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not support the proposed populating of the Cascades with Grizzly Bears. The current state of the natural environment is a delicate ecosystem and we should not jeopardize that with this initiative.

Correspondence ID: 390Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Maple Falls, WA 98266
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 10:26:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No please don't have you lost your minds.... There is so much garbage in this community that already causes enough bear issues!

Correspondence ID: 391Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Auburn, WA 98092
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 10:27:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am commenting in opposition of this draft. I believe this is not a great decision or use of US Fish and Wildlife funding. Until states can manage these animals individually, this should not be considered as another federally ran program. Washington's state fish and wildlife will ultimately end up with higher costs to deal with these animals on our landscape. If Grizzly bears wanted to be in WA, they already would be. I feel that if the Grizzly bears were reintroduced, the anti hunting groups and organizations would protect these animals at such a cost, that they would then never be managed and would pose a threat on our ungulate and livestock species. WA state will never vote for a delisting of the Grizzly bears. Please do not reintroduce them here.

Thank you,


Vice President - WA Chapter
American Bear Foundation

Correspondence ID: 392Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sequim, WA 98382
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 10:27:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzlies are a historical species in the North Cascades. Ecologically speaking they belong, just like the wolves. This is a topic that needs to be handled by science, not guided by ignorant segments of the populace.

Correspondence ID: 393Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98112
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 10:27:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: YES. Grizzly bears SHOULD be reintroduced into their native habitat, the No. Cascades. They BELONG there. Humans will either have to keep out, or figure a way to live in harmony with these scary majestic beasts. We had no business driving them from their homes, and should welcome them back. We are the ones who need to be relocated away from the No. Cascades, not native bears.

Correspondence ID: 394Project:112008Document:132104

Address: San Diego, CA 92115
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 10:28:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in full support of re-introducing Ursus arctos horribilis to the North Cascades. It is part of its historic natural habitat and we humans and our livestock need to re-adapt to life with this animal in the ecosystem. Make it happen!

Correspondence ID: 395Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98122
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 10:29:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Yes, they should be returned, and protected from hunters and ranchers protecting cattle or sheep. Bears are native species and should receive priority over humans moving into what was, until relatively recently, wilderness. Domestic livestock have no business there. If required change the zoning and land use regs to push back areas humans inhabit or might move into. Take "grazing land" out of circulation with a new, very large land use category "predator habitat";

Correspondence ID: 396Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98122
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 10:29:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I'm in favor of retiring grizzly bears to the Cascades. We've seen how ecosystems suffer when apex predators are eliminated, and ours would benefit from re-introducing the bears.

Correspondence ID: 397Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 10:32:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzly Bears are an important part of the N Cascades ecosystem , and having been wiped out by humanity's mismanagement, it is our responsibility as stewards of our wilderness areas to correct that error.

Correspondence ID: 398Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Brinnon, WA 98320
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 10:33:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I think this is a great idea. I think it would enhance our area immensely. We see a growing number of Black Bears in our area and they seem to be getting closer to humans, though we have numerous Apple Trees in the area and we have a salmon spawning river on our property. I believe Black and Grizzly will co exist. Its humans i worry about. Nice to see the "last known Grizzly" is on file with the person that shot it! This is the big issue as far as i can see. Human interaction. Though are is pretty remote. Illegal shooting of the Bears. Can the local Wildlife Officers support this extra activity/work? Anyway im all for it. I think the Wolf re introduction worked well, so why not the Grizzly?
Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Correspondence ID: 399Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 10:34:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think the reintroduction would be a great idea. My concern is people encroaching on the bears territory. Also I would worry about illegal hunting of the bears. I do believe, if there is a way to protect the bears, it would be great for the environment. They would keep rodent/deer populations in check and they would be able to live in their natural habitat. Please withhold my personally identifiable information.

Correspondence ID: 400Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 10:34:56

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support Option 1: Allow grizzly bears to be managed as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act. Only permit some to be captured, moved or killed under specific circumstances, like the defense of life and scientific or research activities.

Correspondence ID: 401Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lake Stevens, WA 98258
United States of America

Outside Organization: Project SeaWolf Coastal Protection Conservation/Preservation

Received: Sep,29 2023 10:36:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please accept our organizational, and our individual Board member support of the proposed initiative to return a sustainable population of grizzly bears into the North Cascade ecosystems.

The North Cascades have traditionally, healed, robust grizzly populations for centuries prior to their extirpation, in the ecosystem is fully capable of supporting grizzly bears in combination with other wildlife. We believe that the presence of grizzly bears as a vital part of a wilderness ecosystem, and we recognize that in many areas across North America, including parts of Idaho, Montana, Alaska, the Yukon, British Columbia, and Alberta, people have managed to recreate, roam, farm, and coexist in harmony with grizzly bear populations.

Grizzlies have become an icon of successful wilderness, and for many of the First Nation people who have lived here since time immemorial, the grizzly has always been a revered and important ecological species present throughout the northwest. As society continues to 'progress' ahead, the trend has been to lose many of our native species to extirpation; in order to ensure sustainable biodiversity, and the true integrity of God and his ecosystems, it is important for us to allow for, and actively support, the return of natural predators into regions where they were previously, and senselessly, eradicated. The presence of grizzlies will also do much to help provide for a healthier prey-species presence in the North Cascades.

We urge the NPS to provide the resources, build the necessary partnerships, and commit to the long-term re-introduction of a stable and balanced ecosystem in the North Cascade by pursuing a grizzly bear reintroduction program in Washington State. Thank you for your attention and consideration.

Michael Kundu, Director
Project SeaWolf Coastal Protection
Lake Stevens, Washington

Correspondence ID: 402Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98101
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 10:41:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in favor of re-introducing grizzlies in the WA North Cascades. They are part of the ecosystem we need to restore for the health of our country/world. Please pass this draft reintroduction plan for Grizzlies in the north Cascades of WA.

Correspondence ID: 403Project:112008Document:132104
Address: OLYMPIA, WA 98501
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 10:43:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Prefer alternative B, existing Endangered Species Act protections.

Correspondence ID: 404Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 10:47:19
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Both thumbs up. I've enjoyed the mountains and woods for over 50 years, hiking, hunting and just wandering.
I'm always humbled when I'm in the outdoors in an area where there's a possibility of sighting ursus horribilis.
I understand that some folks won't be happy for various reasons about reintroducing grizzlies. Still I'm one who is all for their presence in the wild.
I had a friend who killed a grizzly in about 1930 up in Silesia creek. I'd like for others to have that opportunity someday.

Correspondence ID: 405Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 10:47:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I'm writing to support reintroducing grizzly bears in the North Cascades

The very survival of humans and all life on earth requires that we respect and repair ecosystems. Diversity of species (e.g. black bears, grizzly bears, and others) occupying a similar ecological niche AND maintaining the presence of keystone species like top predators are essential for ecosystems to thrive. Humans have removed grizzly bears from the North Cascades in Washington. It is our responsibility to bring them back, even if it means that people have to make shifts in their own lives to accommodate them.

Please keep this effort moving forward so that grizzly bears can once again live in the north cascade mountains of Washington state.

Correspondence ID: 406Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Redmond, WA 98052
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 11:01:19
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I live in WA and quite often hike and backpack in North Cascades. The area is already wild and dangerous enough, and introducing grizzlies there will make it even more so, adding dramatically to the risks of being out in the nature. I believe we shouldn't make any moves and let the nature do its job, if grizzlies find it good for their life, so be it. But changing it artificially (even if we believe it's how we think it needs to be) is the wrong choice

Correspondence ID: 407Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Olympia, WA 98506
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 11:02:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzly bears returning to the Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 408Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 11:03:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Return/restore Grizzly Bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem in Washington, where the animals once roamed.

Do I have to say more?

OK.: "The Upper Skagit people are historically the people of the North Cascades, along with the grizzly bear," Scott Schuyler, policy representative for the Upper Skagit Tribe, said in a phone call. "It has always been important for us to restore and see the return of grizzly bears."

"From the tribe's standpoint, we believe the answer is pretty clear: yes, they do have a right to exist," he said. "Our history proves that coexistence is possible, our ancestors respected these animals and they thrived up until the point they were driven out."

Coexistence IS possible, if we respect Grizzly Bears!

Correspondence ID: 409Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Olalla, WA 98359
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 11:03:49
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I feel that introducing grizzly bears into the North Cascades would create a very dangerous situation for the hikers who visit the area. Because it's a roadless wilderness, a hiker, possibly exhausted from a steep climb up a trail, would be in real danger if they came around a bend and surprised a grizzly bear. I'm aware that there are black bears living in the area, but grizzly bears are bigger and more ferocious. The North Cascades National Park was created to preserve an exceptionally beautiful area for people to enjoy the wonder and peace of nature.....not to go hoarse calling out to warn off grizzlies and constantly looking back over your shoulder to check for them. I also think the introduction of grizzlies would inspire more hikers to this remote area to carry firearms for self-protection, even though that's not legal in the park. Better safe than sorry.

Correspondence ID: 410Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 11:04:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am not for this movement. As a person who hikes/bikes and has lived in Alaska and Washington state, I do not feel like this is a good option. Alaska has many grizzly bears and it is part of the reason why I do not enjoy recreating

there as much as Washington. I also do not see how the environment/ habitat will actually benefit from this. I believe this is being considered for the wrong reasons.

Correspondence ID: 411Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Selah, WA 98942
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 11:05:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Greetings,

I am writing for my extreme support for the "no action" option for the grizzly bear recovery plan. My support for no action is based on public safety and the best interest of the grizzlies that would potentially be relocated. Current grizzly bear populations take advantage of many different food sources, most of which do not exist in the high cascades in enough volume to produce quality habitat for grizzly bears. In populations in BC, grizzly bears take advantage of caribou, elk, moose, white bark pine, fish, and other vegetation. In Montana and other western states where grizzly populations thrive, you can substitute fish for moths and other insects and small mammals. The crest of the Cascades holds NONE of these in sufficient volume, so you'd be taking a bear from its habituated diet and setting it up for failure; either the diet would have to adapt, which would likely directly compete with healthy and also naturally-occurring black bear populations, or the bears would relocate to find more suitable forage. This migration would take them off the crest of the cascades into the human matrix, which only spells disaster for the bears and the persons they interact with. IF the bears stay in the cascades and do not find suitable food... you will have an entirely different challenge; the Pacific Crest Trail sees some of the largest usership on the west coast, with most of the persons trying to compete it doing so in late summer and fall... the same time these bears would be desperate enough for a very poor outcome for recreational users. You are setting persons AND the bears up for a very poor outcome for little to no reward. The fact is that there is no physical barrier for grizzlies to reoccupy the Cascades should they choose to do so from the British Columbia population. Grizzlies are physical, mobile, and highly intelligent creatures that would have already repopulated the region in question if the habitat were preferable to them. Let nature decide where it should exist rather than dictating where it does.

Correspondence ID: 412Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Maple Falls, WA 98266
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 11:09:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: A big yes to this plan!

Correspondence ID: 413Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Olympia, WA 98501
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 11:17:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm so disappointed in this effort - it's too late, folks. The bears got screwed here, first by being hunted almost to extinction and NOW with this effort to repopulate the region! Humans continue to encroach on their habitat - and this will continue as there's no effort to incentivize anyone to have either fewer kids or even no kids. So as the population continues to go up more land is/will be used to house these folks; the bears get less and less habitat & get screwed once again!

And you plan to reintroduce these poor bears into an ever-diminishing territory? What are you thinking? Or are you thinking?!

Wake up please -


Olympia, WA

Correspondence ID: 414Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bothell, WA 98087
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 11:18:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hi,

Option A please. The north cascades have an ever growing people pressure as tourism and outdoor adventure increase. Introducing grizzlies into this condoned space is bound to lead to conflicts and management needs. Please invest the money in other parts of the ecosystem.

Thanks.

Correspondence ID: 415Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Monroe, WA 98272
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 11:18:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Everyone in our household support the restoration of animals which have been pushed out of/hunted out of historic territory.

We support this action.

We ask that controls are put into place to prevent land owners from indiscriminately killing animals that they perceive to be a threat. I am reminded of an old South Park episode where the characters were going hunting and only had to shout "they're coming right for us" and then would unload on whatever creature was in range.

While this is an example in a comedy TV show, it is my perception that property owners only have to provide a flimsy excuse as to why entire wolf packs and other animals need to die.

Civil penalties should be mandatory with killings that are not approved or sanctioned by the appropriate government body.

Restore the Grizzly Bear to its historic habitat and protect it.






Correspondence ID: 416Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Blaine, WA 98230
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 11:24:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not introduce grizzlies to Whatcom County. I feel that with the ever growing loss of territory that would be suitable for grizzlies, due to deforestation and housing development, they will inevitably end up in human populated area. I don't have faith in the department of fish and wildlife to remove and relocate these bears in a timely fashion when that inevitably happens. I have good reason to not have faith in them because of the way they've handled the family of black bears (mom and 2 cubs) that have been roaming my area for over a month now. They were spotted just a couple blocks from where I live. Fish and wildlife released a statement that they would be trapping and relocating them but that was at least a month ago and it has not happened yet, in spite of the public continually posting sightings on social media. This has caused me to fear bringing my dog out to potty when it's dark. I don't have a fenced in yard. I have a German shepherd that is naturally protective of her property and if those bears did happen to come into my property, I have no doubt that there would be bloodshed, probably my dogs blood and/or mine. Please, for goodness sake, please don't release grizzlies into Whatcom County.

Correspondence ID: 417Project:112008Document:132104

Address: BELLINGHAM, WA 98225
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 11:28:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am opposed to the reintroduction of additional grizzly bear population to the Whatcom and Okanogan Counties in Washington State. The grizzly bears that remain are fine, but increased human population and increased recreational use of the area will only increase the opportunity for grizzly/human interaction. As we've seen in WY, MT, and ID, those interactions are rarely pleasant, for both bear and human.

As we see in Glacier, Teton and Yellowstone National Parks, a growing population of tourists are complete idiots and think wild animals are Disney characters. Taking pictures within fee of bison, elk, moose, and bears. Those outcomes are rarely pleasant and the animals are always faulted.

I write this not from fear, but from a protection for the grizzlies from the idiocy of humans. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 418Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Moxee, WA 98936
United States of America

Outside Organization: n/a Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 11:28:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I would like option A: No action.

At this time it seems like there are plenty of places where grizzlies are, and it would do more harm than good to other animals to compete with Grizzly bears in this portion of the Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 419Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tacoma, WA 98445
United States of America

Outside Organization: Fred Ramey Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 11:28:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As an avid backpacker and someone who frequently is out of doors, I fully support the reintroduction of grizzlies into their native range. Seeing them in their native habitat is a priceless experience. We need to preserve the space and the species together.

Correspondence ID: 420Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Marblemount, WA 98267
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 11:28:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Sirs,

I am totally and adamantly against the introduction of grizzly bears into the local environment. When it comes to things such as wild fires, it seems that the park managements viewpoint is to let it go, it's natural! I ask that you take the same stance on everything in the park. Just leave it alone and nature will restore balance in time.

Thank you, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 421Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ridgefield, WA 98642
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 11:30:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think alternative C would be best. Reintroduce to native range but allow for flexibility as the population hopefully increases. Seems like the most practical option.

Correspondence ID: 422Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mukilteo, WA 98275
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 11:30:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do the right thing and restore the balance of nature and return the grizzly bears. This land isn't owned by humans and we need to coexist with ALL of nature. Humans are destroying this earth. And we can help stop it or at least slow it down. Please do the right thing and take steps to restore this beautiful country and let nature do what it needs.
Thank you

Correspondence ID: 423Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Arlington, WA 98223
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 11:31:19
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bear re-introduction, especially to the north Cascades and Eastern whatcom county , is a absolutely horrible idea. We already have massive predator management problems, only getting more and more complicated with the Washington fish and wildlife commission. Introducing a top apex predator like grizzly bears to our ecosystem is only going to hurt it in the long run. Not to mention, eventually someone is going to have a run in with a grizzly and those usually don't turn out to well .

Don't re-introduce grizzlies back to WA state or the Cascades. It is an incredibly bad idea

Correspondence ID: 424Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 11:31:52

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of grizzly bears into the North Cascades. They are an important part of the ecosystem as an apex predator. If they do get reintroduced, there will need to be a lot of public education to help people understand what to do and how to camp in grizzly country, etc. For example, many campsites in the North Cascades are not set up for pitching a tent in one location and cooking 100 yards away. I think it is important to reintroduce grizzlies because that is what the science supports, and I think we should make our decisions based on science rather than fear.

Correspondence ID: 425Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kingston, WA 98346

United States of America

Outside Organization: N/A Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 11:38:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in favor of the option that would allow grizzly bears to be managed as a threatened species under the ESA, and only permit some to be captured, moved or killed under specific circumstances. I am encouraged at the possibility of grizzly introduction to an area in which they once roamed freely.

Correspondence ID: 426Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Roslyn Heights, NY 11577

United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 11:38:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I love the North Cascades. Although I no longer live in WA, I've camped countless nights in the park and surrounding area. The return of the Grizzlies to the park would be tremendous. I can understand the argument that they're dangerous or that they ought to make a natural recovery, but returning the Cascades to their former glory would be a Conservation victory on par with the wolves in Yellowstone, and probably less controversial. The Cascades are the crown jewel of the US, and returning the ecology to pre-US times (as close as possible anyways) would fulfill the mission of the NPS... to preserve unimpaired the natural and cultural resources and values of the NPS for the enjoyment, education, and inspiration of this and future generations. The Cascades without Grizzlies is a loss for the bears, the Cascadesthemselves, and the Americans (and others) who enjoy the mountains every year. To tune into Nature, without all of Its inhabitants, is impossible.

Correspondence ID: 427Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ferndale, WA 98248

United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 11:38:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As someone who frequently recreates in the region, I fully support the reintroduction of Grizzlies into the North Cascades complex.

As someone who has worked in wildlife biology, and ecological research, I believe I have an informed opinion on how the reintroduction of this keystone species can have amazing benefits to the ecosystem at large.

I understand many local ranchers, farmers, and perhaps some recreators will have apprehension or cause for concern about the reintroduction. I believe, however, that any potential threat would be quite minimal and that there are a multitude of various mitigation techniques to help prevent any potential threats to agriculture, livestock, or humans.

I am hopeful that this effort can continue and that we can one day see grizzlies back in this ecosystem they once thrived in.

Correspondence ID: 428Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Reardan, WA 99029

United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 11:40:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Thank you for taking public comment on this matter. As an avid outdoor recreationalist I oppose both Alternatives B & C and would opt for Alternative A (no change) to the current Grizzly Bear management plan for the NCE. We as Washingtonians have enough predator conflict to deal with as it is with wolves, cougars and black bears. The last thing we need is 7x grizzly bears a year dropped off in the NCE.

Correspondence ID: 429Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Enumclaw, WA 98022
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 11:45:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a long time hiker and backpacker in Washington state, I am against re-introducing Grizzly bears to Washington State.

Western Washington is densely populated, with MANY people who enjoy hiking. Mixing Grizzly bears in areas with large human populations, will undoubtedly cause encounters. Many, which will be detrimental to the humans as well as the bears.

Montana, Idaho, & Wyoming are seeing increased Grizzly bear encounters with humans, due to the increased Grizzly populations in those states. This is happening in states, which do not have our population density, nor do they have the hiker density on trails, that we do on any giving weekend.

We do not need to introduce these issues to Washington, the bears seem to be recovering well in Montana, Idaho, and Wyoming, leave well enough alone!

Correspondence ID: 430Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98178
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 11:47:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm writing in support of the 2022 North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/Environmental Impact Statement of all goals and objectives. Namely, to

*Avoid the permanent loss of grizzly bears in the NCE

- Contribute to the restoration of biodiversity of the ecosystem for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations
- Enhance the probability of long-term survival and conservation of grizzly bears within the NCE and thereby contribute to overall grizzly bear recovery
- Support the recovery of the grizzly bear to the point where it can be removed from the Federal List of Threatened and Endangered Wildlife Species

with the objective to...

- Restore a grizzly bear population as part of the natural and cultural heritage of the North Cascades
- Provide Pacific Northwest residents and visitors with the opportunity to again experience grizzly bears in their native

habitat

- Support Tribal cultural and spiritual values, as well as environmental and natural resource objectives related to the grizzly bear population

A healthy ecosystem requires a sustainable representation of all species. The absence of brown bears over the past decades means that the North Cascades ecosystem is incomplete, negatively affecting all species, including humans.

British Columbia has shown that the presence of bears near humans not only can work but can even benefit local economies through recreation and tourism. Common-sense safety measures including adequate signage, and requirements of hikers and other recreational users to carry bear spray and to travel in groups help address the fear-based, zero-sum logic of "humans vs. bears."

Overcoming ignorance and fear requires ongoing public participation in the project. Websites and social media apps could provide not only educational material but opportunities to report bear sightings and behavior. The hugely popular Cornell eBird app is probably the best model for partnership between wildlife science and public crowdsourcing.

Implementation of the plan must include addressing the legitimate needs and safety concerns of local communities. For example, inevitable losses of livestock due to bear predation must be compensated. A clear and fair plan for such compensation must be included in the implementation of any bear reintroduction plan.

Correspondence ID: 431Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98516
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 11:47:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears are an important resource for a healthy eco system. Anyone who is afraid to let 25 bears live on thousands of acres of public land are using faulty logic based on hysteria. It is a small price for ranchers and farmers, who enjoy benefits paid for by public taxes, to THEORETICALLY lose some livestock to predation.

Bears belong here. They should be here.

Correspondence ID: 432Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 11:48:10

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears were eliminated from this environment many years ago for a reason - they are apex predators that are completely capable of killing humans. Even if bear attacks on humans are very rare, even one human killed by a bear is too much. Is this not how we view safety in our home and workplace? One death is unacceptable and inviting a deadly predator back into an environment with humans is a bad idea.

What is the scale of environmental improvements that will occur by bringing grizzly bears back into this ecosystem and is it truly worth the risk?

Is it not true that Grizzly bear populations have completely recovered in Yellowstone?

And if hunters are not allowed to hunt reintroduced Grizzly bear populations, Grizzlies may not have any natural fear of humans. This would increase their danger to society to a level even higher than when they were first eradicated.

I think that it is wishful thinking not based in reality that has led us to consider reintroducing them to Washington State.

Correspondence ID: 433Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Kirkland, WA 98034
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 11:48:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I would prefer option A , continue current management practices

Correspondence ID: 434Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Issaquah, WA 98027
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 11:48:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: This a a bad idea. Our population is way too high to prevent incidences as the Grizzly population grows. HAS THE NPS DONE A FEASIBILITY STUDY...This is the first step to address, crowds of hikers all over. Urban projects growing all over. North cascades is small compared to id. Mt and wy. And the grizzlys are moving all over those areas. 4 bad incidents already this year. We dont want to worry about Grizzlys when hiking our trails.

Correspondence ID: 435Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Concrete, WA 98237
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 11:49:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Go for it

Correspondence ID: 436Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Palouse, WA 99161
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 11:54:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do not support this grizzly bear reintroduction plan for the North Cascade Ecosystem. Grizzly bears are already in Washington state and I strongly believe that we should let the grizzly bears move into the North Cascades on their own schedule and not force the reintroduction. This seems very similar to wolves getting reintroduced into Colorado when the wolves were already moving there from Wyoming on their own. Perhaps instead of reintroducing grizzly bears the focus should be on improving mule deer herds in North Central Washington. The Methow valley used to have the largest migrating deer herd in the lower 48 and now that herd is a mere fraction (about 1/4) of what it used to be. Maybe focus some of your efforts on rebuilding the deer herds first before reintroducing grizzly bears so that the bears actually have something to eat! If not then 200 grizzly bears will dwindle down that deer herd to almost nothing, which means most of those bears will move closer to homes to try and find food. That would most likely end up with human/bear conflicts which would result in grizzly bears being shot. So I strongly believe that your first efforts should involve rebuilding the struggling mule deer herds in North Central Washington before introducing another apex predator into the mix. And like I stated before, grizzly bears are already in North Central Washington, so perhaps a larger, healthier deer herd would help attract more grizzly bears into North Central Washington? Just some food for thought.

Correspondence ID: 437Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 11:55:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a long time resident of Whatcom County I am eager for this to happen. Grizzly Bears are a species that even if you never see one, their effect on the environment is felt. A person knows when they are in the territory of the Great Bear.

My only concern is that proper controls are put on hunters.

Correspondence ID: 438Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Oroville, WA 98858
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 11:55:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I would advocate strongly against reintroducing grizzlies anywhere in Washington State. Human populations are too large and wide spread now. Bear encounters would have a high likelihood. Also, this species of bear provides no additional benefit to our wildlife ecosystem. We have other types of bears that are providing what is needed to balance things. I worry that reintroduction of grizzlies will have widespread and adverse effects that can just not be predicted.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 439Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 11:56:19
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do reintroduce grizzlies to the North Cascades. I am a hiker and have hiked as recently as this August in Yellowstone, so I know how to hike around grizzlies. Is is slightly harder but an acceptable price to pay for the restoration of the full ecosystem. Restoration of all species, especially top predators, is extremely important. So, YES, reintroduce grizzlies. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 440Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98112
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 12:02:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I vote NO, on the restoration of grizzly bears to the northern Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 441Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Olympia, WA 98502
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 12:05:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Thank you for this opportunity to comment! As someone who has worked on ecosystem issues for over 30 years, I'm thrilled to see that the agency is considering restoring a population of grizzlies to habitat that was considered home to their species previously.

I support the restoration plan.

Likewise, with any restoration also comes a need for protection of the species, and stronger protections than say the gray wolf has had. Ranchers and farmers MUST learn to coexist.

Correspondence ID: 442Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Burien, WA 98166
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 12:06:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As prime habitat, the North Cascades mountain range is vital for the reintroduction and essential for the Grizzly Bear to populate. and thrive.

This action is also essential for the well being as well as the natural health of our environment.

According to Scott Schuyler, it is also important to the Upper Skagit Tribe that the restoration of the Grizzly Bears where they historically lived together in harmony. Please, let us not drive a beautiful and environmentally important animal to extinction.

Correspondence ID: 443Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ferndale, WA 98248
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 12:08:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello NPS, I am commenting on the grizzly restoration plan. As a city dweller and HOA board member who has been researching how to keep the huge deer problem down, none of the feasibility study indices I have read suggested reintroducing grizzlies. I must admit, I have not yet read your study and will subsequently, therefore I will not assume you are considering the reintroduction of grizzlies to help citizens, county and city, better manage the overpopulation of the mule deer herds. Having said that (my this is long-winded), I am all for grizzly reintroduction if it will eventually reduce the deer population.

On the other hand, I'm not sure the grizzlies will stay in Eastern Whatcom County if they follow the deer populations. Then there is a problem. I will now read your study outline.

Thank you for considering these comments.

██████████
██████████

Correspondence ID: 444Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 12:13:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am 100% in favor of the restoration of grizzly bears into the North Cascade Ecosystem. Ecosystems are complex and work best with the balance of predators and prey are naturally maintained. I was in Idaho when they re-established Grizzlies in Yellowstone national park. The change with wolf and grizzly bears, to remove the weak and sick members of the deer, elk and bison was beneficial for the park, and the wild animals.

Thank you

██████████

Correspondence ID: 445Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Valleyford, WA 99036
United States of America

Outside Organization: Meenach Farms Business(Official Rep.)

Received: Sep,29 2023 12:14:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not consider grizzly bear transplants. Most of the suitable habitat holds existing populations that would be negatively effected with new introductions. This species has huge ranges and the death of individuals because of your population boost would surely occur. Our human timeline is so limited, give them a chance.

Correspondence ID: 446Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Port Townsend, WA 98368
United States of America

Outside Organization: Retired Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 12:14:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Of course I fully support restoration of grizzlies in the North Cascades Ecosystem. I concur with Joe Scott's statement in this document.

More public discussion should help bring grizzly restoration into the framework of a clear social imperative. The US hasn't been very kind to these bears!

Correspondence ID: 447Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 12:17:58

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My days of long hikes in the wilderness are dwindling as I get older, so I'm putting this comment for the next generations.
I think the wildness of our country is disappearing and I'd encourage the return of the grizzly. We can learn to live with them, hopefully.

Correspondence ID: 448Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 12:18:03

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am against reintroducing Grizzly bears into the north Cascades in Washington state. While the bears were hunted to near extinction in Washington in the 1800's there are grizzly bears on the Canadian side of the north cascades. Grizzly bears can travel quite far in search of food. With no additional hunting there have been I believe two times they've been spotted in the area in the last few decades. If the land and ecosystem was hospitable for them they would have surely migrated back by now or their numbers would have grown. There are several towns and farming communities that are near the foothills of the cascades. I worry that reintroduction will cause there to be contact with livestock, farmers and people. I can't see a reason to spend the time and resources to bring the bears to a part of the cascades that they currently do not reside in large numbers and with little to no migration into the area. Further more we have done a terrible job maintaining our wolf population after reintroducing them into various areas. Clashes with farmers causing more animals to be slaughtered and packs killed. What stands to be any different with these bears? If the grizzly bears migrate and reintroduce themselves into the north cascades of Washington then I am in full support of preservation and protection. Biodiversity makes sense when it makes sense. They have long been absent in large numbers from the ecosystem. Reintroduction causes both risk to the people within the area and the bears themselves.

Correspondence ID: 449Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Auburn, WA 98092
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 12:18:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Alternative choice A, No action required. To say there are no grizzly bears in NCE is misleading and actually a lie. Bear and people interactions in states with them are increasing dangerously and need to be hunted as a management tool. Like with wolves the rules will change detrimental to other species. You certainly failed with the Washington caribou herd.

Correspondence ID: 450Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Everett, WA 98208
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 12:19:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hard NO against grizzly restoration. Especially with the never ending game of keeping wolves listed as a esa species, as a life long hunter we all know what this is about. This is a disaster waiting to happen

Correspondence ID: 451Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Kent, WA 98030
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 12:19:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support reintroduction of Grizzly bears to North Cascades National park.

I think the option to manage grizzly bears as threatened is a better approach than others.

We all need to defend and promote variety and biodiversity.

Correspondence ID: 452Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Langley, WA 98260
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 12:20:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am against the grizzly release to the north cascades park system. The safety of people using the park, people and animals that live near the park and urban areas near the park, the government should be responsible for all damage, death and loss caused from this crazy experiment. Washington is a more urban place than it was 80 years ago releasing grizzlies in this environment is a terrible idea.

Correspondence ID: 453Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Newcastle, WA 98059
United States of America
Outside Organization: None Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 12:20:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears are beautiful creatures but dangerous. They are not endangered animals and the plan to restore and grow their population in area's where people hike, etc is flawed. The state has hunting licenses to help control animal populations without introducing an apex predator into an environment that has no experience with an animal of its size and aggressiveness. People; pets; and livestock will die because of this type of effort and for what ? This is a poorly conceived plan that will endanger the public and needs to be struck down before people get hurt.

Correspondence ID: 454Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Ellensburg, WA 98926
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 12:21:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: They belong there. People coexist with them in many states and provinces. Bring them back.

Correspondence ID: 455Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Custer, WA 98240
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 12:24:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The proposal to reintroduce grizzlies to the north Cascades is foolish. Predator species are already grossly mismanaged in Washington state, as evidenced by increasing predator/human conflicts, exploding predator populations, and decreasing non-predator big game populations, all in the wake of diminished harvest opportunities caused by an unelected activist commission appointed by a mindless, emotionally driven activist governor. As a hunter and outdoorsman, i LOVE watching bears on the landscape. Some of my favorite times I've spent in the wild of Montana, Wyoming, and Alaska have been watching black and grizzly bears interact with their environment, but the potential for conflict with agriculture, civilization, and existing wildlife make me a firm believer that grizzlies belong in areas where they currently are, not here and not now.

Correspondence ID: 456Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Yakima, WA 98908
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 12:28:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do not want Grizzle Bears re-introduced into North Cascades. Even though historically they have been there and they were beneficial this is not the time to do this. People who use the area for camping should not have to co-exist with these bears. It is too dangerous for humans. If this must happen then close the area to human visitors. [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 457Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 12:29:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To Whom It May Concern,
Having Grizzly bears come back to Whatcom County would be very dangerous. This would be worse then the coyotes. The reason being that they would eat our animals and trees and take away the safety of nature.
Please highly consider not having the grizzlies come back. Thank you. A concerned resident of Bellingham.
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 458Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 12:32:41

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a homeowner in rural Whatcom County, and frequent recreator in the North Cascades/Mount Baker region, I wholeheartedly support restoration of grizzly populations in the North Cascades ecosystem. Reintroducing this species into their ancestral habitat will provide significant benefit to humans by boosting North Cascades tourism/ecological protection efforts, and is also an important step in honoring local tribes' wishes and influence. I feel strongly that the positives of this plan outweigh potential negatives, and look forward to recreating in an area that supports this incredible species.

Correspondence ID: 459Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mill Creek, WA 98102
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 12:33:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Reintroducing Grizzlies is stupid and unnecessary. Grizzlies provide no ecological benefit that black bears do not already provide. Black bear are currently overpopulated in the Cascades. Grizzly reintroduction in Montana and Wyoming has been a disaster. The animals are now severely overpopulated. They wreak havoc on livestock, and they kill people every year.

I personally will be initiating litigation to stop this stupid plan.

Correspondence ID: 460Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tacoma, WA 98409
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 12:38:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I fully support restoring Grizzly Bears to their native range.

Correspondence ID: 461Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Vancouver, WA 98662
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 12:39:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Rarely does it work out well to move wildlife into areas where it isn't already flourishing. You guys moved mountain goats into Olympic National Park and what happened? You had to remove or kill them over the last few years at a cost of millions to us taxpayers, mainly due to human-wildlife conflict. There are reasons why the grizzly hasn't flourished in the Northern Cascades and there are plenty of reasons why this would be a dumb idea now. Human-wildlife conflict, degradation of habitat, changes in the stress on ungulate populations, proximity to human-inhabited areas due to migration related to food source, habitat changes, etc. In addition, when you set numbers for restoration goals toward management, you don't account for (or object to) the fact that law suits prevent necessary management once those goals are met, leading to overpopulation and increasing conflict, as has happened in Montana. As a result of your previous actions, the residents of Montana are stuck with an ever-growing population of extremely dangerous apex predators that can't be controlled.

This program is a mistake and if it is accepted and grows out of control, causing harm to humans, wildlife populations, and

financial security for individuals and industry, those of you who design and implement this strategy need to be held accountable for the negative results.

Correspondence ID: 462Project:112008Document:132104
Address: East Wenatchee, WA 98802
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 12:42:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To Whom it may concern,

Whoever thought this up, needs fired! Anyone who thinks we can "co-exist" with Grizzly's doesn't have a grasp on Reality!! No matter how many Degree's they have.

Just because people think that seeing one in the wild would be cool, doesn't make it so! If their food source was here, THEY'D be here! Wildlife don't have a clue what "borders" mean, Hint: they can't read!

But then we all know now, government is "Agenda" driven, not by science or logic or intelligence!

The wolves YOU allowed to be re-introduced has decimated our local wildlife populations, WHAT you thing having Grizzly's in the mix will do to the remainder???

Its not rocket science!!

Correspondence ID: 463Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98126
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 12:43:49
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of grizzly bear to the North Cascades. Biodiversity and predation is important to ecosystem health especially in our changing climate. The northern Cascades host vast amounts of wild land and a monitored population of bears will give us a chance at study and science and a chance for the threatened species to recover and gain genetic diversity across the global population.

We should absolutely take advantage of opportunities like this to preserve or rewild areas and return species to historic ranges.

Correspondence ID: 464Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Montesano, WA 98563
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 12:45:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not support this project. The North Cascades are a fragile ecosystem at the moment based on the recent wildfires ravaging the area, the wolves, and the recent drought. I believe that the NPS needs to let nature run its course as far as letting Grizzlies back into the North Cascades. If nature wants them there, then they will naturally migrate down from BC.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 465Project:112008Document:132104

Address: La Conner, WA 98257
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 12:47:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Biology has long since established that apex predators are critical restoration of our ecosystems. The reintroduction of grizzlies to N Cascades represents a partial step in the right direction. I fully support this effort and believe strongly we need to support our apex predators (both grizzlies and wolves) returning to their original habitat. A healthier ecosystem will benefit both animals and humans as we work toward saving our planet from becoming uninhabitable.

Correspondence ID: 466Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98107
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 12:48:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: A healthy ecosystem includes apex predators. As a natural component of the Washington ecosystem grizzlies belong back in the north cascades.

Correspondence ID: 467Project:112008Document:132104
Address: seattle, WA 98115
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 12:48:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I totally support the reintroduction of Grizzlies into the North Cascade range.

Correspondence ID: 468Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 12:51:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: NO. NO. NO. (maybe "stupid"; would be more appropriate).

Correspondence ID: 469Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Graham, WA 98338
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 12:52:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I fully support bringing the Grizzly bears back to the North Cascades

Correspondence ID: 470Project:112008Document:132104
Address: entiat, WA 98822
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 12:53:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am highly against this brown bear reintroduction proposal. If brown bears are to repopulate the north cascades it should be through their active migration and not through a reintroduction program that deposits new bears into a

new habitat. If Washington gains a population of Grizzlies that migrate from Canada on their own terms than I am happy for the National Park to manage that population. Put this proposal in the paper shredder and then compost it.

Correspondence ID: 471Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Maple Valley, WA 98038
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 12:53:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Who cares about grizzly bear restoration? Good riddance! This is a huge waste of taxpayer dollars. I'd like to know the estimated cost for all of this, including the studies already done, implementation and upkeep. If you haven't noticed, people are struggling to survive in this economy, the federal government is shutting down, and we're borrowing money from China to send to Ukraine. But hey, let's spend millions on some grizzly bears that will, without a doubt, result in people being hurt or killed while recreating. People in known grizzly bear areas such as Montana and Wyoming are much more prepared and capable of dealing with grizzly bear encounters. Keep them there. And stop looking for ways to spend taxpayer dollars. I guarantee if this was voted on by the public, it would not pass.

Correspondence ID: 472Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Burien, WA 98166
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 12:55:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Very Very much in favor of this wonderful plan.

Correspondence ID: 473Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Port Townsend, WA 98368
United States of America

Outside Organization: Inside Passage Seeds Business(Official Rep.)

Received: Sep,29 2023 12:58:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No question: reintroduce grizzlies to the North Cascades.

Apex predators are integral to any effort to restore working ecological systems, especially in the back country of places like the North Cascades. Fears of hazardous interactions with humans are unfounded- -what's really needed is better education of hikers and other users to coexist without harm around grizzlies and other apex species.

Correspondence ID: 474Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Gold bar, WA 98251
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 12:59:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in support of returning grizzly bears as soon as possible . They are a vital part of our ecosystem and have a right to exist in their native habitats. The concern of ranchers is in no way Equal to the bears innate right to exist as they were here before any cattle and it is the job of the ranchers and community to live with and support the bears even if it means changing their farming practices and way of life. Please give the bears back their land as they have existed since long ago. There is no question that this is by far more important than a domestic animal and definitely more than some financial loss from a wild animal. The cows do not belong in the wild. The bears do. The bears cannot speak for themselves so try and imagine if you were in their place and a bunch of bears were sitting around deciding if you had a right to exist. We have a responsibility to share the planet with all its creatures. It doesn't belong to only people.

Sincerely. [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 475Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ellensburg, WA 98926
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 13:00:37

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not reintroduce grizzly bears in Washington State. There is not sufficient territory for that species, insufficient food sources, not to mention human /bear encounters are already extremely high in areas where grizzlies currently exist in the lower 48 (MT, ID). Just because something used to roam an area doesn't mean in the current world they should. We are already having issues with wolves in this state, please don't add grizzlies to the mix.

Correspondence ID: 476Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Port orchard, WA 98366
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 13:01:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I feel that bringing Grizzly bears back to the Cascades is the right thing to do. Anytime we are able to fix what we ad humans have broken we should. No questions asked.

Correspondence ID: 477Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Stanwood, WA 98292
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 13:04:12

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: North cascades are heavily used by hikers used by hikers...many camping sites border this range...be sure to evaluate risks to camping people, families and pets in the cascades...the Grizzly is an apex predator...eats anything.

Correspondence ID: 478Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 13:10:12

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The concept of re-introducing grizzly bears into an environment has been a topic of debate among conservationists, policymakers, and the general public for many years. While the idea may seem noble on the surface, it is essential to carefully consider the potential drawbacks and risks associated with such a reintroduction. This essay aims to outline several reasons why re-introducing grizzly bears into an environment can be a bad idea.

Human Safety Concerns

One of the primary concerns surrounding grizzly bear reintroduction is the potential threat to human safety. Grizzlies are apex predators with a formidable presence, and they have the potential to pose a significant risk to humans, particularly in areas where people live, work, and recreate. Encounters between grizzlies and humans can result in injuries or fatalities, as well as property damage. Reintroducing these powerful predators into areas frequented by humans may increase the likelihood of dangerous interactions.

Impact on Livestock and Agriculture

Re-introducing grizzly bears into an environment can have adverse effects on local livestock and agriculture. Grizzlies are opportunistic omnivores that may prey on domestic animals such as cattle, sheep, and poultry. This can lead to financial losses for farmers and ranchers, potentially forcing them to resort to lethal measures to protect their livelihoods. The presence of grizzlies can also disrupt agricultural practices and place an additional burden on local communities.

Disruption of Local Ecosystems

Grizzly bears, as apex predators, play a vital role in shaping and maintaining their ecosystems. However, reintroducing them to areas where they have been absent for years can lead to imbalances in local ecosystems. The presence of grizzlies can affect the behavior of other wildlife species, potentially causing shifts in population dynamics and endangering certain species. It can also disrupt natural food chains and vegetation, impacting the overall health of the ecosystem.

Economic Implications

The reintroduction of grizzlies can have significant economic implications for local communities. Areas that become home to grizzly populations may experience a decline in tourism and outdoor recreation, as visitors may be deterred by the perceived risks associated with bear encounters. Reduced tourism and recreation can lead to financial setbacks for communities that rely on these industries for revenue.

Resource Allocation

The resources required for managing and monitoring grizzly bear populations can be substantial. Funds that could be allocated to other critical conservation efforts or essential community services may need to be diverted to support the management and protection of grizzlies. Additionally, the time and effort dedicated to addressing bear-related issues, such as conflicts with humans or livestock, may strain the capacity of local authorities and conservation organizations.

Conclusion

While the idea of re-introducing grizzly bears into an environment may be driven by noble intentions, it is essential to consider the potential negative consequences and risks associated with such an endeavor. Human safety concerns, impacts on livestock and agriculture, disruptions to local ecosystems, economic implications, and resource allocation challenges are all valid reasons to question the wisdom of reintroducing grizzlies into certain areas. Conservation efforts must prioritize both the protection of wildlife and the well-being of local communities, and careful consideration of these factors is crucial when making decisions about grizzly bear reintroduction.

Correspondence ID: 479Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sumas, WA 98295
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 13:12:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I heartily support the Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan to restore the presence of the Grizzly Bear to its former home range and health. I don't believe that an ecosystem robbed of one of its apex predators remains in balance. I believe that any human agricultural activity (forestry, ranching, farming) needs to be compliant -- first to the needs of supporting the surrounding natural environment -- if it is to be sustainable. We have made a sorry mess of our world and our future in order to line the pockets of just a few corporate and business interests. This program is just a small part of the vast changes needed as soon as possible to help restore what we have damaged. If that is even possible now.

Correspondence ID: 480Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98105
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 13:16:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Yes, please restore grizzly bears to the North Cascades, they belong there.

Correspondence ID: 481Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Oakland, CA 94610
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 13:17:01

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly support the re-introduction of grizzly bears into the North Cascades ecosystem, using alternative C. While I generally feel that take should be as limited as possible, I am persuaded by the arguments made in favor of increased management flexibility re: Alternative C.

The North Cascades region is one of the most beautiful places in the United States. When you are exploring the area, you are struck by the remoteness of the wilderness - it's not often that we can fully remove ourselves to a place that so free of people. The value of this area is how wild it remains, and we should do everything we can to keep it healthy and a safe home for the creatures that live there. The grizzly once called it home and it would be a real achievement if we could make that true for the bears again.

While there of course risks to humans and livestock with the introduction of an apex predator into the area, I think the ecosystem benefits and the potential for educational and instructional opportunities outweigh those concerns.

Correspondence ID: 482Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Oak Harbor, WA 98277
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 13:18:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I currently live in Oak Harbor but grew up in Skagit County living there my entire life. I spend a lot of time in the North Cascades hiking, exploring and especially deer hunting every year. Yes, I believe Grizzlies should be re-introduced into their natural habitat & environment! They were out here for a reason and help maintain the very delicate ecosystem just as the Wolves do. Though they don't kill nearly the same amount of animals. They mostly eat plants, grains, berries and especially salmon. Animals have a right to be here just as humans & we can all learn to coexist. Humans tend to believe we are the only thing that matters. If anyone has actually been out & explored the North Cascades they'd know just how vast, rugged & remote it is with so much uninhabited space & there's plenty of space to reintroduce Grizzlies. Their population doesn't grow rapidly & they won't explode & multiply while whipping out the numerous prey animals that call North Cascade home. There's more than enough space for all species especially the ones that originate here. Like I said previous, I believe there's a reason they were living here in the first place which tells me they are important & have a valuable role to play here. A role that we might not always understand or see. I think they should be intelligently reintroduced & monitored! Thanks!

Correspondence ID: 483Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 13:24:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The Conservation Wildlife group does great work. If they believe Grizzly bears should return to the north Cascades they should be reintroduced.

As a lifelong Washington resident I care about the environment we are leaving our kids. The PNW is dying as we cut down

the forests and pollute our waters. Let's try and fix the damage humans have created.

Thank you for listening.



Correspondence ID: 484Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Arlington, WA 98223
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 13:24:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Yes anything to help resort this beautiful land to how it once was!

Correspondence ID: 485Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seatac, WA 98188
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 13:26:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am in favor of the do nothing alternative. Based upon these observations:
1. I think the historical bear population estimates are exaggerated.
2. I think the study area's projected bear carrying capacity is exaggerated.
3. I think the study underestimates the probability of released bears migrating outside of the park and conflicting with the human population and certainly is in error by not explaining cogent mitigation.
4. I think the fact that bears may not be migrating, the study indicates (conclusive evidence was never acquired), is indicative that the quality of the bear habitat in the study area is less friendly than the proponents claim.
5. The study indicates there are physical barriers that degrade the quality of the habitat but does not fully consider the significance of this in preventing a successful re-introduction of the bears, either by migration or release.
6. The study does not fully assess the genetic differentiation between the coastal bears and the rocky mountain bears. There are unexplored implications of releasing rocky mountain bears in the coastal biome many of which could have a deleterious effect on the project and the health of the larger population.
7. The study does not adequately address the issue of state jurisdiction.
8. The study does not explore real economic costs.
9. The study seems to misunderstand the significance of climate change on bear habitat. Wildfire is the primary affective agent of habitat. Forest and range activities are also major secondary effective agents. The study does not properly evaluate these.
10. A major defect of this study is it ignores what is going on north of the 49 parallel both in terms of population just north of the border but also in terms of exploring cooperative management of both sides. As there are so many examples of CDN-USA cooperative management, the lack of cooperation with our neighbors is a glaring and unexcusable omission.

Based upon this, it seems best to see if some time in the future bears will migrate into the study area from the north. That's the best way to see if the study area contains good habitat and the best way to insure the bears will stay inside the park and away from human inhabited areas.

Correspondence ID: 486Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98920
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 13:28:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: No.

Correspondence ID: 487Project:112008Document:132104
Address: CUSTER, WA 98240
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 13:31:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: ARE YOU ALL NUTS!!!!!!
WE ALREADY HAVE BIG ENOUGH BEARS HERE AND YOU WANT TO INTRODUCE GRIZZLY BEARS!!!
THESE ARE NOT THE CUTE LITTLE BLACK BEARS WE SEE ALL OVER THE AREA.
GRIZZLIES DO NOT BACK DOWN TO PEOPLE YELLING AND TRYING TO STAND TALL - THESE BEARS WILL
EAT YOU!!
ITS AN ABSOLUTE INSANE IDEA AND MY VOTE IS NO, NOPE, NOT EVER!!
YOU HAVE ALL LOTS YOUR MINDS.

Correspondence ID: 488Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Shelton, WA 98584
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 13:31:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To whom it may concern,

Grizzly bears once occurred in most of Washington, but are now restricted to northeast Washington's Selkirk Mountains ecosystem and are occasionally documented in remote areas near the northern border of eastern Washington. Recent survey data indicates the Selkirk grizzly bear population is slowly increasing.

The North Cascades Ecosystem from Interstate 90 north to the U.S.-Canada border is also a federally-designated Grizzly Bear Recovery Zone (GBRZ), with high-quality bear habitat within North Cascades National Park and surrounding wilderness areas. Grizzly bears have not been documented in the North Cascades since 1996, and wildlife experts believe there is not a functioning grizzly bear population in the North Cascades at this time.

There is no reason to prevent the reintroduction of grizzly bears into GBRZ or other state or federally designated areas. Grizzly bears prefer wilderness areas remote from human activity. Most are solitary. Humans may co-exist with grizzly bears and never see one.

Please do not allow special interests or fears prevent the protection of this species. It is technically extirpated from Washington state due to human fear, greed and activities. Let's work to change that status.

Thank you for your hard work,

██████████
██████████████████
████████████████████

Correspondence ID: 489Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Navarre, OH 44662
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 13:32:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Although I don't live in Washington, I feel that grizzly bears should be re-introduced to that area because they are native to that area. Humans hunted them almost to extinction, and humans should fix the problem. All species of animals are under threat from humans, and humans had better find a way to coexist with the bears, and with all other animals. The animals were here first, it's their right to be there. The main problem here is that humans need to stop breeding.

Correspondence ID: 490Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Lynden, WA 98264
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 13:32:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Why would you do that so close to civilization?

Correspondence ID: 491Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Darrington, WA 98241
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 13:36:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please don't bring grizzlies to this area. It would be cruel to introduce them to an area that is not Grizzly friendly. There are farms and homes with children and pets along with areas that the city people count on to get out and stay physically and mentally healthy. It would surely mean struggle for the people and the grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 492Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Spokane, WA 99208
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 13:39:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do not do this. This is a very bad idea.
Are you going responsible for all the people that die from being eaten by grizzly bears? And if you don't think that's gonna happen I guarantee it is...
All you have to do is look at what's going on in the Rocky Mountains right now. In Wyoming in Montana and Idaho..

I vote, no.

Correspondence ID: 493Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Novelty, OH 44072
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 13:40:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am against introducing more grizzly bears into WA, or anywhere in USA. They contribute to mauling or killing of people, especially if they have cubs nearby.

The population of grizzlies in the Selkirk Recovery Zone is considered healthy and is growing at a rate of about 2.9% per year, and it includes state of WA.

I don't want my taxes to be spent on bears. In addition, the Biden admin.. along with Congress has approved about \$113 billion in aid to Ukraine, instead of helping people in East Palestine, OH. Finally, the border is a mess. Why are illegals given free hotels, but veterans and homeless don't get the same benefit?

Correspondence ID: 494Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Poulsbo, WA 98370
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 13:43:01

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Reintroducing grizzly bears back into their historical native habitat is the only right thing to do. In every single instance of putting top predators back into the territories that they belong in, it has benefitted the entire ecosystem.

All of the original inhabitants of a given area evolved together there, and every one has function to fill in it's niche. Natural systems have never been improved by human's removal of a piece of the puzzle, only degraded.

Correspondence ID: 495Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 13:43:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is incredibly exciting and I'm all for it. This will give a boost to our tourism industry, as well as the opportunity for strengthening the bears prey animal's genetics. Apex predators play an extraordinarily important role in keeping the populations of other predators in check (i.e. coyotes). Predation of deer can aid new growth in burn scars, and landslides. They can also help to keep wolf populations stable due to direct competition of resources. Plus, it would just be flat out cool to see them, and right the wrong of their obliteration in the 19th century. Thank you for your time.

Correspondence ID: 496Project:112008Document:132104

Address: No, WA 98517
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 13:45:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: NO to grizzly bears in OUR BACK YARDS!!!
NO NO NO NO!!!!!!!!!!!!
NO PLACE HERE, NO BUSINESS HERE!!!
NOT GOING TO BE HERE!!!!!!
WE CITIZENS WILL FIGHT THIS TOOTH AND NAIL!!!!

DO YOUR REAL JOB of removing invasive pests and plants!!!! You are USELESS AT THAT!!

Correspondence ID: 497Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 13:45:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: PLEASE GOD NO!

Correspondence ID: 498Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Redmond, WA 98052
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 13:56:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I can only imagine that the North Cascades would benefit from the reintroduction of Grizzlies, much as Yellowstone benefited from the reintroduction of wolves. This is a statement of support for this process. I hope that NPS and other decision makers will put the well-being of our ecosystem over that of human fear and encroachment.

Correspondence ID: 499Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 13:57:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: There he was

I have 3 seconds from this distance, 25 yards, if he charges. Plus or minus 1 second, I hope it is plus. There is no time to think. The thinking for this particular scenario began over many years ago. My actions, mostly already decided upon, with some minor and not so minor changes over the years. I remember exactly when I first thought of a scenario similar to this. Not my age at the time, but the 'art' of it rendered on a "Winchester Repeating Rifle" advertisement. There's a man with a rifle in his hands coming around a turn in the trail along a ridge. On his left is a ledge leading over the abyss. On his right it is too steep for him to climb, and the rock, I think they call it 'screes', it is small very loose rock. There he was. Ahead of him, no more than 20 feet, a Grizzly Bear. A large mature Boar that is roaring at him! Best rifle advertisement I have ever seen.

I could climb a tree. It needs to be the right size though. Not so big that I cannot wrap my arms and legs around it and shimmy up. Not so small that the big brute wouldn't just push my refuge over. I would need to get up about 15 feet though, and quick. Climbing a tree is a good option for a Grizzly and a real bad one for Black Bears. A Black Bear is a great climber. Probably the best climber for its size in North America. Cubs routinely climb trees when they are afraid or when their mother tells them to. Or just for fun because they can.

I could approach this encounter like a First Nations Brave hundreds of years ago. The only way to survive, according to the elders around the fire, is to immediately run directly at the Great Bear while yelling my 'war cry'. He'll either flee or run directly toward me. If he flees, great, chase him for a moment then get back home or into a tree. If instead he charges, jump to the side at the last moment and get home or into a tree. The claws and teeth of a Grizzly would definitely be a "good death".

I could stand my ground. Waiting until the last moment of his charge to leap to the left...or right. A game of chance, or perhaps luck, or maybe just fate. Sounds like 'fate', but spelled 'faith'.

There was a story from a couple years ago about a guide in Alaska who got to the side of a Grizzly and shot him in the neck with a pistol. Killed the Bear. Most of the story's I have read about since Grizzly's started to come back in the West involve Sow's with cubs or hunters around Elk. There was that really bad story, however, about the campers in Yellowstone that were dragged out of the tent in the middle of the night by a Sow and cubs. They had to hunt the mother down and kill her. The cubs were sent to the zoo. After all, you wouldn't want a cub learning from their mother how to kill people. An even worse one, referred to as, "Night of the Grizzly", happened in BC Canada some years ago. In this case two attacks, miles apart, happened on campers in tents.

I enter my yoga "Warrior Two" pose, left leg forward. I simultaneously lift the flap of my holster and grab my pistol. I chamber a round because I don't like to be in the woods with one chambered. I also consider myself 'badass' enough to "make" the time to rack the slide. I am right hand dominant, but years ago learned how to shoot with my left hand. Not as good with the left as I am with the right, but still pretty good. That is exactly where my pistol is now. I have almost always carried a pistol with me in the woods. I have a lanyard attached at the bottom of the grip and then it is looped around my wide leather belt. The pistol, as already mentioned, is kept in a left-handed leather old style flap holster. I like flap holster due to them keeping the pistol from getting snagged on branches when 'bushwacking'. It is also very comfortable when I switch it to an across the chest 'bandolier'. It sits right on my chest all-comfy like when I am in my sleeping bag. For many years I didn't chamber one while I slept either. But, like most things in life, I changed that too after some serious thought. I may consider

myself a bit of a badass but not so bad that I could, within the tight confines of a mummy sleeping bag, chamber a round that would require both hands.

With my right hand now free to reach for my pepper spray. I grab the 'Big Can'. That is not what brand it is, just what I call it. There's a 'medium can' in one of my spare pistol magazine on my belt next to my holster. Then there is the 'little can' on my backpack chest strap. I would like to think I would want to feel free to both give a Bear chewing on my head a root canal some 'pepper seasoning' with his meal. The Big Can's safety is removed and now it also is pointing down range. I give it just a little press to 'test the wind'. It works perfect, and there is no apparent wind. As I have thought about this moment and read about every Bear encounter I can find, my preparation almost feels complete.

Pepper Spray, when used properly, has deterred curious bears and bears charging. I think I have a better than 50% chance it will work here. Though the pistol is pointing at him, I will not fire it until the last moment. I'll be down on my right knee by then and will only have time to fire once, right in his face. As he charges I will slowly lower my self so as to have both a better angle on the pepper spray and pistol shot. I'll also want to be as close to the ground as possible because that is where I am going to end up anyway when his force hits me. I know, to protect myself I should roll on to my side, in to a ball, and wrap my hands around my neck with my knees up to my chest. Take a beating, stay calm, play dead, and maybe I won't end up being just that. That's not me. I am not going down without a fight. Both my life and his.

This is a Grizzly, not a Black Bear. Generally I have come to believe that you should try and fight off a Black Bear, and not a Grizzly. The former more likely to kill and eat you versus the latter just wanting to kick your ass! Black Bear =Fight. Grizzly =Play Dead. Yes, you can tell I have thought about this a little bit before. Maybe it is because I have had multiple close encounters with Bears and every single time they have wanted to get away from me as fast as possible. They were scared, just like me, but actually 'fleeing', rather than being 'frozen' like I was. The first time was the only time they could have been Grizzly and not Black Bear.

It was in the late 1990's in the North Cascades. The area was the Okanogan. My wife and I had been backpacking all day and had just crossed a footbridge that went across a roaring creek. The campground had a handful of spots. Bordered on one side by a steep hill, the creek we just crossed and the other side by a river. Though small, not a river easily crossed. It was also glacier run off and was damn cold. It was late afternoon in late summer and the first site we came to had other backpackers already in it and so did the second. We took the third one and were sitting down enjoying the view when we look up the side of the hill and see a Cinnamon Sow and cubs heading down trail. She is coming from down the hill. She can either go straight across the creek the opposite way we came or turn left and head in to our camps. My wife and I immediately went and told the other campers. We all decided to make lots of noise. We may have even started a campfire, though I don't recall if fires were allowed. I didn't know to look for the Grizzly 'hump' on her shoulders for identification.

My next encounter with a bear was with a small young Black Bear. He was under 100lbs, and maybe only a couple years old. This time I was on the West Side of the Cascades. I had parked my car on Twin Lakes Road near the Yellow Aster Butte trailhead and was walking the rest of the way up to Twin Lakes. My car neither had the four-wheel drive or the clearance to make it the rest of the way. I thus had a couple hours of hiking and a couple thousand feet in elevation before I reached the top. I was carelessly walking on the very outside edge of the road with thick brush heading down the side on my right. I heard the bear for only a brief moment before I saw him and all I saw was the back of his 'arse' as he was running straight down hill through the brush away from me. I think this little bear heard 'something' coming up the road and thought it might get a small easy meal. Instead it saw the tallest animal it had ever seen and this animal didn't in the least act afraid of it.

The most recent close encounter was once again with my wife while backpacking in the North Cascades. We were on our way back down Hannegan Pass from one of the most beautiful Back-packing trips I have ever taken. The great view had however been given up to THE SWARM of BITING BLACK FLIES. "HORENDOUS". Throughout the weekend I must have killed hundreds of them when they landed on me. I know it was 'hundreds' because I started to count my kills to help me better deal with the psychological impact. The flies had us moving fast and making lots of noise too. We came around a turn in the trail and just beyond a small creek, less than 50 yards away, was a medium sized black bear. We stopped, and started yelling at him so as to let him know we were there. The creeks noise drowned out our yelling and it just kept going down the trail the same direction we were headed. My wife and I decided to move even faster and make even more noise with the hope

that it would hear us and move off the trail. For about 15 minutes this is exactly what we thought had happened. Until, quite suddenly, we heard the bear fleeing into the brush off the trail.

Those were the only 'close encounters'. I have seen them from afar, as anyone who pays attention when in the North Cascades in the summer. Up high on the side of a mountain, down in a draw, or even crossing the road. Always too far away to be of any danger or for just a moment.

I have also encountered bear sign more times than I can remember. A couple in particular stand out. A friend of mine and I were hunting Black Bear once and we came across some scat on the side of a mountain the size of an extremely large "lemon meringue pie". Taller than where my hiking boots came up on my ankle and bigger than the length of my size 12 boots. Berries, lot of lots of berries. My friend, older and more experienced than I was had seen grizzly scat before noted that if it was grizzly it would be three times as big. The other time was most recently when I was hunting Elk south of Mt. Rainier. I am a hammock sleeper, not a tent one. A Western Cedar about the diameter of your thigh my hammock was attached to had bear claw marks down the side of it. It was a great tree for the bear to mark. It was among a handful of boulders the size of your living room and it was a cedar tree. They like marking these types of trees. Bears will also, when encountering big rocks like these, walk their perimeter. They are, after all, a den animal. Always looking for another den option in regards to the inevitable forthcoming winter.

I probably shouldn't forget about the many 'other' encounters. If you have every spent time in the woods, by yourself, all alone, with no one close enough to hear you yell, you have without doubt had 'other' encounters too. Those are the ones where maybe your eyes see it, your ears hear it, or you just feel it. A stump, log, branches, or even leaves, that from this distance, at this angle, in this light, looks exactly like a bear. Perhaps you had even seen bear scat earlier in your trip. Maybe heard something and turning towards where the sound came from you have this 'other' sighting of a bear. Dreamt of bears while in the woods, or at least want to believe you were dreaming after waking up.

This big boy hadn't moved at all since we both suddenly came upon each other. He knew I was there and he knew that I knew he was there.

Though my actions are preparing for an assault, I am still looking right at him, in his eyes. Yes, I am sure it is a, 'him'. I take a big deep breath and then yell, with as much anger and fearlessness as I can muster, "I am not here for you Bear!" And I shake my head when I say it. I have always thought I should yell this to any dangerous predator like Grizzly, Cougar, Wolf, and Bear just to let them know that I am not hunting them, when I am not hunting them. They may not understand what I say, but they may know what I mean. I come in peace.

Pray! I forgot to pray. This is the first thing I should have done, not the last. Out loud, but not yelling, just speaking in a normal voice, I say, "Lord your greatest creations are here, now. Neither of us wants to die. Please help us both get out of here without any injuries and go in peace and humility".

The chances of me being here, with him, though slim, are much greater now than they were years ago. I wonder if he is one of the Grizzly's they relocated from Montana or British Columbia. Maybe instead he was born here from parents that were flew over. Or perhaps he is a true 'native'. Roaming the North Cascades like his parents and grandparents before him.

I remember the Grizzly Open House the US National Park Service had years ago that I attended. My feelings then were skeptical and yet optimistic. The North Cascades doesn't have the same great deer and elk populations that the Montana Grizzly's have. The North Cascades are also much more rugged terrain than BC Manning Park. The mountains in the North Cascades are bigger and thus the summer growing season is shorter. Life for Grizzly's in the North Cascades is harder. They monitored the bears they moved for years, but many removed their collars and were thus lost. Their mortality after the move was higher than expected, and yet I don't recall ever reading about any mortality estimates in the Environmental Impact Statement they issued before the relocation started. The cost of the relocation was never important to me. Hell, look at the Trillions of dollars we have wasted trying to do the right thing in the Middle East. Even if it had cost \$50,000 to move and monitor each Grizzly, it is still only about \$15 Million given they relocated about 300 bears. I hope if this Grizzly now staring eye to eye with me doesn't hold any grudges over being captured, tranquilized, and moved to a more difficult habitat. I remember one story from 2010 that a Grizzly attacked and killed a field biologist. The bear had been trapped and tranquilized earlier in the day. Grizzly's are not just bigger than Black Bears, they also are more likely to have a bad attitude. Perhaps

'ornery' is a better term. 'Ursus arctos horribilis' may not mean much to those who don't know Latin or Greek, but 'horribilis' is clearly understood to be the origin of the English word "horrible". That is exactly why I have never planned on shooting a Grizzly that wasn't charging me. No need to piss off 500 plus pounds if you don't have too. I may not have a choice though. Male Grizzly's, 'Boars', are more carnivorous than female Grizzly's (Sow). Maybe he doesn't see me as food though. Maybe something that big with an equally large appetite is always hungry.

Though my current situation with this Grizzly is dangerous, it could be worse. After all, I could be facing a Sow with cubs. Up until about 200 years ago nothing was more dangerous on terra firma in this entire hemisphere than a Grizzly Sow with cubs. If this was the case I would probably have a smaller % chance than what I have now. Still, a Boar Grizzly, is only, the 2nd most dangerous. They are without question though the largest Omnivore on Terra Firma in this Hemisphere. Meat makes up anywhere from under 10% to 90%, depending on his habitat. Boars eat more meat than sows! APEX predator. Top of the food chain. Top of the pyramid. Did I mention their attitude problem? I guess most of us bipedal hominids have attitude problems too. We after all are the one that almost exterminated them. I'm scared. Breathe. Again, " Bear! I am not here for you." It sounded better to my ears that time, more confident, less angry and scared. A Jaguar in the Amazon would be pretty bad too I guess. Mugger in a dark alley with a shiny pistol would be bad but maybe he just wants your money. Cougars are usually just curious and wouldn't mess with a big guy like myself. A pack of wolves would be a serious problem but I would have already shot a couple of them by now. If it was just a lone wolf it would be different. None of these animals have the world 'horrible' in their name though. I am going to take a slow step backward. I did it. "I am not here for you bear. I don't want any trouble. I am going back the way I came". I slowly shake my head and gesture the way I came. That sounded almost normal. Maybe it sounded confident, respectful, with just a little fear. I am going to take another step backward.

I think I surprised him as much as he surprised me. We saw each other simultaneously. This must be the case. If he had been hunting me, in a 'predatory' fashion, he would have charged me the moment he saw me. He would have been anticipating the moment he encountered me and not be just standing there staring at me

I sure have had a long time to think about the potential danger of a Grizzly. Hollywood has sure helped. "Revenant" (2015) with Leonard DiCaprio. The "Edge" (1997) Anthony Hopkins, and many other great actors and actresses. "Man in the Wilderness" (1971") with Richard Harris. Or how about "Grizzly Adams", the TV series from the 1970's with John "Grizzly" Adams.

After a bear charges they are going to knock you down, turn you over on to your stomach, if you are not already there. He'll bite your face head and shoulders as you are turned over. There is no resisting this bears strength. He can easily lift and roll 300+lb boulders for the moth larvae underneath. Rip up dead logs and tree's for insects. The bear from 'Grizzly Adams' probably could have been trained to push over a Prius. His 500+lbs will be crushing. I won't be able to breathe. I'll be gasping for air. I bet it won't hurt though. I am not scared anymore. Just aware. very aware, of everything. I remember everything.

Only 8 people have been killed in Yellowstone National Park in the last 100 years, though they average about one attack per year. 11 have died in Glacier National Park in the last 100 years. They also average 1-2 non-fatal encounters per year. Based on these numbers, The North Cascades could expect an attack about every 5 years and a fatality about every 20 years. The Life Insurance Institute of America, if one exist, probably would value a human life at \$1-5 Million dollars.

I wonder how much live stock depredation has occurred in the last 20 years. I'm sure there has been some. I know these bears can eat a lot but I am sure they are not going to eat \$1 million per year. Government math can be quite 'fuzzy'. Economics Nobel Prize Winner, Milton Friedman, once said, "If you put the government in charge of the Sahara Desert in 5 years you will have a shortage of sand".

Thus the total financial cost of relocating Grizzly's to the North Cascades over the next 20 years could not possibly, even under the worst circumstances, reach \$100 Million. The EIS estimates years ago was less than \$10 Million.

How long has it been since we started staring at each other? Surely it has been just a moment. Time seems to slow down, but it doesn't. Chemicals have been released from my brain that speeds up my awareness with heightened senses. It has been seconds, not minutes. I am so ready for him now. I would fill him with holes and empty the can on him. I am the only one that knows that. How could he know? "Bear, this will burn your face. " Showing him the Big Can. "This is

loud and burns like claws and teeth." Waiving the pistol. I step back again. "Go...go away Bear! Go in peace".
Again, I step back. "I'm leaving bear."

Correspondence ID: 500Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 13:58:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Yes to reintroduction of grizzlies to eastern Whatcom County.

Correspondence ID: 501Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Maple Falls, WA 98266
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 14:00:47
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please don't release grizzly bears in the North Cascades. Grizzly bears pose a significant threat to humans. My family and I live in the North Cascades foothills and spend time deep in the North Cascades. The presence of grizzly bears would make us less happy and less safe.

Correspondence ID: 502Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98105
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 14:01:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The introduction of grizzlies into their historic range is an important step in restoring ecosystems damaged by habitat loss, hunting and over exploitation of natural resources including wildlife. I applaud the national park service in taking this courageous step to correct an absence of this important species.

Correspondence ID: 503Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Vista, CA 92081
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 14:04:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am supporting alternative A (No Action). Introducing grizzly bears would threaten the enjoyment of the wilderness by arguably the most important species in the ecosystem, the homo sapiens. Outdoor recreation has been proven to improve both physical and mental well being. Introducing grizzly bears would vastly increase anxieties among visitors and would cause a lot of people to not visit at all.

Correspondence ID: 504Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Blaine, WA 98230
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 14:04:47
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Why would we want to introduce Grizzlies into Whatcom County? Bears of all kinds tend to roam, and they won't stay in the eastern part of Whatcom County. They will likely roam down into heavily populated areas where they will wreak havoc among crops, pets, and people. Grizzlies are aggressive and will not scare off easily, so there would be a

good chance that they would attack humans. I'm born and raised in Whatcom County and I have never heard of Grizzlies in our county..ever. We have done just fine without them and we don't need them in our county now. Who's brilliant idea was this anyway?

Correspondence ID: 505Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 14:14:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Bring back the grizzlies with the same protection other endangered or at risk species have.

Correspondence ID: 506Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Stanwood, WA 98292
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 14:15:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My family and I recreate extensively in the North Cascades. I strongly opposed reintroduction of grizzlies in previous attempts and even more strongly oppose this initiative. I want my children to be able to recreate in or local forests and backyards without fear of being attacked by an Apex predator. This is just another case of big govt beaurocrats forcing their own personal interests on the will of the people, and people will die because of this.

Correspondence ID: 507Project:112008Document:132104
Address: BOISE, ID 83716
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 14:18:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of Grizzly Bears into the North Cascades Ecosystem. We owe a debt to our future citizens to restore ecosystems that have suffered under the prior managements that has emphases the narrow, short term interests of cattle ranchers and similar group . I have backpacked and climbed in the Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 508Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Concrete, WA 98237
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 14:24:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The Biden Admin. has shown NO EVIDENCE that Grizzly Bears NEED to be place in the North Cascades. This is simply a left wing progressive baseless action rammed down the throat of the residents of Whatcom and Skagit County. I have a home a miles from the NCNP. And DO NOT WANT more predatory animals in this area. WHY we need them has NOT been answered by the proponents of this absurd idea. Stop pushing this agenda on us!! WE DO NOT WANT THIS!!

Correspondence ID: 509Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Lake Stevens, WA 98258
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 14:24:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: While the idea of grizzly bears coexisting with everyone and everything peacefully sounds phenomenal, it just won't be the case. I'm 100% against reintroducing an apex predator with no plan to control their population or protect families out in the wild. At least with hunting black bears there is the potential to curb extreme population growth and human/bear interaction, but as grizzlies are a protected species there will be nothing stopping them. Not to mention the fact they are larger and more aggressive than black bears as well. I firmly believe this is a bad plan that will ultimately lead to loss of biodiversity in the park and will lead to human death or injury with this unchecked apex predator.

Correspondence ID: 510Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 14:28:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am totally against the reintroduction of the Grizzly bear to Whatcom County. The citizens and farmers are struggling to cope with the Wolves, Cougars, and Elk in the rural areas. The cities and counties do not have the financial resources to restore the damage they do. It is not safe to recreate in our state and federal parks w/o a gun now...this increases the risk to human life and the ability to live in the rural areas. NO. NO. NO!

Correspondence ID: 511Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 14:29:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No to the reintroduction of the Grizzly bear to Whatcom County.

Correspondence ID: 512Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spokane, WA 99218
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 14:40:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Bringing back the apex predators such as grizzlies and hopefully wolves is essential to restoring biodiversity. They should be protected by the ESA.

Correspondence ID: 513Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ocean Park, WA 98640
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 14:40:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Just say NO to grizzly reintroduction into the North Cascades National Park. Do NOT cave to the environmentalists, please think of the people who live and work in the region, as well as us who visit this area regularly. This endangers all of us who are in this region.

Just because these apex predators historically roamed these regions does not justify their return. When they roamed and were numerous, the human population was a fraction what it is now in this area.

Blood will be on your hands.

Just say NO.

Correspondence ID: 514Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 14:48:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support bringing Grizzly bears back into the Cascade mountain area.

Correspondence ID: 515Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 14:48:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a resident of Bellingham, I'm lucky to have easy access to the North Cascades and North Cascades National Park, and enjoy hundreds of miles of hiking in the area each year. Backcountry users like me will be impacted by the re-introduction of grizzlies far more than most stakeholders, including front country park guests.

Re-introducing animals like grizzlies to popular recreation areas always brings up a lot of fears in people. But the North Cascades are vast and rugged, and are natural grizzly habitat. They should be here. It's their home, and they've been absent for too long.

The ecosystem and our enjoyment of it will be enriched by the return of the grizzly bear to the North Cascades, and I hope that the Parks Service will engage with local Tribal partners to begin the process of restoring our local grizzly populations.

Correspondence ID: 516Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Everson, WA 98247
United States of America
Outside Organization: Citizen Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 14:53:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of grizzlies. They are natural to this area and would be awesome to have in our mountains again!

Correspondence ID: 517Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 14:53:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am strongly in favor of proposals like this one that seek to restore the ecosystem as much as possible to the way it was before the influx of European settlers. Apex predators help manage the populations of prey, which in turn can affect the balances of other flora and fauna. These ecosystems evolved with bears and returning bears to the ecosystem will help maintain those delicate balances.

Correspondence ID: 518Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sammamish, WA 98074
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 14:53:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support this action!

Correspondence ID: 519Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wasilla, AK 99654
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 14:54:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not reintroduce grizzly bears into the North Cascades. Although this might seem like a good idea on the surface, the fact remains that people and grizzlies do NOT coexist well. When people and grizzlies meet, the people are often injured or killed and the grizzly is then hunted and killed. This is a no win situation for the grizzlies and for people who already live in that area. Put grizzlies where people do not live so that both may prosper.

Correspondence ID: 520Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Issaquah, WA 98027
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 14:55:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: It is dangerous and irresponsible to reintroduce grizzly bears to the northwest forest.

Correspondence ID: 521Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Port Townsend, WA 98368
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 14:57:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: There are so many reasons to protect our magnificent mountain range. The Grizzlies are near the top of the list. We are blessed to live in such a heavenly environment. With that comes responsibility. They share their land with us and we owe them gratitude and protection. Any time an animal is driven from their environment, the environment suffers. Protect wildlife at all cost.

Correspondence ID: 522Project:112008Document:132104

Address: North Bonneville, WA 98639
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 15:00:01

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not put grizzlies in the Cascades. Please. My family and I beg you to not do so. We already have a low population of deer and elk. We don't need them. There are too many predators as it is already. We need to manage the population of predators we have now before adding to the list. So sad and dark of NPS to even consider such.

Correspondence ID: 523Project:112008Document:132104

Address: FOWLERVILLE, MI 48836
United States of America

Outside Organization: Myself Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 15:00:31

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: You sure ccp didn't twist Joe's arm to do this.

You know how the Chinese people (losely)

Love there gall bladders. 5 to 10 yrs. They

Will have enough to survive in the U.S.A.

Seeing as Joe is a traitor to this country.

He is putting there what's into action.
What did they give him for that request.
I would like to know.
All of you traitors can kiss my ass.
China has over 380,000 acres of our land.
And Joe don't care because he will die
soon. And give his corrupt money to his 6 grandchildren.
Oh sorry 7.

Correspondence ID: 524Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 15:01:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support reintroduction of Grizzlies to Washington State under Proposal C of the EIS, allowing flexibility in the management of this apex species. I believe that, as with Washington's wolf management, it has been critically important to listen and incorporate the feedback from competing interests and important constituencies in our State such as ranching and farming into the management plan, while still moving ahead. Finally, I respect greatly the lived experience and leadership of the Native American tribal members in the process so far. I would ask that all management plans for Washington Grizzlies include these tribal experts as leaders in the governing body. Thank you

Correspondence ID: 525Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Stanwood, WA 98292
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 15:03:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Absolutely horrible idea. The landscape does not need nor do we want grizzly bears strolling around Darrington, Granite falls, Rockport Marblemoint or any other small towns near the cascades. Reintroduction of the grizzly bear would plaque our outdoor recreation with fear and anxiety. I say NO.

Correspondence ID: 526Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ridgefield, WA 98642
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 15:04:48

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Based on the research, it seems a viable population is only absent because of humans. I wish a more thorough statement on benefits of introduction were presented. I also believe the introduction of grizzly bears should trigger the removal of cattle from as much public land as possible. Seems like if we were invested in the recovery of wild spaces, removing cattle would be a top priority.

Correspondence ID: 527Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Concrete, WA 98237
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 15:04:55

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Rewilding is an important part of restoring natural ecosystems. The North Cascades should be kept in as close to its natural state as possible -- that means including animals that may be predators. Let the grizzlies back in!

Correspondence ID: 528Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tukwila, WA 98188
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 15:06:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I would like to speak strongly in favor of Alternative B and C, to reintroduce Grizzlies to the Cascades. I believe we impoverish ourselves, our lands, and our ecosystems when we allow human habitation to crowd out the magnificent megafauna that have dwelled here for millennia.

I hope this can be done in conjunction with broader efforts to rewild ecosystems, build migration pathways and crossings, and create corridors and spaces for wild, thriving ecosystems to exist.

Correspondence ID: 529Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Gig Harbor, WA 98329
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 15:07:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Washington is a beautiful state known for its incredible outdoors. The grizzly bear is part of what makes Washington so amazing. I trust that this program will introduce them safely for the betterment of us all and for future generations.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 530Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 15:10:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in support of restoring grizzlies in the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 531Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Port Angeles, WA 98362-9370
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 15:12:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a retired park ranger biologist, naturalist and educator, I am glad to see the grizzly reintroduction process restarted. Research on wolves and other apex predators show that they are key parts of healthy ecosystems. Given the Organic Act's mandate to preserve and protect natural ecosystems, and the inclusion of restoration in that NPS mandate and NPS policies, this is a necessary step for the NPS and the North Cascades ecosystem. There is a growing body of knowledge about how predators and people can co-exist on the landscape. Those tools can and should help assuage opposition. Though in the past, humans have managed wildlife (and habitat) as if only humans mattered and that we and our livestock should take priority and have dominion over all species and natural systems, that, by law, is not the case in national parks. And much of the habitat outside the park is public land, owned by all Americans or Washingtonians, whether we live in an urban area and just visit on a hike, or have a grazing permit to run livestock on public lands.

Over 100 years ago, then again in 1964 with the passage of the Wilderness Act, our society made decisions that there should be wild places where humans are not the dominant force. We eventually stopped bounties on many species we deemed "bad"; and began to learn that natural processes and healthy resilient ecosystems include the full suite of native

species. This knowledge has led to successful reintroductions of species that we humans eradicated such as fishers in Olympic National Park, gray wolves in Yellowstone and Idaho, red wolves in the southeast, peregrines, non-native mountain goats being removed from the Olympic Mountains and translocated to their native habitat in the Cascades, etc

In the face of rapidly changing climate and the shifting of habitat north and upslope, species of all phyla are facing challenges. Restoring extirpated species and healthy ecosystem function is one way we can help our national natural and cultural heritage be more resilient and survive the challenges of our changing world.

Correspondence ID: 532Project:112008Document:132104
Address: enumclaw, WA 98022
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 15:15:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Bring them back. This was part of their original range. The more diversity we have in the woods, the better.

Correspondence ID: 533Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mazama, WA 98833
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 15:15:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Concerned about potential for human/bear conflict if they are reintroduced to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 534Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Eugene, OR 97404
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 15:16:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Time and time again, when apex predators are removed from ecosystems by man it diminishes the ecosystem. We have seen it time and time again.

Don't make Grizzlies like the Thylacine.

The Thylacine is the, or WAS, the Tasmanian Tiger. Hunted into extinction, the species wasn't even recognized as having a conservation issue until after they were all dead. Now, I'm not saying this same thing is going to happen to Grizzlies, but it already has for North Cascades National Park.

Nature and wildlife do not exist to service humanity. They exist unto themselves and support each other in myriad ways we cannot even totally understand. Placing apex predators like the Grizzlies back where they naturally occurred prior to human intervention will help build a better ecosystem and a better park.

Of course people are against re-introducing bears to virtually anything. People hear 'bear' and think 'bad.' Well, the reality is that people aren't going to be running into these bears often, and if they do it is likely their own fault. We also don't have a circumspect way of knowing how much the loss of bears has degraded the habitat or what effects it has had on other species' populations.

You say your land is too close to where the Grizzlies may go? Well, that's unfortunate that your land was placed there, but the Earth takes priority. With all of the bad things happening everywhere, we as the good stewards of the environment we are supposed to be owe it to the planet and ourselves to support healthy ecosystems whenever and wherever we can--even if it's

an inconvenience for us.

The forests aren't supposed to be a safe place. Introducing bears will not make the forest more dangerous for people. Safety campaigns alerting people of precautions they may take to be better prepared for seeing a bear may even contribute to people being more mindful of the world around them in other ways.

On behalf of the plants, animals and land, as well as all of my likeminded human friends...

RE-INTRODUCE THE GRIZZLIES TO NORTH CASCADES NATIONAL PARK

Correspondence ID: 535Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Marysville, WA 98270
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 15:18:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Stop introducing Apex predators into our ecosystem. We do not know best. Leave it alone!

Correspondence ID: 536Project:112008Document:132104
Address: PUYALLUP, WA 98374
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 15:28:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Humans have altered the shape of this entire country. Part of that being the destruction of wildlife in a very small historical window of time. It is important to do what we can to make it right. I would love to see this take place and re-introduce an animal that should have never been absent from these areas in the first place.

Its also important to acknowledge the diversity in people who may comment on this issue. As an avid outdoor enthusiast, and someone who is more connected with nature than the average American. I think getting opinions from people who hunt, hike, and travel the areas that the bears will be at is far more important than discussing with community members who do not commonly go to these areas.

Bring back an animal that can deepen our communities connection with nature, like we used to have so many years ago.

Correspondence ID: 537Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Granite Falls, WA 98252
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 15:38:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: option C

Correspondence ID: 538Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Fall City, WA 98024
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 15:48:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We do not need grizzlies in the north cascades. We already have wolves and growing numbers of cougars that are hurting the deer and elk populations.
With so many people recreating in the woods (many are inexperienced) this will create a potential threat to their safety. Most

hunters now carry side arms as the cougar and wolf populations have grown to a point where self protection is wise to have. Introducing grizzlies will only serve to increase potential deadly encounters.

Correspondence ID: 539Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 15:48:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: While it's not okay that grizzlies were over hunted and driven out of their territory, reintroducing them is going to harm people. In Whatcom especially no one takes bear safety seriously. With grizzlies reintroduced there are bound to be multiple run ins where people who have no business being in bear country will get injured or killed because they don't know the risks.

Correspondence ID: 540Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 15:49:12

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly support the reintroduction of grizzly bears into Whatcom County.

Correspondence ID: 541Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 15:50:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do a lot of hiking and backpacking up in the North Cascades. I understand that Grizzly Bears did occupy this region at one point in time and that there's an environmental interest in restoring the north Cascades to the state that it was in prior to the development of the region. But I don't think that the environmental value of having grizzly bears in the North Cascades is worth the additional risk to humans. I know bear attacks are uncommon, but it's just something that I'd prefer to not have to worry about while I'm out enjoying the wilderness. This doesn't just stand for grizzly bears, I would have similar feelings regarding any effort to intentionally replenish the stock of rattlesnakes, mountain lions, or wolves.

To me, that such a proposition is even under consideration is an indication that the national parks service is out of touch with ordinary folks.

Correspondence ID: 542Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Graham, WA 98338
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 15:51:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a frequent visitor to the NCE for recreation purposes, I can tell you that anything other than Alternative A is absolutely unacceptable. First, there are grizzlies in the area; one was just captured a county east and others have been observed. Secondly, if the habitat was still adequate for a larger grizzly population they would already be there in larger numbers, but that is simply not the case. A sizable population is known to exist right across the border which could easily recolonize the NCE in larger numbers.

Too much human impact has happened and the human population adjacent to the NCE is simply too great to make this a

good idea. If the bears should indeed be there, let them seed naturally. Save us all from conflicts that are sure to occur and save the taxpayers the bloated bill that is sure to come attached to this ill-advised idea!

Correspondence ID: 543Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 15:54:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Bring them back, they were here before, and should be here again.

Correspondence ID: 544Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Newport, OR 97365-9519
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 15:54:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The grizzly bear is still the consummate North American wildlife icon. The grizzly has immeasurable ecological and cultural value for our ecosystems and communities. We have a unique opportunity and obligation in the PNW to co-author a significant conservation success story - to restore the grizzly to a small but important part of its traditional home.

The North Cascades is one of North America's premier intact ecosystems, but it is incomplete without grizzly bears.

Correspondence ID: 545Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 15:57:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Reintroducing the Grizzles will help our ecosystem and prolong the bears with a new home.

Correspondence ID: 546Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Everett, WA 98203
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 15:58:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Adding this type of predator to an area that is enjoyed by many outdoor enthusiasts would present undue hazard and therefore undue risk to the population. For a species that is clearly thriving in other places, this is an unnecessary risk. As the PCT crosses through the north cascades, this would be added hazard to hundreds of hikers. Please do not add grizzly bears as an additional animal to consider when going outdoors in the North Cascades!!!

Correspondence ID: 547Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98274
United States of America
Outside Organization: - Select - Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 16:00:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I absolutely believe the restoration of grizzly bears in the North Cascade Ecosystem in a horrible waste of money and resources. With Climate change impacting so much of our natural areas, fires, landslides, roads washed out,

pollution, salmon restoration issues and plenty more....the idea of spending more time and money on the Grizzly bears seems crazy. And there is the issue of more and more people moving closer to the North Cascades Park, more and more people who desperately need more space and beautiful places to hike in....there will be the possibility of increased bear and human confrontations. One of the things I have most enjoyed about hiking in the North Cascades and in Washington in general is the ease that I can move through our forests without (as I did in Yellowstone and Glacier National Parks) always having to be on alert, looking out for Grizzly bears. I do not find it peaceful or a calm restoring get-away to be always wondering about where a bear might surprise me.

I oppose the restoration of Grizzly Bears in the North Cascades.

Thank you for your consideration,

Correspondence ID: 548Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 16:01:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Sirs/Ladies:

I strongly oppose the proposition to reintroduce grizzly bears into the North Cascades. These mountains are heavily traveled by hikers among whom number my own children and grandchildren. We have black bears aplenty; I see no need to reintroduce this apex predator. Should this species be successfully reintroduced and when there occurs subsequently the predictable lethal grizzly-human encounter, I challenge any of you who support this venture to volunteer to explain to the bereaved family just why it was necessary or even remotely desirable to facilitate such a tragedy. I can personally not conceive of a more grotesque end than to be mauled to death during a bear attack. Certainly, it can be argued that such attacks are infrequent, perhaps extremely rare. Regardless: even a single such event when preventable should be prevented. The chances of being mauled to death by a grizzly bear in the North Cascades today are essentially nil, those risks will escalate exponentially if grizzly bears are reintroduced to area from which they have been eliminated.

Respectfully,

Correspondence ID: 549Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98274
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 16:06:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a Washington resident and frequent user of the North Cascades as well as living right on the edge of them, I highly oppose the idea of introducing grizzly bear. For safety and ecological reasons. If grizzly wanted to be there they would walk down from Canada. There's no barrier to stop them.

Correspondence ID: 550Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Puyallup, WA 98372
United States of America
Outside Organization: Washington State Citizen Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 16:07:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This plan to reintroduce Grizzly Bears to the North Cascades will be just as bad as the reintroduction of the Wolf in our state. The ungulate population will greatly suffer and the opportunity for hunting will completely go away. Washington state needs to be able to manage its current predator population before adding more predators. Additionally this State should start listening to the WDFW biologists about the science which shows that there needs to be an increase in predator hunting and not a decrease. The addition of grizzly's will only make things worse.

Thanks for your time.

I am 100% against this.

Correspondence ID: 551Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sequim, WA 09382-7649
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 16:08:10

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Long time hiker in the North Cascades; have observed grizzly studies. Are there enough rodents for for them?

We very much support the introduction effort.

Correspondence ID: 552Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sammamish, WA 98074
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 16:08:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: People in this area are not smart enough to keep away from black bears who are relatively harmless. They kill garter snakes because they are snakes, they are trying to get selfies with a bear and pet coyotes while their kids are around and they are surprised when something bad happens.

People are not even smart enough to put their trash cans away after trash collection day, leaving them in the street for crows, bears etc. to enjoy.

We are consistently being educated by our police department, city hall and other members of our communities, however, instead of listening- most people just ignore. With grizzlies, this will result in people getting killed and you being sued because you knew and ignored the consequences.

Correspondence ID: 553Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Anacortes, WA 98221
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 16:09:01

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not think returning Grizzly bear population to the North Cascades would be wise. This would have dramatic impacts on other wildlife populations and could pose a threat to neighboring towns. There have already been several negative black bear interactions in populated areas.

Correspondence ID: 554Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Everett, WA 98208
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 16:09:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in favor of this plan. Reintroducing a wonderful and iconic animal species to the North Cascades will be great for biodiversity. Grizzly bears are some of the coolest mammals out there!

Correspondence ID: 555Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Maple Falls, WA 98266
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 16:09:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Firstly, thank you so much for your efforts to conserve the grizzly bear species. I recognize this is urgent for our ecosystem and that measures must be taken.

With that said, the general populous within and surrounding the East Whatcom Areas are nowhere near prepared to have 5-7 grizzly bears released yearly.

This community already has an issue with homes leaving food and trash around their homes, resulting in almost weekly black bear encounters recently.

I strongly believe that the "cultural habits" of this community would attract and encourage grizzly bears to frequent and inhabit residential areas, rather than the intended rural areas and pose a significant threat to humans, their animals, and the bears themselves negating your efforts to help an endangered species continue to thrive.

I would ask that, in the event there is no better location to conduct this, before implementing this strategy strong fines are put into place regarding open trash and food in residential areas to prevent these areas from becoming attractive as the bears are released and exploring for food sources.

Additionally, I do hope that the plan to build a populous of 200 bears is over multiple locations and states as that is a lot of bears to inhabit just the East Whatcom Area.

Thank you for taking the time to read this and I do hope that we can work together to create an acceptable balance for the needs of the ecosystem and humans.

Correspondence ID: 556Project:112008Document:132104

Address: East Wenatchee, WA 98802
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 16:10:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am an avid mountaineer, hiker and backpacker and I am in full support of reintroducing Grizzly Bears to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 557Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Cle Elum, WA 98922
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 16:11:12

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not support the proposal to move/reintroduction of Grizzlies into the North Cascades. Natural movement/migration from BC and for those already in North Cascades can be managed appropriately under the North American wildlife model. Human conflicts, area closures due to bear activity, costs of reintroduction are a few of my concerns.

Correspondence ID: 558Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Yelm, WA 98597
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 16:14:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Why is Washington set overpopulating predators with no intentions of restoring deer and elk populations. Adding Grizzly bears would be a detriment to all ungulates.

Correspondence ID: 559Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98136
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 16:14:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I'm a proponent of the draft plan developed by USFW and am writing to express my support for its advancement. I live in Seattle but frequently visit the north cascades for the same reasons many of us do. To experience a healthy ecosystem, beauty and wildness that a grizzly bear population will only help support. Thank you,

Correspondence ID: 560Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Milwaukie, OR 97222
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 16:15:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of grizzly bears! I hike in the North Cascades every summer and would love to see this incredible species come back. Our federal policies toward "predator management" in the 19th and 20th centuries are a disgrace. This is one small step toward rectifying the mistakes previous generations made.

Correspondence ID: 561Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Spokane, WA 99208
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 16:19:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do not support the reintroduction of Grizzly bears to the North Cascades. The wildlife populations still have not had the ability to adapt to the reintroduction of the wolves. Unleashing 2 apex predators that have not been on the recent landscape will not only be detrimental to the wildlife populations but unsafe for visitors as the two apex predators will be working to establish a footprint.

Correspondence ID: 562Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Snohomish, WA 98290
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 16:23:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do not bring grizzlies back. It will turn a hiker safe area into dangerous zone.

Correspondence ID: 563Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Chelan, WA 98816
United States of America
Outside Organization: Lake Chelan Adventures-Fishing Guide Business
Received: Sep,29 2023 16:23:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: First of all, Why did the Native Grizzly Bear disappear from the Cascades ?

We have enough Predators in the Cascades and lowlands now so why would you want to reintroduce a Apex Predator back into the Cascades.. This is a Huge Mistake just like introducing Wolves...

Correspondence ID: 564Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Everett, WA 98208
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 16:24:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The addition of grizzly bears to an ecosystem that is already having predators issues with wolves, cougars and black bears would be reckless and cause irreparable harm to the ungulate and small game populations of the north cascades. Washington state has already significantly neutered the ability of predator hunters and is now attempting to remove all predator hunting leaving the populations unchecked. The North American wildlife conservation model can't work of this is continued. I beg of you as a life long Washington resident, hiker, and hunter to do the right thing for our wildlife and not add more apex predators to our ecosystems that are already struggling.

Correspondence ID: 565Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Everett, WA 98204
United States of America
Outside Organization: Woodland Park Zoo Conservation/Preservation
Received: Sep,29 2023 16:24:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I believe it is critical to the health and longevity of the North Cascades to restore grizzly bears to their once native territory. Our forests rely on biodiversity to survive our ever-changing climate, and where grizzly bears live, forests thrive. People are able to coexist with brown bears many other places, and native people were able to here in our state for many years. We already coexist with black bears all throughout Washington State- I believe we can manage the same with grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 566Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Everson, WA 98247
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 16:24:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I'm a life long resident of whatcom county, living at the base of mount baker. Like most kids that grew up here, I spent much of my time in the outdoors, enjoying this beautiful place. As a father, I bring my baby outside as much as possible and plan to raise him to understand and care about nature. What I do not support is the experimental reintroduction of apex predators in my backyard. The ungulate populations are not dense in the mountains, there are significantly more deer down in the valley near the agricultural lands and in city limits. This will put brown bears down the mountain and encroaching upon human territory. The amount of hikers here from the city who don't even own a firearm and most don't even bring bear spray is astounding. This is a grossly reckless plan and I greatly oppose it.

I will be spreading this as much as possible so people that actually live here that will be affected get in on this. People from outside the area that live in the city should have no voting power on this, as it doesn't affect them.

I hope this is read and carefully considered, thank you for your time.

Correspondence ID: 567Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Powell, WY 82435
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 16:24:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: This is a terrible plan from a recreational and wildlife population standpoint.

Correspondence ID: 568Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Tacoma, WA 98407
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 16:26:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: What a wonderful idea. Yes, let's return these bears to their historic range.

Correspondence ID: 569Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Kenmore, WA 98028
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 16:27:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Let's restore a viable population of Grizzlies in the North Cascades ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 570Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Issaquah, WA 98029
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 16:28:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am an avid outdoorsman and hunter. I don't want to have to worry about my wife and I life Everytime I visit the North cascades. If the greater Yellowstone ecosystem are an indicator of what is to come for Washington I am greatly concerned. There have been an increase in attacks and deaths in recent years especially amongst hunters. And it is a great concern to my and my wife and our safety while recreating in the North cascades.

Correspondence ID: 571Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98105
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 16:31:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please don't introduce more Grizzly bears. There is no reason to bring back a bear that's capable of easily killing a human quite easily in to an eco system that has high density of hikers and outdoor enthusiasts.

Correspondence ID: 572Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Rockport, WA 98283
United States of America
Outside Organization: N/A Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 16:31:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Reintroducing grizzlies back into the cascades is a bad idea and will result in both human injuries as well as the bears being put into no win situations. We have livestock and families that spend large amounts of time in the wilderness and we already have to deal with predators like Cougars. Grizzly bears are a bad idea.

Correspondence ID: 573Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Puyallup, WA 98374
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 16:32:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do NOT support the release of Grizzly Bears in the North Cascades. There are already wolves, and Wolverines up there. Also Black Bears, to. It would be even more dangerous for campers and hikers if the Grizzly bears were there too.

Thank You, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 574Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Anacortes, WA 98221
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 16:33:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: This is one of the most horrendous ideas I've ever heard. Predators such as black bears and wolves are already excruciatingly miss managed. The deer and elk herd populations are already not as strong as they can be, and this would diminish any light to the population of the deer and elk to continue to grow. Not only is this a terrible idea for the management of our wildlife and our ecosystem as a whole, hope the amount of hikers and inexperienced people with dangerous wildlife like this, would cause disaster. Please diminish any idea of this, as this will ruin the Washington State ecosystem, and alike with other predators in this state, be completely miss-managed.

Correspondence ID: 575Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Everson, WA 98247
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 16:34:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Reintroducing grizzlies back to north cascades is a terrible idea. If anyone who is purposing this has been to an area with grizzlies should know this. The impact they will have on deer, elk, and black bear as an apex predator will lower numbers drastically. Also the normal person that goes into the North Cascades is not experienced with dealing with grizzlies. With populations growing in Washington and more people in the woods this will definitely lead to unwanted animal and human interactions. We need to look at BC and Montanas grizzly population and either let the bears come into the cascades naturally over time. Or look at the negative impacts the grizzlies have on the ecosystem. Once they are introduced we will then be spending tax dollars on extermination very soon after, guaranteed.

Correspondence ID: 576Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Lynden, WA 98264
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 16:34:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Although I do not live in the cascade range, I do spend a lot of time during summer and fall with friends and family in some surrounding towns. Grizzlies are known to travel up to 40 miles a day, with the already dwindling population of deer and elk in our state due to other predators grizzlies would more steadily start coming into contact in the lower foothills where people are at in search of food. Also people hiking and biking in those Cascade trails would be at great risk of attacks as well. I believe a lot of people that spend time in the outdoors would agree with not wanting grizzlies in our state at the choice of the government.

Correspondence ID: 577Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 16:34:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly Bears serve an important role in the ecosystem as an apex predator. Grizzly bears will keep both nuisance herbivore populations (such as deer) and nuisance carnivore populations (such as coyote) at appropriate levels within the ecosystems they exist in. Furthermore, grizzly bears deserve to inhabit the space they originally existed in. This ecosystem evolved in the presence of grizzly bears, and reintroducing them will have a positive impact by restoring this ecosystem to closer to the balance it formerly enjoyed without human interference. Some people may be concerned about having grizzlies in the area, but there are plenty of places where these bears already exist alongside people. We would simply have to learn from these places and adapt to live alongside the bears.

Correspondence ID: 578Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tacoma, WA 98403
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 16:36:31

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My family and I would love the return of Grizzly bears to their natural habitat. This was their home and they deserve the land back. This project would be a step in the right direction.

Correspondence ID: 579Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Vashon, WA 98070
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 16:37:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm fully in favor of reintroducing grizzly bears. Time again when apex predators are reintroduced to areas they previously inhabited the benefits to the ecosystem and subsequently us people are enormous. Please bring back the grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 580Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98115-7763
United States of America

Outside Organization: Retired Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 16:37:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in support of the plan to recover the grizzly bear population in the North Cascades. They were and should be an integral part of this incredible landscape of mountains, glaciers, valleys, rivers, and forests.

Correspondence ID: 581Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WI 98103
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 16:37:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support Grizzly Bear reintroduction into the North Cascades of Washington, as a moral obligation and spiritual benefit to the citizens of Washington, and as an important ecological restoration action.

Correspondence ID: 582Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Suquamish, WA 98392
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 16:38:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am strongly in favor of the reintroduction of grizzly into the North Cascades which is their natural habitat to begin with. Alpha predators are important for ecosystem balance, something that has been missing for decades. If not more. Humans simply can't eliminate everything that could harm them out of simple human arrogance. Again, I'm all for it.

Correspondence ID: 583Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98109
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 16:44:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As an avid hiker/climber/backpacker here in Washington I have already responded that this was a bad idea the last time this was brought up. We have an issue with folks already being bear unaware and causing closures just from black bears. I can't imagine the issues we would have with brown bears with people not following bear protocols...not to mention the effect it would have on other wildlife in the north cascades. Personally I would not backpack anymore there if grizz was back for safety reasons

Correspondence ID: 584Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Tacoma, WA 98407
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 16:47:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: This is a terrible idea and one that will have far more negative impacts on ungulate populations and local communities than any kind of benefits.

Correspondence ID: 585Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98125
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 16:47:19
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Restoring a healthy and robust population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades ecosystem is an excellent idea and should be undertaken immediately with endangered species status for grizzlies to further support these efforts and the continued maintenance of the project in perpetuity. I am in agreement that this plan will play a roll in correcting the ecological imbalances our wild lands have endured. The primacy of the natural world must finally be given our full attention. This project should not get mired in short term complications or the political quagmire that continues to pit the conservation of apex predators against greedy, capitalist "steak" holders. We must rise above the presumption

that the natural world is merely a playground for our amusements. All of us can play a roll as supporters of this project and the continued reinvigoration and eventual expansion of our wild lands if there is a strong emphasis on educating the public about the crucial roll of apex species and how to coexist with them.

Correspondence ID: 586Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Everson, WA 98247
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 16:48:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am strongly against reintroducing predatory species into the northern cascades, especially from the perspective of personal and public safety. It seems like it welcomes litigation as well.

Correspondence ID: 587Project:112008Document:132104

Address: marysville, WA 98270
United States of America

Outside Organization: society Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 16:50:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly disagree with the plan to reintroduce Grizzly Bears. Please don't do anything to make it more likely for them to return.

Correspondence ID: 588Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98512
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 16:50:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am strongly opposed to the reintroduction of grizzly bears into Washington. I have no problem with bears naturally moving back into the cascade range. But reintroduction is a very poor idea. Human populations are increasing and as we encroach further into the landscape we don't need to add this Apex predator which will result in human conflicts.

Correspondence ID: 589Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Roy, WA 98580
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 16:51:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I believe that reintroduction is just a waste of the tax payer dollars. Grizzly bears are already coming down from Canada and will eventually populate the area without our help. Bears that are transplanted will end up getting into trouble with local residents cause damage that the government will end up paying for. Let nature take its course.

Correspondence ID: 590Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98273-3316
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 16:56:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I worked closely around grizzlies for 3 summers in AK and MT doing fisheries work. Despite being careful, making noise, and giving the bears a wide berth, I was charged numerous times and several times thought I was going to be killed. I had a friend severely mauled and nearly killed by a grizzly during this time. His scars were gruesome and

he lost an eye. It is not a coincidence that in the last several decades I haven't had similar experiences with black bears, no matter if it was AK, MT or WA. This is despite the fact that my experiences with black bears are over many more years than the few summers I worked around grizzlies.

Based on these experiences, I am strongly against the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades. It fundamentally changes backcountry recreation, and not for the better, in my experience. Please stop using tax dollars for this grizzly reintroduction effort that will eventually hurt and kill people. Put the funds towards road and trail maintenance instead.

Thank you for taking public comments for this controversial effort.

Correspondence ID: 591Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 16:56:19
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please No, we do not need to mix people with a large predator so close to populated areas and recreational areas. NO, No NO

Correspondence ID: 592Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Marysville, WA 98270
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 16:57:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzly bears should absolutely not be reintroduced to the landscape in the cascade mountains in Washington state. Wolves and grizzly bears will be absolutely detrimental to the ungulate populations.

Correspondence ID: 593Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Newman lake, WA 99025
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 16:58:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: No

Correspondence ID: 594Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Everett, WA 98201
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 16:59:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: It is time for the grizzly bear to become a part of the eco system once again In the North Cascades. This is a perfect space to allow for reintroduction as this area is vast and the possibility of human encounter is low.

When writing the protection plan for these animals please do not allow unjustified killing if the bear roams outside of this area as is allowed with wolves in many areas such as Montana and Wyoming.

I support the restoring grizzly bears back to the North Cascade Ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 595Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Castle rock, WA 98611
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 17:06:49
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am against the grizzly bear reintroduction as it puts too many peoples lives at risk

Correspondence ID: 596Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mt Vernon, WA 98274
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 17:09:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is a terrible idea, the consequences of this decision will have a lasting impact for both our local ecosystem and the safety of those who enjoy the outdoors. As an avid outdoorsman I have witnessed firsthand the current state of our ecosystem, which currently has an overload of predators and is seeing negative impacts as a result. Ungulate numbers are steadily declining and our ecosystem simply cannot support another apex predator.

- the proposed remote location in north cascades national park actually is not great grizzly bear habitat. Any bear planted there will likely move to the east towards Ross lake, or more likely to the west along the mt baker highway. Both of those areas are high recreational use and would be a cause for the safely off hikers and others who venture into wilderness areas. A healthy population of brown bears could be devastating to any local farmers or cattle owners in whatcom and skagit counties. Grizzly bears can easily lose there fear of humans and turn into major problems for people who live around them.
- Another point worth mentioning is any bear transplants are likely to be 'problem bears' from other areas, or at the very least a bear willing to after human food to enter a trap for relocation. Both of these are very bad scenarios, bears without fear of humans will teach there young not to fear humans.
- there are populations of grizzly bears in BC and in NE wa. If our ecosystem could handle these bears, they would move in on there own and we would already have them. My response is NO grizzlies in the north cascades!

Correspondence ID: 597Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98108-5001
United States of America
Outside Organization: Ben Hawley Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 17:10:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Yes, I think that brown bears should be brought back to the North Cascades. I believe that reintroducing species that were historically native to an area is always the right thing to do. They were here before us and were part of the natural balance and should be returned to bring that balance back to whatever degree is possible.

Correspondence ID: 598Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lake stevens, WA 98258
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 17:12:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am very opposed to the introduction of grizzly bears into Washington state. With the recent attacks and deaths across their current range it makes no sense to do so.

Correspondence ID: 599Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98121
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 17:13:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hello,

I am all for reintroducing Grizzlies to the park. You can put even more in the park if there are more available. Bring them back.

Correspondence ID: 600Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Richland, WA 99352
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 17:13:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Absolutely not this is a terrible plan. If predators spread naturally so be it but grizzly are extremely dangerous to people and this would be irresponsible to bring in grizzly.

proper management need to be put into place so we can harvest grizzly each year out of Montana, Idaho and Wyoming then talk about moving them.

Correspondence ID: 601Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lynden, WA 98264
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 17:25:56

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think it's good to let a native animal have its territory back. I hope there will be better curbs on hunting so they won't be driven away again.

Correspondence ID: 602Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Port Townsend, WA 98368
United States of America

Outside Organization: retired educator Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 17:26:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Yes! Please continue with the draft to support frizzly repopulation of the NCE. They are a critical piece of the ecosystem and culturally significant to many with indigenous heritage or those of us who hold the bear totem as our family totem for generations.

Thank you for your work on this!

Correspondence ID: 603Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 17:30:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Well, the bears were hunted to near extinction only a few decades ago and so, a few decades from the onset of this experiment, history will repeat. Because, you know, some people gotta shoot animals.

Correspondence ID: 604Project:112008Document:132104

Address: KIRKLAND, WA 98034
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 17:32:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am in full support of sharing the outdoors with grizzlies.
Please do whatever it takes to bring them back!
thanks, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 605Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Auburn, WA 98001
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 17:33:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I think introducing Grizzly bears into North Cascades National Park is a wonderful idea. I'm an avid hiker and would love to see the positive change bears would make on the area.

Correspondence ID: 606Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Snohomish, WA 98290
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 17:33:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: No! Grizzly Bears should not be reintroduced into the North Cascade ecosystem. Our ungulate populations are already being destroyed by uncontrolled predators and we don't need more.

Correspondence ID: 607Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Lake Stevens, WA 98258
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 17:34:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: NO!

Correspondence ID: 608Project:112008Document:132104
Address: WOODINVILLE, WA 98077
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 17:37:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I want grizzly bears managed as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act, and only permit some to be captured, moved or killed under specific circumstances, like the defense of life and scientific or research activities.
I have attended lectures by state wildlife experts and federal fish & wildlife researchers studying the prime remaining grizzly bear zones including the North Cascades. I've also volunteered at Mt. Rainier National Park where naturalists are concerned about the loss of open meadows. A Grizzly bear can plow through a couple acres of meadows eating dozens of ground squirrels in a couple hours. Meadows are restored by their huge claws searching for autumn food sources. Grizzly bears must be restored to all 6 recovery zones, about 200 total, over the next century. Indigenous peoples have coexisted with grizzly bears for thousands of years. So must All Americans.

Correspondence ID: 609Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mill Creek, WA 98012
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 17:38:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a avid hiker of the Cascade Mountains I worry greatly about this Grizzly plan of yours. I hear way to many stories of people getting attacked and or killed in Montana and I do not want to worry about that when I'm hiking. The Grizzly population would only increase because I have no faith they would be thinned out when they need to be. We already have a exploding Courgar population in this state that nothing seems to be done about and the grizzly would be the same story as they move South. We already have more then enough predators in the Cascades and don't need more. Please don't introduce Grizzlies back into the Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 610Project:112008Document:132104

Address: CENTRALIA, WA 98531
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 17:39:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: What a terribly stupid and dangerous idea.

Correspondence ID: 611Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Auburn, WA 98092
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 17:42:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This idea is very short-sighted. Bears wander and do not respect Park boundary lines. They are a menace to people and ranchers alike. Please do NOT re-introduce Grizzly bears anywhere in Washington State.

Correspondence ID: 612Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tacoma, WA 98404
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 17:57:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This was the grizzlies home before it was ours. They were important part of the ecosystem, and their reintroduction will only strengthen that ecosystem (there is ample evidence for this, the wolves returning to Yellowstone being the most famous example). People will just have to learn to live with them again in a way that is safe for both parties

Correspondence ID: 613Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Marysville, WA 98271
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 17:58:41

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We absolutely do not want Grizzly bears introduced to the cascades. Montana, idaho and Wyoming have enough issues with them attacking people more and more frequently. We do not want to have to worry about these bears while enjoying the great outdoors. PLEASE DO NOT INTRODUCE MORE GRIZZLIES INTO THE CASCADES!

Correspondence ID: 614Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98109
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 17:58:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Bring the grizzlies back. I want to recover and save what we can of the world that we have lost to fear, money, and power.

Correspondence ID: 615Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Union, WA 98592
United States of America
Outside Organization: All Aboard Yacht Charters Business(Official Rep.)
Received: Sep,29 2023 17:59:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I have been a licensed eco tour and wilderness guide in Alaska since 1981 and as well at the 2 bear observatories in Southeast, Alaska. Anan and Pack Creek and have taken 1000s of people to observe brown Bears (Grizzlies) in their natural habitats throughout Southeast, Alaska and British Columbia. I think Brown Bears are one of the most misunderstood animals on the planet. My dear friend [REDACTED] (Pack Creek) found an orphaned brown bear cub in 1942 and put out a bowl of porage for the little guy and until he died in 1989 there had been 82 direct to decedents from the little female. He would share his stories with me of living with these animals. As he often said if they were aggressive by nature they would have been exterminated years ago. They tend to be solitary animals once they are adults and in my 45 year experience with these animals in the wild I have never encountered an issue. Just looking at the tourist industry in Alaska it has been such a boon to local towns like Wrangell for Anan Creek and Juneau for Pack Creek as they are the closest proximity to the Bear Observatories. I know there would be concern with livestock and I'm not sure how to properly address that issue obviously it would be part of their normal feeding habits. But at one time in history there must have been a healthy population of Grizzlies in the North Cascades and it was part of their habitat before it was part of ours. So I'm in favor of their reintroduction.
Thank you,
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 616Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 18:01:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: After living in Alaska for 21 years, with bears literally in my back yard, it has been nice living in Whatcom County and not having to be "bear smart" all of the time. As an avid hiker, I was lucky to have a hiking buddy with me at all times in Alaska as bears are much less likely to attach two or more people together. Here, I enjoy solo hiking and feel fairly comfortable in doing so as the bear population is so much lower. I would not like to see grizzly bears introduced to our county as I like my rather carefree hiking.

Correspondence ID: 617Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Franklin, TN 37069
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 18:02:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am in favor of the Grizzly Restoration Project. We have Black Bears where I live and I enjoy seeing them. I realize that Grizzlies different than Black Bears, but through education of the public, like carrying bear spray, and knowing what to do when you encounter a bear, I believe that this could be a successful reintroduction.

Correspondence ID: 618Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Everett, WA 98203
United States of America
Outside Organization: Northwest Nature / Wildlife Photographers Business(Official Rep.)
Received: Sep,29 2023 18:02:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear SEPA Officials:

My recommendation would be to support Alternative B: Restoration with Existing Endangered Species Act Protections, as it provides maximum protection for the newly reintroduced brown bear population.

I spend a great deal of time in North American brown bear country, and it would be very positive to see them returned to the North Cascades. They are an essential part of the eco system, and help control ungulate populations, similar to wolf reintroduction in Yellowstone.

Brown bear/human interaction rarely results in injury to people. During the 2020-2022 period there were eight fatal attacks in the US, and an estimated 80 non-fatal attacks. By way of comparison, there are an average of 72 deaths each year from bee and wasp stings in the US.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input.

Regards,

Correspondence ID: 619Project:112008Document:132104
Address: St louis, MO 63144
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 18:03:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support repopulating the north cascades with grizzly bears and they should be given complete protection.
Also grizzlies should be given priority over any other use of the park property and surrounding national forests.

T

Correspondence ID: 620Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Saint Amant, LA 70774
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 18:03:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I lived in WA for over 30 years until I recently returned to my home state of LA temporarily. My family and I plan on moving back WA in 2 years. I am in love with the PNW and all that it has to offer. I am probably the biggest animal lover out there. Grizzlies are at the top of my list. I remember seeing them up close and personal in the Olympics where my great grandfather built a cabin. I loved going to Eastern WA and taking photos of them. I have spent A LOT of time in AK. People can absolutely live with these animals peacefully. Yes, there can be instances with any predator, but it is possible. Please please please follow Alaskas lead in how they all live together. People in WA freak out if a bear is in their neighborhood like where I lived in Snohomish. So many more loved them than those others that reported the poor bears for reasons the neighbors caused. These bears are doing what they do, but humans need to be educated in order for this to happen Proper garbage bins need to be provided, and people need to be taught how to live harmoniously with wildlife. I hope wildlife and fisheries will make more of an effort to transport rather than kill what is said to be a nuisance animal. Not everyone is an animal person, and gives false info. Save the bears!!!!!!

Correspondence ID: 621Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Clear Lake, WA 98235
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 18:10:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Yes, I think you're right--bring back the grizzly bears! I'm sure the bears will enjoy eating something besides fish; maybe a hiker or two in between fish, elk, deer, etc. Yummy!

Correspondence ID: 622Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 18:10:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Reintroducing grizzly bears to the N. Cascades is a horrible idea! The North Cascades make up one of the most dramatic and beautiful landscapes Washington has to offer. So many people enjoy the magic that makes up this part of the country. What makes us feel safe exploring this beautiful place is the knowledge that the likelihood of having an aggressive wildlife encounter is very low. While black bears tend to retreat when humans are nearby, grizzly bears are a different animal entirely. Why would anyone think introducing an apex predator into what is now a safe wilderness destination is an acceptable idea? Grizzly bears do nothing for our ecosystem, they would serve no purpose here other than to make those of us who enjoy the outdoors feel unsafe hiking in our own backyard. Please do not reintroduce grizzly bears to the North Cascades, or anywhere else in WA. Please leave in their current habitats where they seem to be doing just fine. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 623Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98105
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 18:11:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Bring back the grizzlies! They belong here!

Correspondence ID: 624Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Tacoma, WA 98402
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 18:14:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do not re-introduce grizzly bears into the north Cascades! That will dramatically change the impact for all of us were local hikers, and will frankly make those trails ones that I no longer would be comfortable entering or pursuing it. You would dramatically reduce a lot of the area that us recreational hikers, feel comfortable accessing by re-introducing grizzly bears, and frankly would probably change my relationship with Hiking in Washington state.

Correspondence ID: 625Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mercer island, WA 98040
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 18:15:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I 100% support grizzly bear reintroduction.

Correspondence ID: 626Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sedro Woolley, WA 98284
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 18:21:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I would like to state that I would agree with alternative C for the restoration of the Grizzly Bear into the NCE. I believe this to be the best management system as it provides the FWS with the best options for the control of the bears. I would like to see any Grizzly that is relocated into the area collard for tracking. I also would like to see the public that is using park hiking trails to be provided with Bear Spray and An air horn if requested. for their protection and the protection of the Bears. This could be done at a dispensing station where it could be returned after the hike if not used.

I am a strong believer in the fact that we as mankind are responsible for the eradication of the animals in this particular environment and should do are best to restore the population to an manageable population of Grizzly Bears. I would like to comment that public safety should be priority and that is why I ask that you have Bear Spray stations available to the public as not everyone can afford it and some may forget to bring it.

I heard of problems with the Wolfs and livestock on the east side in Washington State and this could also become a problem with bears like the Grizzly. I would like to suggest a program where DFWS in Washington adopt a protection program for ranchers where possibly trained Shepard dogs could be purchased by the Department of fish and wildlife and lent or just provided to the ranchers to quell the problem. The Department could provide money to feed the dogs instead of paying for lost animals. best non lethal way of dealing with problem bears or Wolfs.

Thanks [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 627Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Darrington, WA 98241
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 18:22:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We already have a over population of black bears around darrington which is at the foothills of the north cascades, Montana has a couple grizzly attacks every month, why would you put humans in damage bring in such a strong and a aggressive animals. I strongly oppose the idea of grizzlies in the north cascades! Please don't!

Correspondence ID: 628Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 18:25:10

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in favor of alternative A, take no action. I live in Zone 1, within 1 mile of the "recovery zone". I think it has been a waste of our taxpayer money to continue supporting these proposals and studies, let alone the actual implementation of this action. History shows us the fallacy of our intervention in manipulating our environment. I do not think it has been significantly considered the impact of artificially introducing the grizzly bear into our area on the other wildlife, i.e., black bears, cougars, salmon, bull trout ..that so much money has been spent to protect. The effect on recreation in that area has also not been fully looked at. If the grizzly bear naturally migrates, and occupies the area so be it. Do not waste our money in this effort to artificially introduce this apex predator into my backyard.

Correspondence ID: 629Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Eatonville, WA 98328
United States of America
Outside Organization: Northwest Trek Business
Received: Sep,29 2023 18:25:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I would love to see these magnificent creatures returned to Washington's wilderness! I would love to be a part of these sorts of things as well.

Correspondence ID: 630Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Graham, WA 98338
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 18:25:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: It is imperative that we begin reintroduction and support of grizzlies to the North Cascades. Their impact throughout the environment is crucial and we must support this beautiful species. The long-lasting impacts of their absences are yet to be fully understood but based on studies in other National Parks, we know they are a keystone species for many environments including the North Cascades. Furthermore, by reintroducing this species we will have future opportunities for increasing and maintaining genetic diversity for the species. I am a current Fisheries, Wildlife, and Conservation Sciences student at Oregon State University and plan to focus on large carnivore ecology throughout the Pacific Northwest. This is an important cause for me personally and I hope the right choice will be made in reintroducing and supporting a grizzly bear population in North Cascades National Park.

Correspondence ID: 631Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Poulsbo, WA 98370
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 18:25:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I strongly support the reintroduction of Grizzlies into the North Cascades. I have documented one Grizzly on a trail camera in the NW corner of WA, and it was the thrill of a lifetime. The ignorant rednecks who oppose this are the same people who support sedition and chaos. They have forfeited their right to have any voice in the matter.

Correspondence ID: 632Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Oroville, WA 98841
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 18:33:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do not want grizzly bears reintroduced to the national forest. I am a hiker and do not want to meet a grizzly bear! [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 633Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Teisp, WA 98856
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 18:34:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please reintroduce the grizzlies to the North Cascades. They are part of the ecosystem and belong there. We need some wins during this time of so many extinctions.

Correspondence ID: 634Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America

Outside Organization: N/A Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 18:34:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly Bears are a natural part of our county, our state of Washington, and in so many places around our country. We have a responsibility to provide them the protections they need to be able to live and thrive in their natural habitats. They have as much right to live here as we do. Human beings have encroached upon the natural habitats of animals throughout the history of our country and beyond. We need to learn how to live with them, not euthanize them or relocate them. The residents of Whatcom County can learn to do the basic things necessary to not unintentionally attract the bears by ensuring they do not have access to human food in any kind of structure that they can easily access or in our garbage, our recycling, our compost, etc. We need to do everything we can to help the Grizzly Bears be safe in their home just as we want to be safe in ours. We have an obligation as the current occupants of this planet to do everything in our power to protect and defend wildlife, especially the Grizzly Bears. Thank you for your consideration.

Correspondence ID: 635Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Everett, WA 98203
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 18:35:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support this. And I know Diane Feinstein would've too.

Correspondence ID: 636Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Cle Elum, WA 98922
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 18:44:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of grizzly bears into the North Cascades ecosystem. They are important part of the ecosystem and historically lived in the area. People have previously coexisted with bears and can do so again. They belong there.

Correspondence ID: 637Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellevue, WA 98005
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 18:48:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am against any Grizzly introduction in Washington State. If it must be done, start by reintroducing them to Seattle and Olympia.

Correspondence ID: 638Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 18:48:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: In regards considering restoring grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem in Washington, this should not be done. Grizzly's present an unnecessary danger to humans and livestock and are simply not necessary for our

ecosystem to thrive. Grizzly's should only become present in the North Cascades if they naturally migrate here on their own. Additionally, the current predator population of cougars, black bear, coyotes and wolves in the cascades has grown disproportionately to prey in the past decade and it would be irresponsible to introduce yet another predator to the mix.

Correspondence ID: 639Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Brier, WA 98036
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 18:51:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: If Grizzly bears wanted to be in WA state, they would be. There is nobody at the border checking the bears passports, currently there are hundreds of grizzlies north of the border. One of the reasons they arent around is the lack of food, and lack of terrain for them to expand on. Bring in 21 bears and it will result in human casualties. This is a HUGE NO from me.

If the bears naturally come, fine, no problem. But human intervention is not needed here, it will only cause problems.

Correspondence ID: 640Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Stanwood, WA 98292
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 18:53:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm in favor of reintroducing grizzly bears into North Cascades National Park.

Correspondence ID: 641Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Anacortes, WA 98221
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 18:54:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not believe this is a good approach for the North Cascades for a myriad of reasons. I have spent a lot of time in the North Cascades hiking, hunting, and camping. I have been part of wildlife management committees and managing the wildlife we already have can be controversial and tenuous at times. Add another predator without a clear management plan if the population exceeds ESA standards exposes the current ungulate population, hikers, and local residents. These bear have a wide geographical range and with the high fish and elk population in the lower Skagit Valley there is a high likelihood some of these bear will end up in this area and create new problems and challenges for farmers and cattlemen. Based on my experience hunting in Libby, Montana this is an unnecessary risk or step. What is the strategy if the population exceeds expectations and it rises to the level that it could be removed from the ESA in Washington. Is there an active management plan from WDFW that will allow the harvest of these bear when they are problem bear or exceed population expectations.

Correspondence ID: 642Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98516
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 18:56:48

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Writing to express my support for restoring the Grizzly Bear to the North Cascades! They are invaluable to the living ecosystem, as well as should have sovereign rights to be restored.

Correspondence ID: 643Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Longview, WA 98632
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 18:57:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is clearly an overstep by the government to end sustenance hunting in Washington state. The grizzlies are already in this ecosystem and can clearly only sustain the small population of apex predators. Anything more then our population we have now will cause problems to my peoples and our way of life as natives in Washington. No more grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 644Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Marblemount, WA 98267
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 19:01:08

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I live in the foothills of "the park" and I certainly don't want (even more) grizzlies in this area than are already here. Seems to be the lions share of people advocating for grizzly bears in the North Cascades, live 100 miles or more from here. I feel like the opinions of ones that this impacts most, should be weighed more heavily. We have a big enough predator problem with the Mountain Lions, especially, we don't need to bolster the predator population. Look at the increase of grizz attacks in the last few years in the Rocky Mountain region. If you add a predator, we should be managing the population of the predator. However, this thinking is going largely to the wayside of Washington's elected officials.

Correspondence ID: 645Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Duvall, WA 98019
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 19:04:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly support the implementation of the grizzly bear restoration plan for the North Cascades. Option C gives the greatest opportunity for success and flexibility for wildlife managers.

Humans of extirpated grizzly bears from Washington state, and it is our obligation to reintroduce grizzly bears into the best possible remaining ecosystems. The north cascades ecosystem is an excellent location to reintroduce grizzly bears. They are part of what makes these places wild, and are in a global part of the natural world.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 646Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bothell, WA 98012
United States of America

Outside Organization: None Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 19:05:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The Cascades are a great place for hiking, backpacking, and camping. I have enjoyed many outdoor adventures with my family for years. It's safe. I'm not taking my family, my kids, to any part of the Cascades where Grizzlies are present. Why would I do something that stupid? Not safe. Maybe if we vacate land, restore it, we can give it back, but that is not who we are. Not happy about this proposal.

Correspondence ID: 647Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98512
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 19:07:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: MY comments are my own; I do not speak for any official positions of any government agency. I agree with and fully support the NPS/FWS preferred Alternative C to reintroduce grizzly bears into North Cascade Ecosystem in the State of Washington. Having many decades of first hand experience seeking out and viewing grizzly bears, and also personally assisting in managing human - grizzly bear interactions as a full time volunteer in a National Park, I have observed the benefit to people and local businesses to be significantly positive. With appropriate public education on how to safely coexist and how to promote best practices to encourage natural feeding, these bears in their natural environment provide immense enjoyment for tourists and nature lovers alike. They will become a significant tourist attraction thereby generating new tourism revenue. It would be short sighted to focus only upon the challenges of managing problems between bears and cattle on the fringes of the ecosystem. Those challenges are already being effectively addressed in other areas of the United States. The overall benefits of grizzlies being present far outweighs the costs. As key members of the original ecosystem, it's only natural for grizzly bears to be present in wilderness areas, national parks and national forests. Please move this initiative forward.

Correspondence ID: 648Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Issaquah, WA 98029
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 19:10:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please please reintroduce the grizzly bear to the North Cascades. Folks that are against this should move to Europe where all the Apex predators are gone and they won't have to have "their" version of nature ruined. It's a travesty to allow any person to protest this. If they want a curated and especially cultivated nature go somewhere else!

Correspondence ID: 649Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Yakima, WA 98902
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 19:13:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Absolutely silly to think that reintroduction of grizzlies is a great idea. Let's define reintroduction. Are we reintroducing these grizzlies in the same environment they existed in 200 years ago? No there is more human population, livestock and wildlife that is used to not having grizzly predation. They will decimate wildlife, livestock and unfortunately a human eventually. Is a loss of human life in the north cascades something everyone supporting this is comfortable with? Are we truly prepared for the hit to deer/elk populations? The ecosystem unfortunately is not the same that it used to be and not prepared for this

Correspondence ID: 650Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98116
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 19:15:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears occupied the North Cascades for thousands of years as an essential part of the ecosystem. I am writing in favor of the two action alternatives for restoration of grizzly bears. These alternatives will support reintroduction and recovery of grizzly bears. Moreover, data indicate that reintroduction is feasible and will promote conservation of the species.

Grizzly bears coexist with humans elsewhere in the west and we should take this opportunity to restore grizzly bears to its habitat.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 651Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98125
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 19:25:24

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support and agree with this plan

Correspondence ID: 652Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Woodinville, WA 98077
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 19:25:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: If the habitat can sustain a grizzly population they will return on their own. There is a large protected population just north of the border. They don't reestablish in Washington because there are too many people and not enough prey animals. When grizzlies roamed Washington there were significantly less people, there are now over 8 million people and tens of thousands of miles of heavily traveled roads. Washington is already drowning in predators and adding a new apex predator would cripple the Methow Mule Deer herd, which is already a shadow of its former glory. Reintroduction would also endanger the people and livestock of our state. It is irresponsible and reckless to even consider this, which is why this ludicrous proposal has already been shot down a half dozen times. Yet here you are, shamelessly trying to push your agenda through against the will of the people and the advice of wildlife biologists. Asking this every year is pathetic, fix the mountain of problems Washington wildlife faces before trying to add a new one. You people are despicable.

Correspondence ID: 653Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98116
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 19:31:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a hiker and backpacker, one of the things I have appreciated about the North Cascades is not having to worry about Grizzly Bears. The Grizzly Bears in British Columbia, Alberta, Glacier and Yellowstone are the reason why I no longer camp in those areas. And because hotel rates are sky high, I rarely visit those areas at all.

I really do not want to say the same about the North Cascades after Grizzly Bears are reintroduced and become a serious concern like they have elsewhere. Dealing with the annoyances of Black Bears is bad enough, having to worry about aggressive and predatory Grizzlies will turn myself and others away from the North Cascades.

Is that what the NPS wants? To scare individuals and families away from the North Cascades? Sometimes I really have to wonder if the answer is yes.

Correspondence ID: 654Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sultan, WA 98294
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 19:31:41

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: NPS, Thank you for drafting a new plan to bring back Grizzly Bears to the North Cascades. We were almost there in 2015 and I'm glad that you are revisiting this important addition to the North Cascades. The Grizzly is a keystone species that deserves to be back in it's homeland. So I hope that you can make this happen. Thank you...

Correspondence ID: 655Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98199
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 19:39:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm in favor of supporting the natural habitat as it would exist without human intervention in cases where it makes sense, and allowing the restoration of the grizzly population is one of those situations. I'm in favor of restoring Grizzly Bears to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 656Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 19:42:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: While I recognize that this is not necessarily the responsibility of the NPS, the reintroduction of grizzlies into Okanogan county and surrounding areas seems incredibly less important than addressing the impacts that the same humans that eliminated the grizzly population have had on the native people of this land, who also lived here thousands of years before us. My hope is that awareness is brought to this fact, as the reintroduction of grizzlies will likely have extreme social consequences on an already-divided county. I strongly believe that our climate, habitat, and ecosystems will continue to suffer unless the people of this area are united in the fight to address this very important issue. Please consider the social consequences of grizzly reintroduction if adequate attention is not paid to the larger context.

Correspondence ID: 657Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 19:48:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Yes to grizzly bear reintroduction in cascades.

Correspondence ID: 658Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Veneta, OR 97487
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 19:51:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No.

Correspondence ID: 659Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Renton, WA 98058
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 19:52:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears are native to the North Cascades, and their absence is an aberration. There were grizzly bears there relatively recently. It is a land with vast, remote tracts of wilderness where these creatures can live apart from humans. It is a land which deserves to see the restoration of a natural order of life. The bears belong there! Our world is all the less for their absence.

Correspondence ID: 660Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Federal Way, WA 98023
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 19:52:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Wait -they will migrate on their own just like in North Idaho.

My grandfather was the first Forest Ranger in Winthrop. He retired in 1949 and lived to 104.

He never saw a grizzly or any signs of a grizzly bears. And grandpa spent years in the mountains.

Correspondence ID: 661Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Yakima, WA 98902
United States of America

Outside Organization: community health of central washington Business

Received: Sep,29 2023 19:53:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of Grizzly Bear in the North Cascades. Alaskans and Canadians can live in harmony with this magnificent species and we can too. It will greatly restore the ecosystem in this area which historically was home to the Grizzly. Thank you for your efforts. [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 662Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Roslyn, WA 98941
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 19:53:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: You commie idiots want to fine me \$1500 for "attracting bears" with my simple life every summer! My bird feeder or my waste management can will cost me \$1500 because you refuse to manage the bears we already have! You refuse to relocate the bears we already have then gaslight me like I did something wrong?? Get a grip! This is the worst idea ever - because you clowns refuse to be accountable. Manage the current bear population first! This is some new money scam and that's all it is! Tell the truth for once - you need this as an excuse to abscond with taxpayer money!! You don't fine me \$1500 for your failures then beg for money!! You work for ME!! DO YOUR JOB!!!

Correspondence ID: 663Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98125
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 19:54:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To whom it may concern,

It is of the utmost importance that we take swift action to bring brown bears back to the North Cascades ecosystem. For far too long mismanagement and lack of understanding for the biological and cultural role these bears play has prevented them from thriving in a land that historically has been outstanding bear habitat. I would hope those that have the power to restore these bears to the North Cascades would work tirelessly bring them home.

Correspondence ID: 664Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Lynden, WA 98264
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 19:55:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: They are Apex predators. All of the time spent rehabilitating deer, elk, and other game populations in the state will be all for nothing. Grizzlies will decimate populations of non-predator and predator creatures alike. Please do not reintroduce grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 665Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Lynnwood, WA 98046
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 19:57:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: No thanks. Would you send them to your children's backyard.

Correspondence ID: 666Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98125
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 19:59:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I'm an avid hiker and I value the wildness of the North Cascades. I want grizzly bears to be a part of that wildness again. There is plenty of space for both of us.

Correspondence ID: 667Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Camano Island, WA 98282
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 19:59:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My family is really excited about the prospects of Grizzlies being back in their rightful home in the North Cascades. It will change how my wife and I engage with the wilderness around us, but we look forward to this new awareness that it will bring. We respect all of the large carnivores on the landscapes we visit and live in. Thank you to everyone working on this reintroduction. It can only help make our wild spaces more healthy and functional....which is something we all benefit from.

Correspondence ID: 668Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 20:02:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Simple, really. We killed them. We need to bring them back.

Correspondence ID: 669Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Lake Stevens, WA 98258
United States of America
Outside Organization: Lake Stevens Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 20:13:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Look, I was born and raised in a moderately rural area near wildlife. We had school lockdowns at least 3 times because of black bear activity in the school yard. I've had friends and family loose house hold pets to cougar and coyote. I am an avid hiker and outdoorsman. I carry a 10mm handgun with me on trails because I know the potential danger of wildlife. Grizzly bears pose an extreme hazard to people and were hunted to extinction for a reason. Our state already has enough hazard in the wilderness. Our ecosystem has changed. We have seen the absolute disaster that reintegrating wolves into the Cascades has caused on competitive species and lives stock. Do not make the mistake of tossing another apex predator into the mix and reaping havoc on the environment at the cost of the taxpayer.

Correspondence ID: 670Project:112008Document:132104

Address: MAZAMA, WA 98833-9700

United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 20:13:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 671Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Skykomish, WA 98288

United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 20:18:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm in staunch opposition to your restoration plan. As one who will be directly affected by the plan--living, working and hiking alone in the mountains of Zone 1--I feel very strongly about this. While many urban dwellers may have romantic visions of these 700 lb apex predators living wild and free in the mountains, it's not the urbanites who live out here, *in* these mountains. Their lives won't be directly impacted. It's the rural residents of these more remote areas and communities who will have to share the mountains and rangeland with these imported animals--not the urbanites.

Grizzly populations have not only met recovery criteria goals in other areas of the US, such as the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem and Northern Continental Divide Ecosystem, but surpassed them. Their numbers and ranges continue to expand. They're thriving. This isn't a species that's on the brink of extinction. But if you truly believe they need more range here in Washington, bring a few home and let them live in *your* backyard.

Correspondence ID: 672Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Issaquah, WA 98029

United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 20:26:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Yes! Pls return the bears to their historic habitat

Correspondence ID: 673Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Edmonds, WA 98020

United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 20:29:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not do this to us. The North Cascades is now an area frequented by a lot of hikers and campers. These bears are fabulous predators; I don't want fabulous predators where I recreate any more than I want them in my

neighborhood. They no longer fit into the North Cascades because humans are likely to have fatal encounters with them if they are placed here. Please do not do this. Please. Do. Not. Do. This. Don't do it. Stop.

Correspondence ID: 674Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 20:33:10

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am so happy to hear that these majestic animals may be reintroduced to their habitat. This has been their home much longer than it has been ours. They absolutely deserve to live and thrive in the North Cascades!! What a gift!

Correspondence ID: 675Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kirkland, WA 98033
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 20:36:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am a Washingtonian. We love the north Cascades. It's wonderful. We hike and play there.

And I support the reintroduction of grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 676Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Carlton, WA 98814
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 20:44:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Really grateful to see grizzly being reintroduced. Predators are an essential part of intact ecosystem. Essential for survival. Proud of this project!

Correspondence ID: 677Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sedro Woolley, WA 98284
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 20:44:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I feel it's an excellent idea, since right now all bears are on the move and will be here regardless. That's because of a new law in Alaska, which allows hunters to kill bears with their cubs inside their dens. Bears do not feel safe in their dens anymore. Everyone should carry bear spray and know how to use it. Never run, scream, have direct eye contact, or smile showing your teeth. These are signs of aggression and/or could make a person become prey.

Correspondence ID: 678Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Friday Harbor, WA 98250
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 20:51:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Bears are good. Bears are nice. Bears help maintain a balanced ecosystem. In short, bears are beary Kool! Tourons love approaching bears and bears love to maul tourons so that's a win-win scenario. Just gotta keep the bears off the roads and out of the donuts. Go Bears!

Correspondence ID: 679Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bremerton, WA 98312
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 20:52:56

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As an avid hiker, outdoorsman, fisherman and hunter I oppose the relocation of Grizzly bears in the North Cascades. The effect of Grizzly Bears towards random hikers, cattlemen and outdoorsman would be detrimental. I say NO Bears

Correspondence ID: 680Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Arlington, WA 98223
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 20:53:12

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: There is absolutely no reason to plant grizzly bears in the Cascade mountains in Washington State. Grizzlies already reside in BC Canada and there is nothing from stopping them from coming down to Washington. People are guaranteed to be killed, and our deer and elk populations would absolutely get destroyed. Also, livestock would get mauled and killed, making life even harder for farmers and people with animals. Keep grizzly bears out of Washington State!

Correspondence ID: 681Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98122
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 20:53:15

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a Washington resident and avid outdoorswoman, I would like to see grizzly bears returned to the North Cascades, just a small part of their historical, native range. I see the preservation and restoration of natural ecosystems as a critical component of creating a healthy, sustainable Earth. Modern civilization has selfishly and single-mindedly taken possession of the planet (including the United States and Washington state), paving, plowing, logging, ranching, polluting and constructing over complex ecosystems, diminishing the rich diversity of life that once existed. As the world comes to face the devastating consequences of climate change, we must also come to terms with the fact that our determination to bend the world to our desires and comforts has jeopardized the very thing that sustains us. The Upper Skagit Tribe has asked for grizzlies to be reintroduced back into their native habitat. We should respectfully honor their request and have the humility to seek their guidance in the process of reintroduction and ask them to share their knowledge on coexisting with grizzlies. If and when grizzlies return to Washington, it will be critical to educate the public on how to safely and respectfully share the land with a species whose time has come to return home.

Correspondence ID: 682Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Eugene, OR 97405
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 21:03:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears were once endemic to the Northern Cascades and must be allowed to recover to a sustainable population.

Correspondence ID: 683Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Chehalis, WA 98532
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 21:08:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As it is written in Genesis. We were created to be stewards to the Earth. The plants and animals and fish in the sea. Let the animals live and thrive in all their environments! Bring back the bears and stop trying to control pacha mama

Correspondence ID: 684Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Port Orchard, WA 98366
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 21:09:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I vote a NO!!!!!!!

Correspondence ID: 685Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98116
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 21:12:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I believe one that we should 100% reintroduce grizzly bears into territory that they once considered home. We should reintroduce them gradually under the endangered species act, while that limits what we can do wilhen situations arise I also believe it will give them most protections and the harshest penalties and anyone who hurts or poaches the bears.

Correspondence ID: 686Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Concrete, WA 98237
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 21:18:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am not in favor to add to the already existing population of grizzlies. The wolves that were introduced are not the same as what was already here and they don't mesh well together. The introduction of elk has been nothing but an increasing problem and I have no doubt that the grizzlies will wander right out of the mountains and into populated and cause problems. We don't have that problem now due to the fact that there isn't an over population of them. Do not bring grizzlies into our mountains.

Correspondence ID: 687Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 21:21:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: What a treasure to have these beautiful and necessary more than humans back where they belong.

Correspondence ID: 688Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Okanogan, WA 98840
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 21:23:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Re introducing Grizzlies should not happen in the North Cascades. Unfortunately there is not a lot of room for them to roam like they once did due to human population increase and a large prey population decrease. Our deer herd numbers have been suffering greatly due to wild fires and predator increase. There are also very popular hiking trails such as the Pacific Crest Trail which could lead to multiple human to bear conflicts. People will go hiking and never come back I'm afraid. Hikers and wildlife viewers like to come to Washington State because there are no grizzlies to be worried about. Grizzly human conflicts are on the rise in neighboring states such as Idaho and Montana. We don't need to add Washington to the list of growing bear conflicts. Please let the voices of lifelong Eastern Washington residents be heard!

Correspondence ID: 689Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Selah, WA 98942
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 21:24:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Putting Grizzlies in the North Cascades will have a dramatic impact on hunting and recreation in Washington state Cascades. I STRONGLY DISAGREE with the reintroduction of any more predators in Washington. We already have too many bears, wolves and cats adding grizzly bears will cause a multitude of problems. I'm currently hunting in Montana and people are killed every year by Grizzlies!!! I believe since the PCT goes through the Cascades this will impact people's safety!!! Please do not put anymore Grizzlies in WA.

Correspondence ID: 690Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Orting, WA 98360
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 21:27:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To whom it may concern,
The ecosystem in Washington state has been uprooted by the reintroduction of wolves. As a life long resident of this state and an outdoor enthusiast and hunter I have personally witnessed the ungulate populations decline and have seen their lives turned upside down. The patterns and movement of both mule deer and moose have been impacted negatively. Both species used to graze the slopes and let you walk passed them. Now they live in constant fear, they spook at the slightest sounds and their populations have dropped dramatically. The state is 100% at fault for this for not controlling a non-native invasive wolf species that was brought in to our state. We already have to deal with the release of non-native mountain goats that were released into the Olympic Park. After all these stupid decisions and millions of dollars wasted trying to fix the problem you want to bring in another species. Are you kidding me? Is it the plan of state and federal agencies to ruin our native ungulate populations? Leave the ecosystem alone, you all have done enough damage and we may not ever recover from the wolves. Leave the grizzlies where they are.

Sincerely [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 691Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Rockport, WA 98283
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 21:29:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I believe for nature to truly reach a balance and ultimate equilibrium humans need to stop attempting to make changes that we see as fit. We have made enough changes that have turned out to be poor decisions in hindsight. Leave nature alone and let it restore itself the way the planet would have without our interference.

Correspondence ID: 692Project:112008Document:132104
Address: OLYMPIA, WA 98502
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 21:31:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: please don't let this species become ONLY exist in stories. this is a legendary animal that has given so much to humanity in the ways of lore, culture, and a humbling perspective to the power of nature. we owe it to extend ourselves to facilitate a chance at survival

Correspondence ID: 693Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Rochester, WA 98579
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 21:32:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: In my opinion this is a terrible idea. Don't do it!

Correspondence ID: 694Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98118
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 21:42:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please reintroduce the bears. I think it would be such a great step towards protecting bears and protecting the ecosystem and environment, along with helping to leave our corner of the world a better place than when we found it :)
Thanks,
██████

Correspondence ID: 695Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98199
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 21:47:19
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Bring the grizzly back to the North Cascades!

Correspondence ID: 696Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 21:55:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a frequent hiker and backpacker in park and wilderness areas within the North Cascades Ecosystem, including North Cascades National Park and the Glacier Peak Wilderness, I strongly support the proposed preferred alternative (Alternative C) for the reintroduction of a population of grizzly bears. Grizzly bears should return to the North Cascades; the proposed alternative provides a path to achieve that while providing a reasonable degree of flexibility for agencies.

Correspondence ID: 697Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Duvall, WA 98019
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 21:55:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am in support of proposed plan C.. I also would like to see supports in place for animal corridors to reduce human/bear interactions on road as well as humans foolishly creating nuisance bears with their unsecured trash receptacles when camping and in border communities.

Correspondence ID: 698Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Custer, WA 98240
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 21:56:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The last thing we need is grizzly bears people are already being mauled and killed in other states that have grizzly bears, we don't need that here. Not to mention it's already a predator paradise in Washington with our lack of management. Let's think about our deer and elk, fawns and calves don't have much chance anymore with the black bear, cougar, and wolves. There's not enough on the landscape to support the predators we already have. Let's not add more.

Correspondence ID: 699Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 21:58:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am in favor of reintroducing grizzly bears to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 700Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Spokane, WA 99208
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 21:58:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do not reintroduce Grizzly's to the north cascades. Our ungulates are barely surviving as it is. The methow valley deer heard used to be the largest migrating deer herd in the United States and the herd is now a shell of its former self. It's time we start to manage the apex predators we already have in this state rather then introducing more.

Have you guys not seen the number of cougar wolf incidents we have already had? How about the little girl from hunters that was attacked by a cougar last year. Or the forest service employee that was trees by a pack of wolves. Our predators have no fear and don't associate humans with danger which in this state is a huge problem. This isn't rural Montana where the people are ready to protect themselves from a grizzly need by with a side arm. The north cascades is a huge destination for people to hike trails especially the PCT. With no management the PCT will become an all you can buffet of hikers for these bears and kill the small local economies that depend on the camping, hunting, and hiking trips that surround the areas.

Do not reintroduce Grizzly bears.

Correspondence ID: 701Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Colbert, WA 99005
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 22:03:34

Correspondence Type:Web Form
Correspondence: I love this idea!!

Correspondence ID: 702Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98126
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 22:08:16

Correspondence Type:Web Form

Correspondence: I support the re-introduction of Grizzlys.

Correspondence ID: 703Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Everett, WA 98201
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 22:09:10

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Humans were responsible for removing grizzlies from the North Cascades and it's our responsibility to bring them back home."

Correspondence ID: 704Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Port Orchard, WA 98366
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 22:12:03

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I agree it is past time to reintroduce with monitoring. If you don't fully understand why it is imperative for a balanced environment to include predators please take the time to watch the PBS show "Serengeti Rules";. pbs.org/wnet/nature/serengeti-rules-dhbtnm/19906/

Correspondence ID: 705Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sultan, WA 98294
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 22:16:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please don't reintroduce this predator into our forests.
Thanks for your consideration!

Correspondence ID: 706Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 22:16:52

Correspondence Type:Web Form

Correspondence: I say do it

Correspondence ID: 707Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lake Stevens, WA 98258
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 22:20:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am in support of re-introducing grizzlies to the north cascades.

Correspondence ID: 708Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Tacoma, WA 98406
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 22:35:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Wildlife belongs in the wild. Bring native species back to their home turf where they belong.

Correspondence ID: 709Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 22:35:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We are missing grizzly bears in an ecosystem that is otherwise intact and can support them because of direct persecution by humankind. Let's bring them back and let them roam their historic ranges and make room for them be a part of the world that they have an innate right to inhabit. Finally. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 710Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98126
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 22:36:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I'm an avid hiker and I value the wildness of the North Cascades. I want grizzly bears to be a part of that wildness again. There is plenty of space for both of us.

Grizzlies are home to this area and it is our job as stewards of the planet to ensure their success for our generation and all generations to come.

Correspondence ID: 711Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Salem, OR 97301
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 22:41:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As an avid hunter/outdoorsman/hiker/camper/fisher/tracker/trapper/furtaker I 100% disagree with the reintroduction of grizzly bears. Look at the issues we are currently having with the wolves we recently introduced with the farmers and cattle. Do a simple search of cougar attacks in the Portland. I fear wolves and would fear a grizzly attack and the legal repercussions of needing to defend myself from an attack that is an "endangered species".

If this goes into place, this will be an absolute disaster with activist community.

Correspondence ID: 712Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Stehekin, WA 98852
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 22:44:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Why would you artificially transplant bears to a new geography? Have you learned nothing from the last 100 years of hatchery plants? Let the bears come naturally. The ecosystem is there and intact. The bears don't need our help to get there.

Correspondence ID: 713Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bothell, WA 98012
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 22:44:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the gradual introduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 714Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Onalaska, WA 98570
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 22:47:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I think it is a terrible idea to bring grizzly bears back to the north Cascades. I like to go recreate up there since my girlfriend lives in Arlington and I've also been to Montana where it isn't recommended to use tents in bear habitat areas. I don't want to have to worry about that in the north Cascades. Also I think the deer and elk populations would suffer since they are no longer used to grizzlies being around. Leave the grizzlies out of Washington please

Correspondence ID: 715Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Ravensdale, WA 98051
United States of America
Outside Organization: Citizen Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 22:48:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: This is a guaranteed threat to human life by purposefully releasing grizzly bears and encouraging population. Whether starting with a few or dozens it does not take much to quickly have a population. All it takes is one bear to destroy a human life. Hiking becomes out of the question. Living on our property becomes a threat. These bears could easily approach us in our forested property and kill us while we are taking the dog out for a walk. Our children and pets are no longer safe playing outside. We don't live in the city. We live in a forested mountainous area in king county where there is commonly wildlife the migrated through from the cascades. Our lives would be in danger as well as our community. We are not supportive of a purposeful effort to repopulate the cascades with grizzly bears.

Correspondence ID: 716Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 22:50:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Humans were responsible for removing grizzlies from the North Cascades and it's our responsibility to bring them back home. They are significantly culturally to those who came before us and should be honored and respected as such important beings in the ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 717Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Richland, WA 99352
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 22:58:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do not support the reintroduction of Grizzlies. As we saw this summer, Grizzly and human interactions are deadly. We successfully control game animals with the conservation model in the western states. We don't need to introduce more predator animals back in to the ecosystem

Correspondence ID: 718Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Marysville, WA 98270
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 22:59:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: This ecosystem can no longer support grizzlies

Correspondence ID: 719Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellevue, WA 98007
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 23:01:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: WA state already has a problem with predators. Adding another apex predator will have negative consequences on the ungulate population. Since introduction of wolves the number of elk and deer have been going down. Cougars numbers are increasing annually and also decimating the ungulate population. Black bear numbers are up. The grizzlies will further devour the population of elk and deer. Not to mention the problem they will have with humans. WA state residents enjoy the outdoors, now with grizzlies around there will be attacks on humans who enjoy the outdoors. We can track grizzly attacks on humans going up in neighboring states that introduced grizzly. The people of WA don't want introduction of grizzlies into out eco system.

Correspondence ID: 720Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Tacoma, WA 98403
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 23:04:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Humans were responsible for removing grizzlies from the North Cascades and it's our responsibility to bring them back home. If we don't take action now, we risk losing grizzly bears from the North Cascades forever.

Correspondence ID: 721Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Arlington, WA 98223
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 23:06:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Having hiked extensively in Whatcom, Skagit, and Snohomish county for the last 35 years, seeing wildlife is a huge part of the experience. Knowing there is always the possibility of black bear, cougar, and more recently wolf (East of the mountains), I always carry self defense measures for my peace of mind and those I hike with. But grizzly bear is a different type of threat, requiring self defense measures that I believe 95% of hikers either do not possess or will not carry - namely large caliber handguns paired with Pepper spray. With more and more people enjoying wilderness (trailheads are more crowded than ever), and less of them adequately armed to defend themselves and others, purposefully reintroducing

grizzly bear in our wilderness areas is a recipe for death - both bear and human. For the sake of all who already enter the wild foolishly unprepared for encounters with predators, please do not make matters worse by tipping the odds even more against human survival.

Correspondence ID: 722Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98133
United States of America

Outside Organization: Self Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 23:21:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Seattle resident here. I have vacationed in the NCE for 30+ years; recognize the ecological importance of grizzly bears in the the ecosystem; and support the reintroduction of grizzlies. Thank you for accepting my comment.

Correspondence ID: 723Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America

Outside Organization: none currently Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 23:21:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Brown bears should be returned to the North Cascades ecosystem. They are a necessary and historical component of this habitat, and their presence (along with wolves and wolverines) will help restore a natural balance that has been missing since these animals were exterminated by the hand of human beings. While the presence of the brown bear will change the equation in the North Cascades for humans and livestock, and "bear aware" education will be very important for all those entering this region, this ultimately means that the North Cascades will now be a more complete wilderness and ecosystem. Just because we have grown accustomed to the lack of brown bears in our state does mean that they should forever be denied a habitat in Washington. Indeed, we must accept responsibility for having decimated their population and therefore disrupted the North Cascades in the first place. The question is once reintroduced, can the bears be protected and not shot as soon as they leave National Park property, as we have seen in other situations. They must not only be reintroduced, but also not exist under threat. As humans, we have done great damage to the wildlife with which we share this planet. Only occasionally do we have the opportunity to right a historic and environmental wrong. In this case, in the North Cascades, we have the chance to do something good, that will not only change how we see the region, the wilderness, and our place in it but give a species a new world to roam.

Correspondence ID: 724Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98512
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 23:24:12

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This will lead to harm of humans. It's nothing more than a line item on a long list to end hunting in Washington, so there is no legal justification for gun ownership and eventually total control of people, most of whom are already sheep unfortunately.

Correspondence ID: 725Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Marysville, WA 98270
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,29 2023 23:25:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think adding grizzlies to the area is a terrible idea unless they can be properly managed and harvested. Not only are they destructive to our wildlife ecosystem, they pose a great threat to hikers and backpackers, one of the major attractions for the Pacific Northwest.

Correspondence ID: 726Project:112008Document:132104
Address: MOUNTLAKE TERRACE, WA 98043
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 23:37:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I understand certain people's desire to try to bring an animal back into a range that previously it has called home. Humans have long been changing the land, for many varied desires. It was this same desire that led to deforestation of the Douglas Fir, the creating of freeways, and the removal of grizzlies from our land. I do believe that letting the land get back to what it was and the biodiversity of our environment is very important. In the same way the people have wished to shape the land to fit their needs, some of us wish to return it back to it's original state. With the best intentions we all wish for the best of our land, but I think it's time we let nature handle it. Nature will correct it. It will take time and we as the inpatient species we are can't handle such subtle slowness, but it's time to let nature take care of itself. Its in my uneducated and likely ignored opinion that we should not put brown bears into the NCE, but let nature take care of itself for once.

Correspondence ID: 727Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Marysville, WA 98271
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 23:44:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am in Support for reintroducing Grizzly bears into the cascades. Historically they were in the region and were removed by human intervention. I do not believe that they will cause significant harm to the area and any harm they may cause can be mitigated with proper education to the land owners.

Correspondence ID: 728Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Enumclaw, WA 98022
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29 2023 23:54:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a Volunteer at Mount Rainier National Park, former Park Ranger as well, and an avid hunter, I am opposed to the reintroduction of grizzlies to the North Cascades in Washington state. While advocates believe the introduction will bring back a "natural" balance, I point out the idea of moving mountain goats from North Cascades to Olympic National Park as an example of the usual folly we humans make.

Yes, I realize the goats had no natural minerals available (particularly salt) in Olympic which caused bad behavior toward humans. Grizzlies, being an apex predator, have the habit of having aggressive behavior, because they are the top of the food chain. And humans being what they are, do stupid things around wildlife. Unfortunately I see the reality of aggression toward humans becoming a problem, and then we end up euthanizing the bears due to bad human behavior. Let's not start down that road.

The grizzlies WILL start in one location, but rapidly expand into urban neighborhoods. There is NO WAY you can keep that from happening. Please don't put bears in the position of becoming a victim of human encroachment, ignorance and stupidity, AGAIN. It is a shame we can't coexist, but humans are the problem, not the bears.

Correspondence ID: 729Project:112008Document:132104
Address: marblemount, WA 98267
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023

Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Did you NOT try this a few yrs back ? Let nature do its own thing !!!! If its meant to be it will happen.

Correspondence ID: 730Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lynden, WA 98264
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly oppose the re-introduction of grizzlies into the North Cascades. I believe it will lead to harmful human/bear interactions that will result in deaths and injuries of both bears and people. Washington has a strong culture of outdoor recreation and having so many people sharing the mountain regions with grizzlies is bound to lead to conflict. Currently grizzlies are in close proximity to the North Cascades just across the border in Canada as well as NE Washington. If the habitat and opportunities are right the bears will be able to re inhabit the North Cascades on their own time and as their growing population and expansion allows.

Correspondence ID: 731Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98102
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Bring back the bears
Winnie the Pooh would want this

Correspondence ID: 732Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 01:09:41

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a 60+ year outdoorsman, w/ experience all over the western US; I oppose this Grizzly Bear plan in the strongest terms, based on my different facets and considerations; including but not limited to safety, livestock impacts and other related impacts. Also the funds are better spent elsewhere. [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 733Project:112008Document:132104

Address: PORTLAND, OR 97219
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 01:14:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a visitor to several Federal lands where Grizzly Bears exist and thrive, and a visitor to the North Cascades several times a year, I want to express my strong support to reintroduce Grizzly Bears to the North Cascades ecosystem. There are many examples of the fact that an ecosystem does best and achieves long-term balance when its apex predators are present. Grizzly Bears historically belong in the North Cascades, and bringing them back will contribute to the wholeness of the ecosystem, and also to the cultural heritage and practices of the area's original, Indigenous inhabitants. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 734Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 01:18:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing in support of the Grizzly Bear restoration project in Whatcom county. As a member of the community and home owner, I believe that restoring our habitat with all creatures is vital for helping improve the overall wildlife in the area.

Correspondence ID: 735Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Issaquah, WA 98029
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 02:03:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear National Parks Service,
I came to WA state 37 years ago from West Virginia. I was employed at the Boeing Co. for 30 years and retired just 2 years ago.

I am continually amazed by the beauty & wildness of WA state. My father instilled a love of nature, birds and all wild life, in my 3 siblings and I. We had to travel far to other states to see great numbers of wildlife, but he took us every year, on a very limited income, canoeing in the Okefenokee Swamp, Myakka River State Parks, Yellowstone National Park and north to Canadian wilderness, so that we would treasure all nature and wildlife.

In my own back yard, in Issaquah for 27 years, I saw native and flying squirrels, bobcats, racoons, deers, and the adolescent bears that strolled through every spring, along with numerous species of birds, from tiny Nuthatches to hefty Pileated Woodpeckers.

Our WA wilderness and the ability to live and interact so closely with our wild brothers and sisters, is one of the most incredible components of our life in the Northwest.

I am strongly in favor of the reintroduction of Grizzles to the North Cascades wilderness. Protecting and shepherding this reintroduction will be a huge benefit to our future generations. Restoring native species, such as the Grizzlies is the right thing to do for our children's children and for WA state. Studies have shown that these apex predators can coexist with humans, and will, by and large, avoid them. Please move forward with the plans to bring back this amazing species into our state.

Sincerely and with compassion for all wildlife,


Thank you for the opportunity to support this effort.

Correspondence ID: 736Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98109
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 02:50:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I believe that reintroducing grizzly bears into the North Cascades would bring back the restoration of these amazing animals. Grizzly bears and humans can coexist safely together as long as the grizzly population is well managed and education about grizzly bears is taught to the public.

Correspondence ID: 737Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Custer, WA 98240
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 03:14:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzlies are dangerous predators. Why introduce them to a very populated area? We have been fine without the threat. They will travel and I think it's a big mistake and will result in domestic animals, and maybe people, being injured or killed. It's going to cause unnecessary controversy for years to come.

Correspondence ID: 738Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 03:59:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do restore grizzly bears to their native range in the North Cascade mountains! This is long overdue and would be wonderful!

Correspondence ID: 739Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Auburn, WA 98001
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 04:05:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Yes, grizzlies should be restored to the North Cascades. The ecosystem unequivocally can support them and they would benefit the region in numerous ways. Grizzlies lived in harmony with humans in the region for millennia before being driven out. They undoubtedly have a right to exist in the region.

Correspondence ID: 740Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98168
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 04:14:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Why on earth would we bring killer attack grizzlies to kill our hikers, campers, and little children to our Cascades? There are plenty of thriving grizzlies in Yellowstone, Montana, etc., for anyone to enjoy. There's enough regular stories of those killed and eaten by grizzlies in those areas. Please don't cancel our future of being in the outdoors, it's pointless and serves no purpose, please leave them where they are.

Correspondence ID: 741Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seven Hills, OH 44131
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 04:37:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I grew up in Central Oregon and I'm aware of the tensions between apex predators and locals. I support re-introduction of the "Grizzly" to the North Cascades but only with a "10j" experimental designation with adequate funding to compensate ranchers for livestock losses. Wolves had this designation when restored to "Yellowstone" and the "The Frank" in 1995. I also recommend that grizzlies are transplanted from the "Glacier National Park, Yellowstone, and other areas around Wyoming" to the North Cascades. The reason I suggest this is that there is still a lot of animosity with locals with wolf re-introductions in the 1990's. Many locals from Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming feel that a bigger Canadian wolf was brought in that had the capability of bringing down bigger prey and thus elk herds being decimated throughout the "Rocky Mountain West." The science can say what it wants about the specifics of wolf re-introduced in the 1990's, but locals have their first hand accounts as well through their hunting techniques and campfire stories. Perception is often reality!!! DO NOT TRANSPLANT THE NORTHERN CANADIAN OR ALASKAN COASTAL GRIZZLY/BROWN BEAR TO THE NORTH CASCADES!!! I wish you well with the re-introductions.

Correspondence ID: 742Project:112008Document:132104

Address: mazama, WA 98833
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 05:03:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: i a 100% in support of reintroducing grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem. for way to long the story of predators and "progress" has been to wipe them out. We now know all these predators, from Pine Martens up to Grizzly Bears play an integral role in the ecosystems, health, not to mention, the social/psycho/spiritual benefits.

the Grizzly is unique in its power, intelligence, religious significance for indigenous peoples. with the threat of climate change, and all it know and unknown impacts, it seems to me the intelligent thing to do is work to create as healthy and intact ecosystem as we can in the Northwest, since our future for our wild lands is unknown at this time.

lastly, i want my grand childrens grand childrens to be able to say, 100 years ago, WA state and Federal Gov. to the unprecedented step to reintroduce grizzly bears.

i also feel strongly if bears are becoming a nuisance or killing livestock, there ought to be a fairly simple way for ranchers and farmers and rural home stealers to get help from the Gov., eliminating problem bears, and more than fairly compensating for the damages and lost revenue. we need to get all folks on board, or this will never work. ██████████

Correspondence ID: 743Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98122
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 05:34:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: While the inclusion of Grizzly populations in the cascades would change the region for both recreation and for farmers it seems that it would be worth while to pursue this reintroduction to help further balance the natural ecosystem. Additionally the un-occupied range for these bears seems like it would prevent much interaction between them and livestock.

Correspondence ID: 744Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Marysville, WA 98270
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 06:23:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is an absolutely terrible idea. As an avid outdoorsman my friends, family and I spend hundreds of days in the field. We first hand see the effects of predators on our ungulate populations. They are already diminishing by the year all over our state and a major reason is due to our current predator populations. Predator populations as far as black bears, wolves, mountain lions and coyotes are thriving. Adding MORE grizzly bears to this will hurt the ungulate population to an unrecoverable level in my opinion based on the research and experience I have had, done and seen first hand.

Correspondence ID: 745Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Hurricane, UT 84737
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 06:33:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To whom it may concern: releasing grizzlies back into the Cascade Mountain range is a disastrous idea. I was born and raised in Western Washington and to hear that this is what is trying to happen is terrible. The amount of

damage that they would cause will be detrimental to the ecosystem. The wildlife will take a downward spiral in numbers quickly and the ecosystem will not be able to handle it. The Cascade Mountain range is one of the most beautiful ranges in America and is traveled often. It won't just be detrimental to the ecosystem but it will also put all the travelers through the range at risk. All the hunters that hunt that region also will be at risk. You all need to rethink this and not go through with it. Keep the North Cascades safe for all living things.

Correspondence ID: 746Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ketchum, ID 83340
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 07:08:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We support the reintroduction plan.

Correspondence ID: 747Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kenmore, WA 98028
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 07:36:48

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Do NOT bring back grizzly bears. They will come back on their own.

Correspondence ID: 748Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Chelan, WA 98816
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 07:46:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm a retired NPS Park Ranger with a BS in Wildlife Biology, I'm not in favor of transporting grizzly bears from other locations to the north cascades ecosystem. Let nature take its course and allow them to repopulate the area naturally. No need to spend time and money, and stress the animals and human population by forcing faster repopulation. Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

Correspondence ID: 749Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seabeck, WA 98380
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 07:47:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I fully support all efforts to RESTORE the grizzly bear population to the North Cascades Ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 750Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 07:49:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not reintroduce grizzlies to the area. They are dangerous predators which will inevitably lead to bad interactions with humans. The north cascades are fairly heavily trafficed hiking areas which means human bear encounters are garunteed. This will not meaningfully help the ecosystem and will result in deaths.

Correspondence ID: 751Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Deming, WA 98244
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 07:50:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We have lived in the Foothills of Whatcom County, adjacent to the Mt. Baker/Snoqualmie National Forest, for over 40 years. The return of grizzlies would thrill us. Can't be any more threatening than the cougars that we already see here. Yes, bring them back and let's score a small victory for the ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 752Project:112008Document:132104
Address: ARLINGTON, WA 98223
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 07:50:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Absolutely not! It's a terrible idea! The eco system is stable without grizzly bears involved. The bears that are there do not stay in the north cascades year around. There is minimum 8ft of snow during winter and that does not leave u til very late spring. That alone forces all animals down to the mountain towns and cougars alone are destroying the deer population and farm animals every year.
The pacific crest trail is one of the most traveled hiking trails through the park alot of it goes through bear territory. Every year I travel alone on my horse through this area without any threats other than the amount of people and long distance hikers I pass. The safety of the outdoorsman of that area will be at risk if grizzly bears are introduced. The bears will venture down into the valleys and not stay in the mountains. 100 years ago that's what happened every year, my grandpa was there. It was not safe late fall or early spring to be up in the passes with out protection and a group. No one in their right mind wants to waste funding to do this project, it is not fair to the bears who will inevitably die or move out of the area anyways nor the citizens who travel this beautiful park year after year.

Correspondence ID: 753Project:112008Document:132104
Address: SAMMAMISH, WA 98074
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 07:52:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I'm a resident of King County in WA state and am in full support of this proposal.

Correspondence ID: 754Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Lynden, WA 98264-9705
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 07:56:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: There is no sane reason to re-introduce Grizzly bear in Washinton State. It will impact the already hurting elk and deer population and the feel good planting of wolves sure has been a problem. I am a hiker and the idea of having to give up safe time in the outdoors just to satisfy a few people who want the bears doesn't make sense. Let the bear people go to Montana if they want to pet a grizzly.

I noticed that a new rule has been put in place regarding storage of food when hiking in the Snoqualmie National Forest. There hasn't been a problem with hikers and bears so this tells me that those in positions of power already have decided that the bears will come.

Have you noticed how many Grizzly bear attacks there have been in Montana this year?

Correspondence ID: 755Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Graham, WA 98338
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 07:59:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Let's look at history, so we don't repeat the same mistakes again as the government seemingly loves to do. Mountain goats were transplanted into Olympic National Park (well before it was a park) and what happened? You had to remove or kill them over the last few years at a cost of millions to taxpayers, mainly due to human-wildlife conflict and impacts on the ecosystem.

There are reasons why grizzly bears haven't flourished in the Northern Cascades naturally. Human-wildlife conflict, degradation of habitat, overall numbers of predators, changes in the stress on ungulate populations, proximity to human-inhabited areas due to migration related to food source, habitat changes, etc. In addition, when you set numbers for restoration goals toward management, you don't account for (or object to) the fact that lawsuits prevent necessary management once those goals are met, leading to overpopulation and increasing conflict, as has happened in Montana and Wyoming. As a result of your previous actions, the residents of these states are stuck with an ever-growing population of extremely dangerous apex predators that can't be controlled and that have no natural fear of humans. How many more human lives must be lost or severely impacted from grizzly bear encounters before the push to "re-introduce" them to areas there is no evidence they never naturally existed will go by the wayside? This feels like the gray wolves issue all over again as they are about the management threshold and still not actively being managed.

This program is a mistake from the onset and if it is accepted it will grow out of control, causing harm to humans, domesticated livestock, already lacking ungulate populations, and financial security for individuals and industry. Those of you who design and implement this plan lacking these understandings need to be held personally and financially accountable for the negative results.

Correspondence ID: 756Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Darrington, WA 98241
United States of America

Outside Organization: City of Darrington, building official Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 08:00:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The residents of Darrington have said no to this time after time. Our community would be deeply affected by bringing Apex Predators into the ecosystem here. We were a city that relied on logging but that has gone away. We now rely on tourism. This could have a severe affect on that, which would severely impact our community. If their was a sustainable food source here the bears would be here, let them migrate on their own, you do not need to step in

Correspondence ID: 757Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 08:00:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in full support of Grizzly recovery in the NCE. While I personally prefer Alternative B, I understand the complexity of the issue, and if Alternative C makes for a more palatable option for the whole of our society, then I support that as well.

Correspondence ID: 758Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 08:06:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I vote NO on re-introducing Grizzlies in the North Cascades. There. I said it. Cancel me.

Correspondence ID: 759Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Deer Park, WA 99006
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 08:06:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do not think grizzlies should be introduced to the landscape, The ungulate population is suffering enough because of bad management not to mention the danger to rural Americans.

Correspondence ID: 760Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Tacoma, WA 98446
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 08:20:49
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Predatory animals such as grizzly bears play a key role in maintaining balance in the natural world. By keeping populations of lower level organisms in check plants and insect populations are able to attain there ideal level of growth, the level they maintained for thousands of years before colonists arrived to the United States and removed the predators. The north cascades is a special place in that it has seen very little human impact compared to many other areas of the United States including other national parks. By reintroducing grizzly bears to this park we will be able to further return this area to the wild status that it held prior to human intervention. This will allow the ecosystem to stabilize and protect all life present in the area, and prevent further harm to the world which benefits all life including humans. While large predators are scary to humans taking simple actions to reduce our interactions can prevent a bear attack; and bears belong in this area entering their home cones with the risk of an interaction with them. Yellowstone saw many levels of improvement in the ecosystem including balancing of herbivore populations and regrowth of natural plants, after the reintroduction of wolves, and I as an avid outdoorsman I am excited to see how this regeneration of grizzly bears can return this space to the way it was prior and to human development.

Correspondence ID: 761Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Puyallup, WA 98371
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 08:28:47
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I would like to comment on grizzly bear reintroduction in the north cascades. I strongly oppose this and hope that you will too. There is not enough wildlife to support them thanks in part to poor management from WDFW. Grizzly bears will decimate the already dwindling herds, affecting the sportsmen that rely on hunting to support themselves and their families. This will create dangerous situations for hunters and hikers as there will be more and more attacks and deaths to the people. I believe there is already a few grizzlies here that migrate from Canada and Idaho and they should be left to naturally reintroduce themselves. They will also prey on livestock affecting ranchers and their livelihoods. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 762Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Las Vegas, NV 89129
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 08:31:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have grizzly bear friends in the northern forests of Washington. When I lived in Mountlake Terrace in Washington a few years back I usually go up Drive North and go for a 3 mile hike. They were very friendly and I did with the best of my knowledge and Common Sense not to alarm them and it was just a great thing to be with them. Save the Bears.

Correspondence ID: 763Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Granite falls, WA 98252
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 08:39:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No grizzly bears should not be introduced... this is a terrible idea considering our populations of deer and elk are already low. Also the PCT and tourism out beautiful state trails and summits bring would be at a huge decline and put people in danger for no specific gain other to increase grizzly population.

Correspondence ID: 764Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 08:39:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not reintroduce grizzly bears. Grizzly bears have all of Alaska, much of western Canada, and parts of the inland west in the U.S. I will no longer be able to do anything in the national forests near my home or NCNP if I know grizzlies are there, as I am afraid of them, and for good reason.

Correspondence ID: 765Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 08:40:08

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To whom it may concern, I very much support re-introduction of grizzlies into the north cascades, where they formally roamed, and I very much look forward to the plan coming to fruition and so that one day my kids and their kids can see this area as it was or at least closer to its natural state one day.

Thanks,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 766Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellevue, WA 98008
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 08:41:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Would love to see the reasons why and the benefits it brings to our area. I love the grizzly and have lived in Alaska and N Idaho and the Griz was always respected. I hope we can bring them back.

Correspondence ID: 767Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ferndale, WA 98248
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 08:53:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I think bring back grizzly in North Cascades will be a positive for the area provided that public education for people who use the area for recreation is made available to prevent/minimum negative interactions with the bears.

Correspondence ID: 768Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Everson, WA 98247
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 08:53:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Trying to bring back any species to an area is often counterproductive. Any time you try to help nature often it is worse off. Remember the results from trying to relocate the rams/goats to the Cascades. How did that work out? I recall not so good. Leave nature alone.

Correspondence ID: 769Project:112008Document:132104
Address: East Wenatchee, WA 98802
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 08:53:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please DO NOT place more grizzly bears in the north cascades!

Correspondence ID: 770Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Sedro Woolley, WA 98284
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 08:53:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: What could possibly go wrong? Attacks on people and livestock. Happens every year in states with grizzlies. Wyoming is totally out of control. Is it really worth the death of a person or maybe two for a political agenda? Just another reason to shut down access to people on public lands which is the ultimate goal.

Correspondence ID: 771Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Everett, WA 98204
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 08:55:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I'm a parent who cares about wildlife, and I want my children to experience grizzly bears as an important part of our regional culture

Correspondence ID: 772Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Yakima, WA 98902
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 08:58:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear National Park Service,

I am writing to express my support for Grizzly Bear Restoration in the North Cascades.

I support introducing large mammal predators because they have a role in maintaining a healthy ecosystem, because their existence is threatened by human activity and because it will preserve the wild character of the region.

My wife and I live in Yakima, WA. We enjoy backpacking 2-4 weeks every year in the rugged and wild country of the North Cascades Ecosystem. I am grateful that the North Cascades NP is managed as a wilderness park, which includes large mammal predators.

Thank you,
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 773Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bremerton, WA 98312
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 08:59:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: No we shouldn't introduce grizzlies back here... I'm a avid hunter and have already noticed population going down from disease, and especially wolves.... The wolves need ti be killed or give us tags. Thanks

Correspondence ID: 774Project:112008Document:132104
Address: la conner, WA 98257
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 09:01:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Bring Griz back. Lots of them. Maybe a few known Griz maneaters to thin the crowds.

Correspondence ID: 775Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 09:02:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To whom it may concern, I am writing to state my opposition to restoring grizzly bear populations in the North Cascades of Washington State. I believe that it causes the potential for more risk to the many recreational users of the North Cascades than it does good. Thank you. [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 776Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 09:06:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: It would be great to see grizzlies back!

Correspondence ID: 777Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Everett, WA 98208
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 09:07:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please accept this as my support for national park service and reintroduction of grizzly bears to their natural habitat.

Correspondence ID: 778Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Burlington, WA 98233
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 09:07:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Are you crazy?

If the bears find their way on their own, then fine. If you put them there and someone is killed, now you have liability and open yourselves to lawsuits. Also , there could be livestock issues as with wolves .

I will feel the need to carry a gun when hiking which opens the possibility of shooting accidents increasing due to more guns then currently are being carried .

Mixing two top predators will result in a 50/50 kill result, Half the time people will die and half the time bears will die. If your ok with that, then bring them on and prepare for the lawyers .

Correspondence ID: 779Project:112008Document:132104

Address: South Prairie, WA 98385
United States of America

Outside Organization: Private Citizen Unaffiliated Individual(Official Rep.)

Received: Sep,30 2023 09:07:31

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Bring back all native animals to their homes. Let humans move away from them, if they don't like it!

Correspondence ID: 780Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98116
United States of America

Outside Organization: WA state citizen, teacher, hunter, fisher, hiker Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 09:07:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: It seems a logical thing to do, reintroduce grizzly bears to the North Cascades where they once made their home before eradication by short-sighted white men. Have seen many changes to what should be natural habitat over my lifetime, and man-made changes usually end up not working out. Re-wild our north cascades. Re-balance our ecosystems. People should get off pavement more so they may see and appreciate the wonders of nature. Bears should be in our mountains, please do the right thing..

Correspondence ID: 781Project:112008Document:132104

Address: North Bend, WA 98045
United States of America

Outside Organization: N/A Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 09:09:48

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think it ridiculous to, once again, bring this idea of introducing grizzly bears to the Cascade area. It is a bad idea.

Correspondence ID: 782Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Everson, WA 98247
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 09:10:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Fully support the restoration of grizzly populations in the Washington cascades. I'm an avid hiker and take seriously the possibilities of human and bear interactions on trails or in campgrounds, but managing those interactions is a human responsibility. Large predators play an important role in our ecosystem and I look forward to a day when there is a very real chance of seeing them once again in their native range - even with the added safety precautions for people who are venturing out into those ranges.

Correspondence ID: 783Project:112008Document:132104

Address: stanwood, WA 98292
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 09:10:55

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not think this is needed or beneficial. our horned friare hurting from predators to much in our state do to hunting laws. Please NO.

Correspondence ID: 784Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Snohomish, WA 98296
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 09:17:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support restoring grizzly bears to the North Cascades. Our wild lands should be truly wild with ALL wildlife present.

Correspondence ID: 785Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98273
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 09:18:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Why do we as humans have to even get involved and keep meddling with mother nature? Isn't this similar to the goats that overpopulated and then screwed up the balance and were flown out? Then there is the Cougars who are now protected and starting to overpopulate. Give that another 10 years and it will be out of control. I like to spend time outside but I am unsure which is more scary a Cougar or a grizzly. I don't hike with my gun, but if grizzlies were brought in that would probably change for safety. Grizzlies are smart animals. Upset the balance of mother nature by meddling and bad things are going to happen, like preventable deaths and lawsuits. You have a whole different entitled population to think about than you did centuries ago.

██████

Correspondence ID: 786Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Oak Harbor, WA 98277
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 09:22:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is a mistake! Washington's ecosystem cannot support Grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 787Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Issaquah, WA 98027
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 09:22:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a resident within 10 minutes of the North Cascades, I've seen growing issues with wildlife migrating into densely populated housing areas in the search for food. This includes black bears, bobcats, coyotes, etc. My concern with the proposal to reintroduce grizzly bears into the North Cascades does not realistically account for the likelihood that these apex predators will migrate just like the current wildlife is doing. With so many more people living and recreating in the North Cascades and with more people moving to the surrounding areas, this proposal just invites dangerous encounters with a dangerous animal. To be more explicit, vote no on reintroducing grizzly bears to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 788Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spanaway, WA 98387
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 09:28:49
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: With the ban of bear hunting in Canada, the population will exceed their viable range and naturally move into the state. With that said, it is already happening. In the Northwest corner, north of Spokane, grizzlies have already migrated into the state. There is no need for intervention when it is already naturally occurring.

Correspondence ID: 789Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Renton, WA 98059
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 09:29:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please reconsider this reintroduction effort. There are no apparent benefits, and only increase the likelihood of negative human & animal interactions. Placing a large apex predator on the landscape, who has been absent from the ecosystem will cause irreparable harm to current wildlife populations, and reduce recreational opportunities in the area that benefit conservation and other fragile environments.

This plan can only result in negative impacts, for no real gain.

Correspondence ID: 790Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 09:36:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly believe this is a unwise decision to add grizzlies back into our area. There surely will be unwanted human interaction . We have encouraged all to use the cascades for recreation enjoyment and that's pretty hard to do with an aggressive species like grizzlies in the area. Grizzlies and humans do not mix well.

Correspondence ID: 791Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 09:37:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Bring the grizzlies back!

Correspondence ID: 792Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seabeck, WA 98380
United States of America

Outside Organization: Northwest Mountaineering Recreational Groups(Official Rep.)

Received: Sep,30 2023 09:38:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I favor reintroduction of Grizzly Bears with certain limits. First, I think their range should initially be kept North of Hwy 20 in the NCES. The area would include: NCNP, Pasayton Wilderness, Mt Baker Wilderness.

As the introduction proceeds, I recommend collaring all grizzlies to monitor and control their outward migration from the areas listed above. As much as possible, grizzlies should be moved away from all permitted grazing allotments, and areas where there is high human activities, i.e. towns, settled WUI areas etc.

As the bear population grows, I recommend limiting the bears North of Hwy 2. with the same limitations on grazing plus, preventing expansion into the Lake Chelan National Recreation area. They should be allowed in the Glacier Peak and Henry M Jackson Wilderness areas.

Due to very high human activities, I don't believe bear expansion should be considered South of Hwy 2.

Finally, USFWS should work COOPERATIVELY with ranchers and private property owners to ensure bear reintroduction does not negatively affect their operations, homes, and property.

Correspondence ID: 793Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Oroville, WA 98844
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 09:42:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not believe we should introduce grizzlies to the North Cascades. If the ecosystem could support them they would already be there due to the healthy population in neighboring British Columbia. It would place give predator to an already struggling ungulate population that would be very hard to manage due to political feelings rather than using science to manage them. This state has already proven to not regard science when managing predators.

Correspondence ID: 794Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98273
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 09:45:58

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No, simply put. Look at the effects Grizzly Bears have had in Wyoming and Montana on ungulates as well as the negative human encounters. It just does not work. Please stop Thai madness and do not add grizzly bears to an already suffering ecosystem. This will negatively impact black bear populations, ungulates and cause human deaths. Do not bring grizzly bears to the Cascades!!!

Correspondence ID: 795Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Maple Valley, WA 98038
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 09:46:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: It's time to bring grizzlies back to Washington state. We hear the same commercial worries about bringing wolves back but then we hear all the complaints about how elk and deer are overwhelming grazing and crop lands. We need the bears and wolves to rebalance the entire food chain down the line. We also need bears to help spread the nutrients from salmon far and wide in our forests and grizzlies are rock stars in the salmon game. They are a keystone species and we need them doing their jobs. For the commercial interests there are ways to compensate and help with stock predation and the problem is not so huge that an entire species should be restricted from living in Washington. The fears stated in a news report about danger to families is interesting. If you live where bears naturally hang out you should be prepared to share the space. Many, many people live where grizzlies live and we already live with other bears and cougars here in Washington. I'm sorry people are afraid but there are ways to live cautiously, safely and equitably around wildlife. We need to leave the idea that ranchers rule the decisions about keystone animals of any kind in the past. They are the reason why so many essential animals were hunted to near or complete extinction for financial reasons. We've been paying the price for that excess ever since. Bring the grizzlies back and continue to educate people on how to live safely around wildlife.

Correspondence ID: 796Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98273
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 09:49:12

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Bringing Grizzlies to WA should not happen. Dangerous to human and devastating to our deer and elk herds.

Correspondence ID: 797Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Puyallup, WA 98375
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 09:49:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We already have grizzlies in this state. I don't think it's right to use tax payer dollars to introduce something that is already here. As grizzly bear populations grow across the west they will naturally filter in. I am against this use of resources. Also the population in Washington would lead to more bear conflicts which would mean more bears killed.

Correspondence ID: 798Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Piedmont, MO 63957
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 09:51:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Predators are an important part of North American ecosystems, and human intervention has reduced predator populations across North America to a fraction of what it once was. This has destabilized ecosystems across North America and has caused long-term consequences that we have yet to see fully play out.

As Federal Land, the North Cascades National Park belongs to all United States citizens, and as one of the most likely candidates for the reintroduction of important predator populations, the National Park Service and U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service should reintroduce Grizzly Bears to the North Cascades National Park in as great of numbers as is possible until it reaches a sustainable population as would have existed in the area prior to human intervention. This action would benefit all US citizens through tourism, education, and the responsible stewardship of the North American ecosystem.

This is why I support alternative B under the Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Environmental Impact Statement. I believe this Action Alternative fits with the spirit of the Endangered Species Act and is the most responsible action for managing a sustainable ecosystem for the benefit of all Americans.

Correspondence ID: 799Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826

United States of America

Outside Organization: Human Race Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 09:52:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I would like to add my name to the list of citizens opposed to reintroducing grizzly bears to the North Cascades. As one who has spent 50 years hiking in the North Cascades, reintroducing grizzlies in our mountains makes no sense. The issue has been addressed and discussed for many years. Time and again citizens have responded with a resounding no. Washington has the largest population of the Western states with the exception of California. North Central Washington has been flooded in the thousands with hikers since the pandemic. Trailheads are overflowing with vehicles every day in the summer. It is ludicrous to put grizzlies in this mix of humans. Unless you want to scare out many hikers? Unfortunately, support for grizzlies in our mountains comes from those who don't live in our mountains. Often, they live in our population centers in the Puget Sound region and would not be impacted by this decision. Unless all hikers are packing firearms, they are more vulnerable to attack. Threats to existing wildlife and livestock are also reasons to oppose this issue. In conclusion, Use common sense, which isn't all that common anymore. The inevitable clash of humans versus grizzlies is always predictable, Do not increase this problem. Leave well enough alone!

Correspondence ID: 800Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225-8134

United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 09:53:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please install signs at trailheads close to grizzly bear habitat notifying hikers of bears presence, how to minimize potential problems, and minimum number of hikers in group.

Correspondence ID: 801Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mountlake Terrace, WA 98043

United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 09:56:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello,

I'm an avid bow hunter, fisherman and hiker, and I frequent the north cascades wilderness, national forest and state forest frequently .While I think it is cool to see apex predators on the landscape, I DO NOT support the reintroduction of grizzlies into the north cascades.

A) Grizzlies are already in the north cascades, and have been unable to rebound back naturally to they're original population.

I feel this is a habitat issue. I feel money could be better spent improving habitat

B) Washington had a predator issue, mostly due to WDFW's policy, the ungulates are the ones that are suffering.

Reintroducing grizzlies will only throw fuel on the fire

C) this seems highly politicized, and I feel most people who support this don't frequent the north cascades outside of main trailheads. I don't feel like getting attacked when I'm hunting/ fishing or hiking off trail

Once again I feel habitat is the main issue here, and this is what the main focus should be.

Thanks you for considering my letter

██████████
████████████████████

Correspondence ID: 802Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lynden, WA 98264
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 10:02:47
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Absolutely not. We do not need more predation in Washington. Look at properly managed states such as Colorado who makes 10 times the revenues Washington makes in tag and hunting sales. Why? Because they keep predators to a low and the game thrives. Please consider residents opinions as the northwest is full of hikers. No one wants grizzlies around. No one who enjoys nature at least.

Correspondence ID: 803Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Toutle, WA 98649
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 10:05:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As soon as we can return the deer and elk to there original grazing grounds,example rear out all the fences that keep l them out of Yakima Yakima valle remove the subdivisions that are covering the foot hills of the mountains, we have a over crowding situation now..I do not see where returning grizzly bears,would help. Explain this to me.

Correspondence ID: 804Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Olympia, WA 98502
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 10:14:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I feel that it should always be our responsibility to return a living species to the wilderness when humans are the cause for their eradication. Beyond our responsibility, returning Grizzlies will help restore the ecosystem of the NC. Additionally, as climate change progresses it will be vitally important to expand natural corridors especially for apex predators like the Grizzly Bear.

Correspondence ID: 805Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98101
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 10:16:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: This is a really bad idea. The bears are a potential threat to people. Introducing bears who as yet have not posed a threat to anyone means nothing since that doesn't prove they can't be a threat in the future.

We cannot return to the past. In the present these potentially dangerous creatures aren't a fit. What are you going to do if even a few years down the road one of these bears hurts somebody?

Correspondence ID: 806Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Fremont, CA 94536
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 10:20:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Sport "hunting" has NEVER lead to the extinction of any game animal! Poachers are not hunters, they simply kill for the sake of killing, none of the animal is used to feed themselves, and is often left to rot. You need to get writers that print the truth no matter how much it goes against your environazi B.S. they may have been hunted to

a point where it was safe for humans to occupy the area, or killed in self defense, but that just means they felt threatened and moved out of the area. Regulations have been in place for centuries, and these regulations were brought on by hunters recognizing that for numbers to stay healthy, there should be limits. Don't blame hunters for lack of numbers, it's usually the governing body that fouls things up. Look at our borders, whose to blame?

Correspondence ID: 807Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Custer, WA 98240
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 10:23:41

Correspondence Type:Web Form

Correspondence: Let's see how many hikers get eaten....

Correspondence ID: 808Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Eugene, OR 97408
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 10:24:21

Correspondence Type:Web Form

Correspondence: No

Correspondence ID: 809Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Graham, WA 98338
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 10:24:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: WA state already has grizzly bears around Northport and Colville. They don't need to be planted in the North Cascades. I know multiple people that had wolf encounters this year. Areas where fish and game doesn't even acknowledge there are wolves. WDFG can't even properly manage our wolf population honestly. Why should outdoorsmen/women trust them will a grizzly population?

Correspondence ID: 810Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bow, WA 98232
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 10:26:48

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of Grizzly Bears to the North Cascades ecosystem...Good work NPS!

Correspondence ID: 811Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bothell, WA 98012
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 10:27:15

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I totally support the plan to introduce grizzly bears to the North Cascades, as they are a part of the ecosystems which exist for thousands of years.

Correspondence ID: 812Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 10:30:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm not understanding why there is a need to reintroduce these animals to whatcom county? So they can be hunted? Where they once roamed is no longer a part of their livelihood, it's been turned into hiking trails. What benefit would come of it for both animal and human? To me it just means death for both.

Correspondence ID: 813Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98119
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 10:42:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a hiker and conservation ecologist I strongly support the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades. They are ecosystem engineers, and would help with the elk overpopulation in the same area. Reducing elk numbers can help reduce the spread of CWD, hoof diseases, and other infections that are running rampant in these herds currently. Some may argue that human hunting can be used in a similar way, but we are not hunting the same elk the bears are, and I think grizzly bears are the best option to allow the North Cascades ecosystem to recover. I would love to live to see the day that grizzlies are back in the Cascades, and if we don't take the chance now we may lose the option forever.

Correspondence ID: 814Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Portland, OR 97266
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 10:42:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am strongly in favor of reintroducing grizzly bears to the North Cascades. They deserve a chance to thrive again in their habitat, and are an important part of the area's ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 815Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Blaine, WA 98230
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 10:46:49
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Very foolish & dangerous plan for reintroduction of Grizzlies that will pose a great threat to humans in close proximity. There's no ecosystem benefit in such reintroduction. N.W. Washington State is not Alaska.

Correspondence ID: 816Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Portland, OR 97266
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 10:48:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the bear introduction - yes to bears

Correspondence ID: 817Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 10:50:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I don't want grizzly bears in the North Cascades national Park or the Cascades at all. The entire range abutts, a heavily populated area and is used very frequently. We've already got a top predator in the Cascades with the black bear and the grizzly serves no unique ecological use. I believe this is just a ploy to keep the grizzly bears on endangered species list because they would be endangered in this area once they're introduced. This move will kill people and not help the environment.

Correspondence ID: 818Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Marysville, WA 98270
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 10:50:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As an avid outdoorsman I want to say that introducing grizzly bears is not a smart idea. We live in a state where camping and hiking is an activity that lots of people do and there are way to many concerns that will follow if these bears are here. There are to many stories or people being attacked or killed from these bears, a man just got his lower jaw ripped off this year and another lady killed. How would you feel having something like that happen when you decided to bring these bears back. Personally if I was to give a vote and a grizzly killed someone's in that area I would feel like part of that persons death or major injury was part of my fault. Please don't bring these animals to my back yard. Thank you

Correspondence ID: 819Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Blaine, WA 98230
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 10:56:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My vote is an emphatic, loud NO to relocating grizzly bears to the North Cascades or anywhere in Washington State. We have black bears that migrate to the lowlands for foraging and fattening up in warm weather months in preparation for the cold winter months. They are highly visible in neighborhoods all over western Whatcom County as far west as Blaine and Birch Bay....but black bears are relatively harmless and timid toward humans and, if left alone, they fill up and move on. Much of Whatcom County is farmland with farm animals roaming the land making them easy prey to a hungry grizzly bear. Grizzly bears would likely migrate into the lowlands in much the same way as black bears do during warm weather months. BUT...grizzly bears are MUCH larger, MUCH stronger, MUCH more aggressive, and MUCH MORE DANGEROUS to humans. Statistics show that grizzly bears are responsible for more human death than all other bears combined. Bringing them here is a foolish and irresponsible idea with no regard to human safety. PLEASE DO NOT DO THIS !!

Correspondence ID: 820Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Graham, WA 98338
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 10:57:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is literally a horrible horrible plan and idea. This State is absolutely overrun and overpopulated by predators as it is. An introduction of Grizzly Bears would truly only make matters worse! For the individuals and organizations that feel this is reintroduction of bears is cute or necessary- I can absolutely assure you that it is not! There is literally no food for them as it is. They are a Carnivore. The deer and elk population in this state have dramatically declined due to the number of predators in this state as it is. We are so focused on protecting predators that it is pulverizing and DESTROYING the wildlife population of other species. We do not need grizzly bears introduced into the Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 821Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98119
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 10:58:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hi there,

We need to restore grizzlies to their traditional lands and environment. Grizzly bears are an important part of their traditional ecosystems. The future is in restoring what we have destroyed, rather than continuing to destroy the world we live in.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 822Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Napavine, WA 98532
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 11:09:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Early settlers struggled with dangerous and threatening animald for a reason. Grizzlys, wolves, cougars and coyotes were the primary animals that were both troublesome and dangerous. They were eleminatef for common Sense reasons: they preyed on people and their ability to conduct safe activities outdoor. It is more important to protect people and their families as well as the conduct of outdoor activities. Everywhere these dangerous animals are brought back to areas where people live and use the outdoors for whatever reason has resulted to the threat or deaths of people and loss of economic benefit.
I strongly object to this proposed a the idea coming from sime animal activist or environmental group on the East coast suggesting activities they have no idea of the consequences.

Correspondence ID: 823Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Sumas, WA 98295
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 11:22:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: No, absolutely not. DO NOT BRING GRIZZLY BEARS TO WHATCOM COUNTY

Correspondence ID: 824Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Cle Elum, WA 98922
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 11:25:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The introduction of the grizzly bear would be highly detrimental to the heath and wellness of prey and predators in Eastern Washington. Putting more pressure on Animals that do not need any more problems. I strongly believe going through with this would be terrible.

Correspondence ID: 825Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Glacier, WA 98244
United States of America
Outside Organization: Graham's Store Business(Official Rep.)

Received: Sep,30 2023 11:29:03

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This project is not advisable. The likelihood of success is minimal and likely shortlived. The grizzly is gone because the habitat no longer supports it's needs.

What protein sources are still available in the NCE in the same abundance as the source location of the bears? None. The salmon runs have dwindled. There aren't vast herds of mammals. The nature of the terrain is so different (steep, narrow valleys, void of protein), that most relocated bears will suffer malnutrition and disease, and likely end up in human populated areas because that is where the food can be found.

How much of the forest/park access will be removed or closed to human traffic? It is already clear that there is a preference for decommissioning roads rather than maintaining or increasing access. It is rumored that this plan includes expansion of the wilderness boundaries, which in north Whatcom county, would eliminate just about every forest service road and campground. Will the Mt Baker Ski Area be allowed to operate as it has? It seems at odds with the pursiut of this proposal.

Who will be liable when grizzly/human interations occur? As a reintroduced concern, it seems necessary to consider the very serious potential of this occurance and that, outside of the park /wilderness boundaries, that liability would lie squarely on the parks department.

So, if there are guarantees that this project will not lead to less public access, that damage liability from direct interaction or indirect action(decreased access, reduction of business income, or property values) be placed on the NPS, and if these guarantees are codified, then I could be persuaded to look the other way.

All in all, I think this is a misguided pursuit. It has been poorly presented to the public, and will prove to be waste of public tax dollars, which could be used to improve an already deteriorating infrastucture.

Correspondence ID: 826Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 11:32:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Adding grizzlies to Whatcom County is a terrible idea. We live is a very populated part of Bellingham city limits and we are already harassed by otters, bobcats, raccoons, deer, and coyotes. We do NOT want or need additional wildlife creeping into this county and eventually into areas where humans live.

Please be rational and keep dangerous animals far away from humans!!

Correspondence ID: 827Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Blaine, WA 98231
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 11:35:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I believe restoring Grizzly bears to East Whatcom County would be a HUGE mistake! There is nothing to stop them from coming West to the populated areas where they could cause great harm to property, humans, & other animals. Then we the taxpayer will have to pay to have them removed when they shouldn't of been there in the first place! Also what will you do when they get over populated? Go out & kill Them! That seems counter productive! I am totally against reintroducing grizzlies into Whatcom County, we have enough issues with black bears as it is!

Correspondence ID: 828Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sedro Woolley, WA 98284
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 11:37:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: "Engineered" reintroduction plans such as this as an offset to actions by past generations fail to take into consideration that there is nothing stopping the natural reintroduction that nature provides for. With Grizzly bears existing in the same mountain range in Canada and borders a man made, artificial barrier, there is nothing stopping any animal type or population from expanding its range. Why humans believe they can do a better job "fixing or managing" items such as this is arrogant in my view.
Additionally regarding the impact that this will have on the communities that that exist within the reintroduction areas appears to be of no concern. The special interest groups, "environmentalists and bureaucrats who don't live in these areas and regularly ignore the voices of those who do because these smaller communities don't represent large enough political group will never have to deal with the outcome.

Stop these types of programs and protect the people who you are supposed to serve

Correspondence ID: 829Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 11:38:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I believe we should restore grizzlies to the NORTH cascades in order restore the balance of preforms and in doing so restore our forests. We need to restore the natural balance to ecosystems to combat human caused climate destruction. Every year we are dealing with horrific fires which are either immediately killing or killing long term as after effects of breathing smoke. We can't expect young people to volunteer to fight Forrest fires in perpetuity. We've got to try everything at our finger tips.

Correspondence ID: 830Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Port Townsend, WA 98368
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 11:50:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I supports efforts to restore a grizzly bear population to the North Cascades Ecosystem and am pleased that the the NPS is moving ahead with a draft plan and environmental impact statement. Thank you!

Correspondence ID: 831Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Kennewick, WA 99337
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 11:56:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am in favor of alternative A.

Correspondence ID: 832Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Starkville, MS 39759
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 12:11:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As someone who grew up in Washington and logged many hours hiking and hunting in the northern cascades, I strongly oppose. Grizzly bears are slowly expanding their range southward from British Columbia, forceful reintroduction will prove detrimental to public relations and already dwindling ungulate herds. Let them continue to expand their range, naturally.

Correspondence ID: 833Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98146
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 12:13:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Bringing grizzly bears back to the North Cascades is crucial for the balance of the ecosystem.

As someone who loves to hike and camp in the North Cascades, I am still in favor of bringing back grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 834Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Port Angeles, WA 98362
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 12:23:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a hunter I have mix feeling about this happening I have a feel it's going to end up as just another gray wolf problem and hunters and hunting of these animals will never happen or we will be discarded from the talks.

Grizzly bears shouldn't be re-introduced at all unless you plan on allowing hunting to happen when they are recovered. If hunting and hunters and the rural communities that are also going to be impacted by this the MOST are not going to be included this shouldn't happen at all and shouldn't be decided by the I5 corridor and the people in Seattle, you should be asking the most affected communities, and the people who work on the land like the ranchers, farmers and hunters

Correspondence ID: 835Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Blaine, WA 98230
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 12:23:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: "The time has come for the grizzly bear to return to its habitat to take its place in the indigenous ecosystem," said Scott Schuyler, policy representative for the Upper Skagit Tribe, whose territory lies within the recovery zone. "The Upper Skagit successfully coexisted with grizzly bears for thousands of years, and we should once more."

I will defer to the Upper Skagit Tribe.

Correspondence ID: 836Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98133
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 12:24:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I'm an avid hiker and also often canoe on Ross lake. As much as I love hiking in Washington's Mountains, there is always a sense of loss as there are no Grizzly Bears. We have a cabin in the Targhee National Forrest of Eastern Idaho where we both hike and canoe knowing Grizzlies are around. Yes, you need to have increased dilligence while recreating. But that sense of the place truly being wild is so much greater with the bears than without.

The plan for a slow reintroduction makes sense. I can't comment on which of the two levels of protection are better for the plan as I don't know all the pros and cons. I do know Wolf Reintroduction has been very successful. Restoring Grizzlies can be just as successful and would return the Cascades to their natural state.

Correspondence ID: 837Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Portland, OR 97230
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 12:32:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I WHOLEHEARTEDLY support the reintroduction of Grizzlies. The simple reality is that ecosystems are healthier after predators such as wolves and grizzlies have established healthy YET sustainable populations. Impacts to humans are lightyears negligible as compared to lightning strikes, etc. People have a very unhealthy view of grizzlies as they do sharks! Livestock owners have to inalienable or inherent rights to graze on public lands without some risk they and they alone should manage. Put another way, especially IF Native Americans who were absolutely here first support the reintroduction then for once we shouldn't discount their desires.

This park is also very remote with few visitors compared to say Glacier and Yellowstone + surrounding areas outside of those parks. BANFF NP and others in Canada manage a native population of Grizzlies very well (I was just there this past summer).

Americans vested in this decision should be more worried about invasive species such as the giant Asian hornet, zebra mussels etc that are absolutely killing our native ecosystems!

Correspondence ID: 838Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Federal way, WA 98003
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 12:35:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Absolutely not. Spend money into curing hoof rot and rebuilding our Roosevelt elk population.

Correspondence ID: 839Project:112008Document:132104

Address: East Mt Vernon, WA 98274
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 12:38:55

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No, no , and no. Black bears ok. Grizzly? You must be joking

Correspondence ID: 840Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98107
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 12:40:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm writing in support of the National Park Service's and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's draft plan to restore grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE), a region they roamed for thousands of years. The North Cascades is one of North America's premier intact ecosystems, but it is incomplete without grizzly bears. As a hiker, nature lover, and longtime WA resident I fully support the reintroduction of grizzlies to the NCE.

Sincerely,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 841Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bothell, WA 98012
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 12:50:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I cannot emphasize enough the importance of not releasing Grizzlies into the North Cascades ecosystem. The state of the ecosystem is already predator heavy with sustaining or exceeding target numbers per WDFW population reports, all while there is a targeted effort to limit or remove predator management. Increasing apex predator numbers beyond the already present Grizzly population with no plan to manage will be detrimental to other game populations and inevitably will lead to Grizzly/human interaction.

I will also add that Grizzlies are already present in the North Cascades. I have personally seen them on 3 different occasions, and commonly hear of other hunters and hikers seeing them as well. There is no need to increase numbers if populations are naturally occurring on their own.

Correspondence ID: 842Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Woodinville, WA 98072
United States of America

Outside Organization: Self Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 12:54:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am 100 percent in favor of grizzly bear reintroduction into the North Cascades because they belong there. I know that there have been very few confirmed grizzly sightings in the North Cascades over the past 20 years or so, but it is not a viable population able to reproduce. The greater North Cascade ecosystem, including the National Park and surrounding National Forests and Wilderness Areas is large enough to accommodate a grizzly population without adverse affects to nearby human communities. There are very few areas in the lower 48 that have suitable size and habitat to support bear reintroduction where they are not already present, and this is one of them. Please restore this magnificent animal to its previous range and rightful place in the North Cascades.

Thank you for your consideration

Sincerely

██████████
████████████████████

Correspondence ID: 843Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Burlington, WA 98233
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 12:55:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No!

Correspondence ID: 844Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Burlington, WA 98233
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 12:57:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No. Do not bring grizzlies back to the cascades

Correspondence ID: 845Project:112008Document:132104

Address: La Conner, WA 98257
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 12:58:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please consider the following regarding re-introduction of grizzly bears into Skagit County. Time and time again our government has done similar with Elk in Alger, Wolves, etc. and each time it has become an unmitigated disaster and yet, here we are, with our county government pushing ahead anyway without regard for human life and/or other forms of wildlife that will be affected. Please reconsider your support for yet another foolish waste of taxpayer dollars and will do nothing.

Grizzly bears already have access to the North Cascades Ecosystem and wander in and out from Montana, Idaho and Canada, so why do we need to artificially bring more bears to our area?

Bringing in more grizzlies would not be sustainable. If the North Cascades ecosystem could support more grizzlies, they would already be living here.

An increase in the grizzly bear population would likely create conflict between the grizzlies and farmers, ranchers and homeowners. Bears looking for food would find easy sources on farms, ranches and homeowners' back yards.

The Canadian First Nations are also planning to introduce grizzlies to their side of the border. If they introduce bears before the US Federal Government makes their introduction, then all the planning, expenditures and work done by our agencies will be for naught. Apparently, then, the whole plan will be scrapped.

This is a political, not an environmental solution to the loss of the grizzly bear. By artificially increasing the amount of wildlife in the North Cascades, resources would become more scarce. According to ecologists, the North Cascades Ecosystem is already degraded, due to political pressures on the WA State Department of Fish and Wildlife. Adding more grizzly would put that much more pressure on the ecosystem and affect other native species. The grizzlies would find little support for their own survival and have to travel elsewhere to find food.

Correspondence ID: 846Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spanaway, WA 98387
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 13:01:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: "The grizzly bear is still the consummate North American wildlife icon. The grizzly has immeasurable ecological and cultural value for our ecosystems and communities. We have a unique opportunity and obligation in the PNW to co-author a significant conservation success story - to restore the grizzly to a small but important part of its traditional home."

The North Cascades is one of North America's premier intact ecosystems, but it is incomplete without grizzly bears.

This is the second attempt by the agencies to restore grizzlies to the NCE after a 2015 process was halted by the Trump administration in 2020. At the time, more than 159,000 members of the public wrote comments supporting the reintroduction of grizzlies.

"The time has come for the grizzly bear to return to its habitat to take its place in the indigenous ecosystem," said Scott

Schuyler, policy representative for the Upper Skagit Tribe, whose territory lies within the recovery zone. "The Upper Skagit successfully coexisted with grizzly bears for thousands of years, and we should once more."

Correspondence ID: 847Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 13:12:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: If the grizzlies make it back on their own, great. But there should be no human intervention to attempt to establish a population.

Correspondence ID: 848Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 13:17:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Absolutely not! We hike, camp, schools take elementary children there for Mt. School. The bears left for a reason, let them stay gone for the safety of all who enjoy the cascades! This isn't Alaska!

Correspondence ID: 849Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Kirkland, WA 98034
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 13:19:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I favor restoration efforts of grizzlies in WA state N Cascades. But be wise. If Experimental status allows more controls to safety and intervention of bear-human encounters then start there. Honoring the many stakeholders in this process is critical. Look to seminal research of the Craighead brothers.

Correspondence ID: 850Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Three Rivers, CA 93271
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 13:22:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the plan to have recovery of the grizzly bears in the North Cascade mountain range. The grizzly bears have lived in the North Cascade mountains for thousands of years and therefore have a right to live there in peace. It is a tragedy that the grizzlies were brought to near extinction in the North Cascade mountains. The grizzly bears are an important part of the ecological well being of these mountains. The grizzly bears feed on plants and animals which help these important species prosper. The bears dig the soil which is good for living life. The North Cascade Mountains would feel like something is missing without the grizzly bears. They belong. In these mountains like all other life. People have learned to live with the grizzly bears for thousands of years. The Native American people credit the grizzly bears for helping the native people live with the land. The grizzly bears have given tremendous knowledge and resources to native peoples. The grizzly bears and people get along really well in Glacier National Park and surrounding areas. The people know how to live around these bears in a safe manner. Millions of people stay around the grizzly bears in safety. On rare occasions if a person is hurt, it is the persons fault for not obeying safety rules and precautions. I would like grizzly bears have a recovery in California as well. I hope grizzly bears are brought to the North Cascade Mountains as soon as possible. People do not need to fear the grizzly bear when they learn how this bear lives and they know its behavior. Safety rules and precautions are very easy to find in books and on the internet. Black bears are common all over North America and people get along with them and so

people can also get along with the grizzly bear. I would love to see a nice number of grizzly bears in the North Cascade Mountains. Thank you for helping this happen.

Correspondence ID: 851Project:112008Document:132104
Address: las vegas, NV 89141
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 13:32:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: this area is still wild and is a perfect place to bring back our grizzlies !!!

Correspondence ID: 852Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98274
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 13:39:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: i'd prefer that they be allowed to naturally repopulate NW WA, vs, introduction from other places.

Correspondence ID: 853Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Monroe, WA 98272
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 13:47:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: That would not a be a good idea. We have to many predators as it is

Correspondence ID: 854Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Shelton, WA 98584
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 13:57:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Not only no but hell no! Look at all the grizzly human conflicts that exist already!

Correspondence ID: 855Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 14:03:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Do not reintroduce any grizzly bears to Washington state

Correspondence ID: 856Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Spokane, WA 99206
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 14:03:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I believe reintroducing grizzlies is not a great decision. Why would we do this if they have free rein to move from Canada to the cascades and yet they don't. This to me says that something is lacking as they don't choose to

inhabit them. Another reason not to is as stated safety, for people, their pets and livestock. As with reintroducing wolves to NE Washington. They are going unchecked and spreading around the Eastside like fire. It has caused resentment from hunters and outdoor enthusiasts who see the damage they do especially going unmanaged as in no season for them other than tribes. Even a special draw or raffle tags. This leads people also taking matters into their own hands and poaching. I feel doing the same with grizzlies you're looking at the same issue. I understand wanting to put a species back where they once were. But times change and so do animal behaviors and where they choose to inhabit.

Correspondence ID: 857Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Vancouver, WA 98682
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 14:04:41

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm fully in support of re-introducing grizzly bears to the Cascades region. This is one of their native habitats and they are an integral part of our ecosystem. Their eradication from the area is tragic and I hope that their reintroduction will help restore our natural landscape to the full biodiversity it is supposed to have. Of course, I want for human safety to be at the forefront of whatever plan you decide on, but I see no reason that we can't share our natural areas with the bears who have just as much right to call the Cascades their home as we do.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

██████████
(Please do not share my personal information unless absolutely necessary.)

Correspondence ID: 858Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 14:04:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Who will be held accountable when hikers are killed? Will those people be charged with involuntary manslaughter?

Correspondence ID: 859Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Shoreline, WA 98133
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 14:14:10

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Under no circumstance do I support bringing grizzlies back into the north Cascades. These animals are nowhere near extinct and this area has acclimated just fine to living without them. They are magnificent animals, and they are extremely dangerous as well as a hazard to any type of livestock or domestic animals to say nothing of humans who find themselves facing one that feels threatened. They will displace the native black bear population, that will find itself vying for limited food resources and forcing both species to find food ever closer to humans and their livestock. I have no idea who dreamt this up or why, but anyone living in grizzly bear country will tell you they are not something to willingly bring into a region that exists under the pretext it will not have to fight with grizzlies for its survival. If the NPS has extra money, maybe they should put it toward something better. Just say no. Best and thank you.

Correspondence ID: 860Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98122
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 14:15:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am writing to express my objection/disagreement to the North Cascades Grizzly Reintroduction Plan Alternatives B & C. I support Alternative A, current management.

In 2016 WTA estimated the number of hikers at 2.7 million and growing. Currently WA state reports 292 million annual user days . Maulings by grizzly bears seem to be increasing even when hikers are doing the right things. Virtually no backpacking in Glacier National Park or Yellowstone National Park, plus access is often restricted
As a regular hiker and backpacker this will increase my and all other hikers' risk of injury or death. In a time of increasing world population it seems unnecessary to increase the population of aggressive apex predators in our state.

Additionally the population of this state continues to grow and will continue to do so. Having apex predators next large populations is dangerous.

None of this study looks at the impact this would have on our black bears. We have little enough wilderness and wild places to handle the wildlife we have without seriously stressing them by adding grizzly bears.

While I understand the official name of the recovery area is North Cascades, most residents of WA equate North Cascades to the North Cascades National Park without understanding that the proposed recovery area actually extends down to I-90, a much larger area than North Cascades National Park. Thus residents considering this proposal are misled.

Correspondence ID: 861Project:112008Document:132104
Address: St. Pölten, UN 3100
Austria
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 14:17:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Long-Awaited North Cascades Grizzly Plan Should Restore Threatened Population

Correspondence ID: 862Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98122
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 14:19:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I fully support action plan C of the Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan. I believe in giving autonomy to indigenous groups to help manage the population as this is their historical land.

Correspondence ID: 863Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98122
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 14:21:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I fully support Action Plan B (designating Grizzly's as a threatened species)

Correspondence ID: 864Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Tenino, WA 98589
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 14:21:52

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We do not need more grizzly bears in Washington state. There are so many hikers, myself included in this beautiful state. I don't want to have anything to do with one of them while exploring this beautiful state. They are the ultimate predator, they will eat all the innocent deer, elk, salmon, beaver, and other wonderful animals. I don't want to be scared for my life when I go hiking. There are too many stories in other areas where grizzlies are present and they attack innocent people. Please do not release anymore grizzly bears into this state.

Correspondence ID: 865Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Everson, WA 98247
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 14:29:10

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please don't reintroduce Grizzlies into the North Cascades. I used to live in Alaska where they roam freely and belong. Hiking in Alaska was always a nerve racking experience as there were yearly grizzly attacks. Many were fatal. The North Cascades are a heavily trafficked area in the spring, summer and fall months with hikers. This will inevitably lead to encounters. Due to the inability to carry firearms in the Park this would make for risky hiking situations and camping. Many women enjoy backpacking and the scent that a woman can produce during menstruation can lead to bear encounters. I enjoy hiking in North Cascades National park without fear of a grizzly encounter. It is one reason why I moved away from Alaska. While I love Glacier National Park and Yellowstone, the presence of Grizzlies makes it a more stressful experience. The range that grizzlies can cover means they will inevitably leave the Park boundaries and wind up overlapping into towns in the Okanogan and Skagit counties.

The reintroduction of wolves has led to cattle and sheep losses. This will be no different.

Please re-consider this flawed plan.

Thoughtfully,

██████████
Eagle Scout, Father and Washingtonian

Correspondence ID: 866Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Yakima, WA 98903
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 14:34:31

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Reintroducing predators will not only harm the deer and elk population, but it will also put every human that goes in the mountains at risk. Your plan to scare hunters out of the woods will not work. We will not comply.

Correspondence ID: 867Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Albuquerque, NM 87106
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 14:35:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly support the NPS plan to release grizzly bears in Washington. I think that sessions of congress would be a lot more exciting to watch on C-Span if the senators and representatives were dealing with 800 pound apex predators that can run at 30 miles per hour. I'd like to recommend that the White House be well stocked with grizzly bears as well.

I really appreciate the willingness of the leadership of the country to show how seriously they take the ecology in this manner.

██████████

Correspondence ID: 868Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bremerton, WA 98312
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 14:36:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Absolutely not! Apex predators like Cougars and Black Bears are already overpopulated and poorly managed in WA. I am 38 years old and have been hunting this state for 24 years. In that time I have seen a decline in blacktail deer and elk populations in Western WA. I went from never seeing a cougar for like 15 years to seeing at least 1 to 3 per year since. Without the proper hunting methods they are extremely difficult to manage. Now they are overpopulated and not in healthy sustainable numbers. They're moving into populated areas near people and starting to get use to being around people. Grizzly bears will do the same. They are beautiful animals and definitely have their place, we just don't have room for them in WA State.

Correspondence ID: 869Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Anacortes, WA 98221
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 14:44:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears already have access to the North Cascades Ecosystem and wander in and out from Montana, Idaho and Canada, so why do we need to artificially bring more bears to our area?

Bringing in more grizzlies would not be sustainable. If the North Cascades ecosystem could support more grizzlies, they would already be living here.

An increase in the grizzly bear population would likely create conflict between the grizzlies and farmers, ranchers and homeowners. Bears looking for food would find easy sources on farms, ranches and homeowners' back yards.

The Canadian First Nations are also planning to introduce grizzlies to their side of the border. If they introduce bears before the US Federal Government makes their introduction, then all the planning, expenditures and work done by our agencies will be for naught. Apparently, then, the whole plan will be scrapped.

This is a political, not an environmental solution to the loss of the grizzly bear. By artificially increasing the amount of wildlife in the North Cascades, resources would become more scarce. According to ecologists, the North Cascades Ecosystem is already degraded, due to political pressures on the WA State Department of Fish and Wildlife. Adding more grizzly would put that much more pressure on the ecosystem and affect other native species. The grizzlies would find little support for their own survival and have to travel elsewhere to find food.

U.S. Representative Dan Newhouse is one national leader who is speaking out against this proposal. He states. "Time and again, our communities have spoken to express staunch opposition to the introduction of these apex predators, which would be detrimental to our families, wildlife, and livestock alike," This quote would be great to include in your emails.

Correspondence ID: 870Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Maple Falls, WA 98266
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 14:45:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: It seems like a bad idea to me, for both people and grizzlies, to reintroduce the grizzly into an area where the human population is growing, the use of hiking trails is increasing, and people are increasingly encroaching on animals' natural habitat. It will inevitably lead to more human-bear encounters, which will not end well for either. You can't turn back the clock, let's instead focus on protecting the wildlife that still remains in the area.

Correspondence ID: 871Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Gig Harbor, WA 98335
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 14:55:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Getting grizzlies back into this part of their natural home range is beyond exciting and it's high time that it happens! Too many of wildlife here in the U.S and elsewhere have been decimated and mostly due to ignorance and fear. We can find a balance to live with all the other beings on this planet, if we just open our hearts and minds.

Correspondence ID: 872Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98122
United States of America
Outside Organization: N/A Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 15:13:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear NPS,

Re. Possible Reintroduction of Grizzly Bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem

I have some questions based on the known spring and summer feeding and ranging habits of the grizzly, as they can be expressed in square miles and elevation. Perhaps this information is detailed somewhere in the report, but both features escaped this reader's attempt to detect them.

US Fish and Wildlife (2007) reports that spring and summer feeding ranges for female grizzlies are estimated to be 50-300 square miles, while those for males are estimated to be 200-500 square miles. A 2004 Canadian analysis performed by Ardea Biological Consulting (Smithers, BC) states that spring feeding occurs on "low elevation slopes" and riparian areas of that province, while summer activity occurs on "mid-level slopes" and "low elevation river bottoms". Elevations can range from sea level to 5,900 feet.

Figure 3 on p. 29 of the 2023 USNPS report displays "Staging and Release Areas", with a distance scale of 10 miles. To take one example of a Staging and Release Area, Letter "G" represents a "Potential Staging Area" on the southeastern boundary of the Western Pasayten Release Area, both of which are approximately less than 30 air miles from the settlement of Mazama, Washington.

It's gratifying to learn that released bears will at least initially be radio collared and therefore closely monitored. That said, bears are not cattle and will often go where they please, even if they seek to avoid interaction with human beings, much as the report accurately states.

My question is: How are negative interactions between grizzlies and resident as well as transient humans to be minimized, given what is well known about the feeding ranges of the grizzly ? "A fed bear is a dead bear" is a maxim for a reason with a long, sad record. This respondent generally favors the restoration of the grizzly to the North Cascades as well as other regions, but the well-documented habits of the bears needs to be communicated in a forthright way to avoid any potential misunderstanding of the risks involved.

The question of bear predation on cattle and other livestock is a separate matter. The administrative status of much (but not all) of the North Cascades ecosystem should minimize if not reduce lethal encounters with human-introduced livestock.

Correspondence ID: 873Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98177
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 15:14:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears are important to the ecosystem and have a multitude of benefits. I fully support restoring grizzly bears to the North Cascades ecosystem as soon as possible.

Correspondence ID: 874Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 15:28:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Lots of thought, technical expertise, and work went into this EIS, something the contributors should be proud of. I am in favor of Alternative C, informed in part by my own personal experiences with grizzly bears when I lived in Alaska for 11 years in the 1970s and 80s (and before that in Montana). There, I saw grizzlies from a distance in the Actic Wildlife Refuge, and later along the North Fork of the Koyukuk River, and up close (exceedingly so) on the Noatak River. On the Noatak, I had one very threatening encounter with a female grizzly, the memory of which initially gave me pause when I saw the proposal to introduce grizzlies to the North Cascades. However, having now read much of the EIS, and considering the wider ecological benefits on so many levels, I favor the introduction and management of grizzlies in the careful manner detailed in the third Alternative C of the EIS.

Correspondence ID: 875Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Redmond, WA 98052
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 15:30:48

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think it is very important that grizzly bears return to this area. We all need to share and respect other species. They are also an important part of the ecosystem and we need to learn to respect them.

Correspondence ID: 876Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Port Orchard, WA 98367
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 15:44:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: In Montana, people go hiking with guns to protect themselves from possible grizzly bears attacks. If grizzly bears are released in Washington, people should also be able to carry guns when hiking to protect themselves from the bears. I vote NO on grizzly bears release in North Cascades. I want to keep enjoying hiking.

Correspondence ID: 877Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98119
United States of America

Outside Organization: Private Citizen Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 15:46:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Once again, this proposal to reverse natural history is being promoted by who knows who? Wolves expanded into the United States from Canada by natural means; grizzly bears presumably could do the same. The strongest objective to this proposal is that it will inevitably result in bear human contacts that likely will prove fatal, to the bear, if not to the human. The North Cascades ecosystem does not appear to be deteriorating in any important way without the presence of grizzly bears, nor does there appear to be any strong support for the proposal from people who live in or adjacent to the areas that may be affected. In short, it's a bad idea that has been floated many times but never has gained the support necessary to push it through despite widespread opposition. The North Cascades are of great value; do not diminish that value by doing something that will almost certainly affect in a negative way hikers, backpackers, packers, etc. who currently make wide use of the area, and contribute to the economy of adjacent towns.

Correspondence ID: 878Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Boulder, CO 80304
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 15:49:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I went to school for 5 years in WA State (both WSU and SPU) and continued to live there for 10 more years til I moved to Colorado for family.

I was often gone on the weekends exploring the backcountry.

In the 70's and 80's that wasn't as popular, (especially for a female).....so I loved it all the more for the solitude and wild.

I did a fair amount of hiking/backpacking and cross country skiing in the N Cascades.

Occasionally I encountered black bears, never a grizzly, altho I knew they were there in small numbers.

I worked on a NPS Mountain Lion Predation-Rate project summer of 1991 in Yellowstone and hiked the backcountry, occasionally every most of the wild including grizzlies from afar. That was before wolves were reintroduced, but I loved being in a mostly intact eco-system all summer, hardly every seeing people (once you got off the main roads).

Now is the time to reintroduce the grizzly into the N Cascades.

In terms of human interaction, now is the time as the human population increases in the NW, and the backcountry gets busier w/people.

Let's get used to being 100% grizzly-smart in the N Cascades Ecosystem before it becomes like Estes Park/RMNP where the space was too diminished for wolf reintroductio (per the people who were afraid to reintroduce wolves as a way to keep the elk population/RMNP more balanced).

I realize RMNP at 415 sq miles is considerably smaller than the N Cascades Ecosystem, but in Natural Resources we are often 'wishing' we could've acted earlier to preserve/expand ecosystems.

Thank you to everyone who is working towards this reintroduction!

Correspondence ID: 879Project:112008Document:132104

Address: BLAINE, WA 98230-9550
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 15:49:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Just not necessary. Leave well enough alone.

Correspondence ID: 880Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Coeur d alene, ID 83815
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 15:54:56

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think the grizzly's should be introduced in the north cascades to help the population that is already there . I think they will

Do well in the environment . That being said they should not be endangered anymore as they are in the plenty in Montana and idaho

Correspondence ID: 881Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ferndale, WA 98248
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 16:16:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I would prefer to not have grizzlies running around Whatcom County.

Correspondence ID: 882Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Carnation, WA 98014
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 16:19:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not allow such a ridiculous thought of action on introducing grizzlies into the cascades. This seems like a poorly thought out action. Based on my experience being in the cascades, there are a lot of hikers/backpackers that are not aware of what can happen with a grizzly encounter. I fear that a lot of innocent people, including kids, can be in danger more so if this were to happen. I personally do not see a reason that this is necessary and even considered an acceptable thing to do in this beautiful state we live in.

Thanks for your time.

Correspondence ID: 883Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Boston, MA 02135
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 16:27:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I fully support the reintroduction of the Grizzly Bear to the North Cascades, as well as their protection as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act! The bears are a very necessary and critical part of the natural ecosystem in this area, and their reestablishment would help to restore an essential balance to the entire ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 884Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 16:28:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in favor of option A - no action to reintroduce Grizzly Bears in the North Cascades. I believe the human-grizzly interactions would be too frequent and too dangerous. Grizzlies can cover a large territory, so importing them into the wilderness area is no assurance that they will not migrate into more populated areas. Indeed the easy food sources available in populated areas will serve as an attractant. I understand that you plan to educate the population on ways to mitigate interactions, but the human population is not demonstrating that existing education programs are working well with respect to black bears. Just come by on garbage day and see for yourself.

The NCE continues to be a popular area for back country hikers and tourists, who will be unlikely to enjoy an up-close and personal interaction with a grizzly in their natural environment. Grizzlies will also present a risk for individuals working in the NCE.

Grizzlies have the potential for significant predation of endangered salmonids, species with much more advantageous economic and ecological benefits. The comment that fish are not expected to be a primary food source for the grizzlies seems

to be wishful thinking. At a minimum, expected preparation of ESA listed salmonids must be addressed and quantified in the impact statement

As a taxpayer in Washington, I am uncomfortable that this plan anticipates WDFW would be responsible for managing the population once reintroduced. I am also feel that WDFW establishing a target population goal appears to be beyond their legal capacity to do so.

Correspondence ID: 885Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mukilteo, WA 98275
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 16:31:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I oppose the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascade mountains in Washington state. The area is not large enough to support these animals and accommodate all the human recreation that takes place there.

Correspondence ID: 886Project:112008Document:132104

Address: BLAINE, WA 98230
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 16:36:48

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I VOTE NO TO THE GRIZZLY BEAR RESTORATION PLAN FOR THE NORTH CASCADES ECOSYSTEM.

Correspondence ID: 887Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Burien, WA 98148
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 16:45:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not re introduce grizzly's into this area of the state.

Correspondence ID: 888Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Rice, WA 99167
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 16:46:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Having skimmed this comprehensive report, I am writing to express my general support for working to recover grizzly bear populations to the NCE recovery zone. It is my belief, as a wildlife biologist, that the habitat where this species once roamed will benefit from having their ecological effects back on the landscape. While some may express concerns over potential conflicts, with so few remaining in the lower 48, these *potential* effects should not be the limiting factor for why a native species should not exist in its native habitat. Additionally, any potential effects are minimal in light of the human-caused alterations already affecting these areas. Thank you for the time spent compiling this information and for consideration of my comment. I do not have a preference for the options for recovery and leave that in the capable hands of the scientific experts.

Correspondence ID: 889Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Issaquah, WA 98029
United States of America

Outside Organization: none Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 17:10:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: No, I do not want grizzly bears to be reintroduced. My family. which numbers around 100 are all outdoor skiers, hikers, etc. and we believe it is too dangerous to people, They are not in danger of dying out. I grew up in Winthrop and I had a cousin attacked by a bear and my father was threatened while hunting. They are dangerous to humans.

Correspondence ID: 890Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Spokane, WA 99205
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 17:20:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of grizzlies to the Cascades. Human activity harms so much of our delicately balanced Ecosystems. It's important that we maintain and restore what we can.

Correspondence ID: 891Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Edmonds, WA 98026
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 17:37:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am against bringing Grizzlies back to the North Cascades. The ecosystem there is stable, and bringing Grizzlies into that ecosystem will provide no actual benefit. It's only relative purpose is an emotional attachment to a previous time. Nostalgia is not a valid reason for returning a dangerous predator into an existing and stable ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 892Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Shoreline, WA 98133
United States of America
Outside Organization: --None-- Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 17:54:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do NOT introduce grizzlies into the forests of the Northwest Cascades/Washington. They may have been part of the eco-system many years ago, but that doesn't mean they should be placed in any forest that is so close to where people live and camp. Its not fair to the grizzlies or the people living here. There are 25,000 grizzlies presently living and thriving in Canada. Parts of Canada that are REMOTE. Re-introduction here is unfair and dangerous for bears and people. Please, don't do it.. [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 893Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bothell, WA 98012
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 18:02:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As an avid hiker, conservationist, and parent I value the wildness of the North Cascades, and I know that grizzly bears would help to rebalance the local alpine ecosystems. I want grizzly bears to be a part of that wildness again, and I my children to experience grizzly bears as an important part of our regional culture.

Humans were responsible for removing grizzlies from the North Cascades and it's our responsibility to restore them to their native range.

Correspondence ID: 894Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Blaine, WA 98230
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 18:12:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My vote is a resounding NO!

Please allow Mother Nature to resolve the issue overtime. Consider controlling the hunting licensing. Preserve their natural habitat in the mountains so they stay there. Increase their food source.

Humans usually screw up the natural balance when they attempt to interfere.

Our community can't even handle having a non violent black bear mama and her 2 cubs roaming and foraging for food and tipping over garbage cans before returning to the mountains to hibernate. You really think they could

Deal with a grizzly family any better? would be welcomed?

Correspondence ID: 895Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bonney Lake, WA 98391
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 18:23:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears should be restorrd to their natural habitats and I support this initiative. My concern rests with how will their restoration be protected from those that can cause them harm through intentional acts or negligence.

Correspondence ID: 896Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Shoreline, WA 98155
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 18:37:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not reintroduce them. I enjoy hiking with my family of little kids with ease. Black bears do not concern me but I wouldn't want to hike if you introduced grizzlies back.

Correspondence ID: 897Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Maple Falls, WA 98266
United States of America

Outside Organization: None Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 18:57:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Bringing back these magnificent creatures will bring a kind of balance back to the wild parks & wilderness areas.

Correspondence ID: 898Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spokane, WA 99205
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 19:00:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As hiker on PCT from Canada down through Northern Oregon, I think introducing grizzlies could help control the recreational hiker population.

Correspondence ID: 899Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 19:26:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: No way. I like to hike and don't want to increase my risk of being mailed by a Grizzly. It's probably my biggest fear when I'm going hiking. I love the North cascades.

Correspondence ID: 900Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Marysville, WA 98270
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 19:32:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: It makes total sense to be reintroduced grizzly bears into the Eastern most Western Washington Mountain Ranges. Whatcom County should just the start, and they should eventually be reintroduced to all of the Eastern Mountain Ranges in Western Washington.

They are the apex predator that is lacking thus allowing deer and elk populations to continually rise to critical levels where many start starving to death in the winter time because of lack of food for overpopulated herds.

If they are properly reintroduced with a wide ranging plan to keep hikers and remote homes and people safe, I see no reason whatsoever not to move forward with this proposal.

Thank You and Thank You for Allowing all Washingtonians a chance to comment on this proposal...



Correspondence ID: 901Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Nine Mile Falls, WA 99026
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 19:33:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I think the idea of introducing an apex predator into an area where they do not currently live is a terrible idea.
The population of Washington State continues to grow, but there has been no significant increase in public / park lands. Personally, I have noticed a dramatic increase in the volume of coyotes, moose, and deer over the last three years. It seems likely that as the population has crept into the habitat of these animals, they are getting pushed more into populated areas. Locally, this may also be a result of a wolf pack.
I spend as many as four or five days a week in the local woods here and have also noticed a significant increase in the number of people I encounter.
As the country's population swells, more and more people will visit the woods. Introducing grizzly bears is not a safe decision. The ecosystem has been doing just fine without them, and I question the true motive of anyone who wants grizzly bears reintroduced here.

Correspondence ID: 902Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Sedro Woolley, WA 98284
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 19:35:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I oppose the reintroduction of Grizzly bears to the North Cascades via transplanting them. The greater North Cascades has been a grizzly bear recovery zone since the 90's and has had natural grizzly bear migration and visual sightings of their presence since then. So with that being said they are roaming the north cascades and there is no need to reintroduce them since they are here already. They may not be in the numbers advocates want but that really is not their choice as to how many the area can hold comfortably. I do not think we want the foothills of the cascades ending up like the Eastern front of the Rocky Mountain plains areas of Montana where Grizzlies are roaming in towns and neighborhoods threatening a higher population density of the cascade range. Let them reintroduce themselves at their pace not ours!!! If they want to be here so bad they will come on their own there's nothing stopping them!

Correspondence ID: 903Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America
Outside Organization: NA Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 20:05:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please don't reintroduce grizzly bears into our forests. I'm an avid hiker, and this reintroduction would severely impact my feeling of safety in the wilderness nearest my home. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 904Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 20:20:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Pile em in there! Over half of this state could use a good dose of reality

Correspondence ID: 905Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Washougal, WA 98671
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 20:54:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Ranchers are already having enough problems with wolves in eastern and now central parts of the northwest so why add another apex predator to the scene that will often see domestic animals as easy prey.

Is there going to be enough information provided scientifically or otherwise to absolutely prove that this decision will be beneficial and worthwhile?

Yes the grizzlies roamed the area for thousands of years but there are now thousands more people, and thousands of other human population related issues needing to be addressed.

Correspondence ID: 906Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lynden, WA 98264
United States of America
Outside Organization: Self Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,30 2023 21:04:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: What a bad idea. This will be a disaster for humans, livestock, other wild species, but most of all for the grizzlies.

Being a long time resident of Washington, and spent time in Alaska and Montana, it's obvious that this won't work in a densely populated area like ours.

Inevitably, a grizzly will kill livestock, a pet dog, or a hiker. Then the bear will have to be tracked down and killed. It's not fair to set them up for failure.

Correspondence ID: 907Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA, WA 98225
United States of America

Outside Organization: All Other Inquiries Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 21:16:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Terrible IDEA! We have so many hiking areas in the Whatcom county area where local people and people who visit all over the world. Why in the world would you put these people at risk. Especially in the MT Baker area and in and around all the lakes in the area. This is a terrible idea! We are already dealing with brown bears coming into the towns around the area.

Correspondence ID: 908Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Buckley, WA 98321
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 21:25:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Washington already has a predator problem. Between black bears, cougars, bobcats, wolves and coyotes, our ungulate herds have been dropping steadily. We currently have been having more conflicts between predators and people throughout the state. Adding grizzlies would put more of the public at risk for dangerous encounters and will just add more pressure to our already failing prey populations. I am completely against adding grizzly bears to Washington State.

Correspondence ID: 909Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Chehalis, WA 98532
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 21:31:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears DO NOT belong in the Cascades! Washington state is already over populated with predators and under managed. Predators with the same food source are making their way into urban areas and causing harm to livestock and humans. I disagree with any introducing of grizzly bears.

Correspondence ID: 910Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spokane, WA 99208
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 21:36:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Large, intact ecosystems are exceedingly rare in the lower 48. The North Cascades is the perfect place to bring one back. Bring back grizzly bears!

Correspondence ID: 911Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Everett, WA 98203
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 21:42:52

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Thank you for soliciting comment on this! I do not think our state should be investing time and money in re-establishing grizzlies in Washington state. We are geographically close to grizzly populations in both British Columbia and Idaho, and if there were a reason for them to migrate back to the north central cascades they would have already. The reality is that North America needs conservation policies, and the idea that we can "re-wild" Washington and make things the way they were is extremely unrealistic and costly. There's far too much for this state to work on already managing existing habitat and ecosystems, some of which are super important (like migratory waterfowl in the pacific flyway, salmon estuaries and more).

Thank you again for opening comment on this and I hope you'll take the passionate voices of those most invested in the long term conservation and health of Washington state's existing wildlife to heart.

Correspondence ID: 912Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98199
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 21:48:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly support Alternative A - no action. I do not support human relocation of grizzly bears into the park. I feel that the risks to safety and potential for conflict far outweigh the benefits (which are minor). If grizzly bears were to inhabit the park I'd much prefer they migrate naturally from adjoining areas.

Correspondence ID: 913Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Malaga, WA 98828
United States of America

Outside Organization: Concerned outdoorsman Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 21:54:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: First off the introduction of grizzly bears was shot down a few months ago. Second the introduction of them in the north cascades will cause more issues with our deer herds and elk herds which we already have decreasing numbers. We have a increasing predator population. Why would we want to increase that by introducing grizzlies? We have more and more bear and cougar incidents every year. We would just have more and more severe incidents with domestic animals and hikers in this region.

Correspondence ID: 914Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Redmond, WA 98052
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 21:55:45

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I spend a lot of time in the mountains, both for hiking and biking. I'm concerned this proposal would decrease human safety, even if bear encounters are rare. I don't want to think I need to bring firearms to keep myself safe. I don't see why I should care that no grizzlies exist here. I support plan A - do nothing.

Correspondence ID: 915Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 22:12:56

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of Grizzly Bears into North Central Washington.

Correspondence ID: 916Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Puyallup, WA 98374
United States of America

Outside Organization: Nope Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 22:39:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello!

As a resident of this beautiful state and an avid protector of our local ecosystem I highly support the reintroduction of species that we have lost or endangered.

I have done a lot of research regarding the changes to Yellowstone after the reintroduction of wolves and how massively different the ecosystem changed back to its original state from before our predator culls.

Please support I the educated and safe reintroduction of these beautiful animals and all they do for our ecosystem.

Thank you!

Correspondence ID: 917Project:112008Document:132104

Address: East Wenatchee, WA 98802
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 22:53:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Introducing grizzly bears back into the north cascade would be a terrible mistake if done. Washington state has a hard enough time managing the predators that it already has / has introduced. The commission is in no shape to have that kind of responsibility when they can't even trust the biologist it employs. This would be a huge impact on deer and other wildlife in the area as well as a decline in tourism. Predator/ human conflict have become the norm in Washington and adding a new apex predator would only further this with mortality.

Correspondence ID: 918Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98273
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 23:03:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No. Do not bring grizzlies to the cascades

Correspondence ID: 919Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Arlington, WA 98223
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 23:05:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No, do not plant grizzlies in the Cascades. It will further negatively affect our fragile ecosystem. When will learn to just live well enough alone.

Correspondence ID: 920Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Fall city, WA 98924
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 23:18:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Reintroducing grizzly bears to North Cascade National Park promotes ecological justice by restoring a keystone predator to its native habitat, aiding in maintaining a balanced ecosystem. Grizzlies play a crucial role in regulating

prey populations and vegetation, fostering a healthier environment and promoting biodiversity. This reintroduction aligns with principles of fairness and equity, giving a species a chance to thrive in its natural setting after being displaced. By advocating for the reintroduction of grizzly bears to North Cascade National Park, I aim to align with several Native American tribes that support this initiative. Many indigenous communities, such as the Upper Skagit and Sauk-Suiattle Tribes, have voiced their connection to grizzly bears and the importance of their presence in the ecosystem. Aligning with the goals and vision of these tribes seems like a scientific-best-practice as the tribes have lived here since time immemorial and thus have vast scientific and ecological knowledge. As a life-long Washingtonian and back-packer, I prefer to live and recreate in well-managed, biologically diverse environments.

Correspondence ID: 921Project:112008Document:132104

Address: LYNDEN, WA 98264
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 23:23:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am curious as to why the need to introduce grizzly bears in Whatcom county. What will this do to enhance the area? Personally I can not see a benefit to the introduction of a predator into a populated area.

Correspondence ID: 922Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Darrington, WA 98241
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30 2023 23:26:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The North Cascades currently has an abundance of black bears. There are currently grizzly bears and we do not need to add more. This is going to lead to a high number of people-bear conflict that will cause more televised issues that will not make any agency involved look good.

Correspondence ID: 923Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lynden, WA 98264
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My name is [REDACTED], I'm a [REDACTED]-year-old resident of Lynden, WA, in Whatcom County where grizzly bears may soon be reintroduced. I have spent extensive time hiking, backpacking, skiing, and otherwise enjoying the beauty of the North Cascades. I have also had encounters with black bears throughout my travels in Washington state, all of them perfectly agreeable. Humans and bears can and should coexist in the wild places of our state. I fully support the reintroduction of grizzlies. I and many other Washingtonians will be good neighbors and enthusiastic protectors for these incredible apex predators. Grizzlies command a different level of respect and caution compared to the smaller and more skittish black bear. Their presence in our forests will add so much intangible value to our wildlands, culturally and spiritually. Please approve this plan.

Correspondence ID: 924Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ferndale, WA 98248
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 02:18:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To hell with that why would we want to bring such a giant majestic killer to our woods. Sure let's take away guns and bring back bears. This makes no sense what are you gonna feed them after all of the salmon rehabilitating streams and bring an animal that could eat hundreds of pounds of fish daily. This sounds like a retarded plan to waste more

money and add more danger to an already dangerous world in the northwest I would sure just like to know why you would want this

Correspondence ID: 925Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Edmonds, WA 98026
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 03:44:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not restore bears to the North Cascades. I have love and respect for bears and understand that they once roamed these mountains. However, the restoration would be dangerous to humans and would decimate the ungulate population. I hunt, hike and camp in the north cascades and I do not wish to do so with predators of this magnitude.

Correspondence ID: 926Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Carson, WA 98610
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 04:30:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To whom this may concern,

Introducing grizzly bears into the northern cascades is a terrible idea. Washington state has booming number of bears. Unfortunately many people don't realize bears need to be managed just like any other game species. If grizzly bears are introduced into the northern cascades there will be no plan to manage these bears and they will quickly overwhelm and decimate many other species in the area. Not to mention this region is very popular for hiking and recreating and there will definitely be an increased danger to the human population. Introducing grizzlies into this area is a terrible idea that will cost people their lives and taxpayer dollars. Please do not do this.

Respectfully,

■

Correspondence ID: 927Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Fall City, WA 98024
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 05:57:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am absolutely against bringing grizzly bears back into WA state.

Correspondence ID: 928Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Shoreline, WA 98155
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 06:30:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Having spent four decades hiking, hunting, fishing, foraging, climbing, and sometimes living in North Cascades, I heartily endorse action alternative C. We should actively restore the grizzly population. But ethically, we must do so while allowing for responsive and flexible management options when conflicts inevitably arise. Alternative C will restore the population and foster long term coexistence.

Correspondence ID: 929Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Redmond, WA 9805
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 07:06:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I disagree with the re-introduction of grizzly bears in WA.

Correspondence ID: 930Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sequim, WA 98382
United States of America
Outside Organization: Citizen Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 07:19:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly oppose the reintroduction of grizzlies into the north cascades for 2 main reasons. As an avid backcountry hunter and hiker here in washington state, we already suffer from a lack of predator management do to many governor appointed commissioners on the board of fish and wildlife that are anti-hunting and are affiliated with anti hunting groups. These commissioners have already stripped away our spring bear hunts even though our biologist say that there is a very healthy population of bears. This lack of reasoning with science based data is disturbing to say the least. Our elk and deer populations are already suffering and to introduce another apex predator will only harm them more. Grizzlies in wyoming, Montana and Idaho have reached there recovery numbers many years ago but still there is no management in place for them unless they are a problem bear that has had problems with human interaction.

My worry is that these bears will reach there recovery number or quota and when it is time to start to managing there numbers anti-hunting groups will petition and shut it down just like they have done with wolf management in idaho, montana and in washington. These groups don't spend time in the country these animals live in and have not had interaction with them because I guarantee if a grizzly was wondering around in there neighborhood were there kids play they would demand that grizzly be killed.

Here in washington we have 3 apex predator species and the means of managing them have been largely stripped away so until we get a handle on our predators that we currently have the introduction of another predator needs to be postponed. Thank you for your time

Correspondence ID: 931Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America
Outside Organization: Woodland Park Zoo Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 07:30:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hello,

As a resident of WA state and conservationist, I am writing in support of Grizzly Bear reintroduction into the N. Cascades, with a preference for Alternative C. As the reason grizzlies are missing from this ecosystem, it is up to us to restore them to their home range where they can provide vital ecosystem, cultural, and spiritual services. There are multiple examples of positive grizzly-human co-existence; let's add WA to that list!

Thank you to the many advocates who have been working on grizzly recovery in WA for the past few decades. You are incredible!

Correspondence ID: 932Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 07:49:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Having both hiked and bikepacked through grizzly country in both Canada and United States, I respectfully ask that the species NOT be returned to the North Cascades. Their obvious threat to humans has been well documented. Should they be returned to the North Cascades, please do realize that there will ultimately be deaths (for both grizzlies and humans).

Correspondence ID: 933Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Lake Forest Park, WA 98155
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 07:51:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do NOT introduce a problem where we do not have one now.
Do NOT import Grizzlies to the North Cascades!

Correspondence ID: 934Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Quincy, WA 98848
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 08:06:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We do not need grizzlies brought into this state. We are already over ran with to many predators. Wdfw has bad policy on managing the predators we have already and our ungulate populations are at a crazy decline because we have to many predators. Also the hikers in this state are hiking around with headphones in and not paying attention. If there is grizzlies around there will be hikers getting attacked. And anyone that wanted to introduce the bears will have to live with the fact that they had a part in some one dying from the bear attacks that will occur.

Correspondence ID: 935Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Fall City, WA 98024
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 08:07:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: No, please do not encourage grizzly bears to return to the area.

Correspondence ID: 936Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Edmonds, WA 98020
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 08:09:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Establishing Grizzlies in the North Cascades Park is a very good idea. Please proceed with your plan.

Correspondence ID: 937Project:112008Document:132104
Address: CARNATION, WA 98014
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 08:17:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Not in favor. We do not have the public safety, emergency response, or healthcare infrastructure and expertise in place to deal with the consequences of bear human interactions that are present somewhere with a grizzly population such as Alaska. Releasing a small and isolated population such as this also does not set the species up for success in terms of recovery and survival, while it is very likely to engender additional closures, cautions, loss of valuable opportunities for outdoor recreation in an already limited and competitive environment. If we are going to commit to reintroducing the bears, then we should truly come at it with all the changes, cost, and responsibilities that would entail. An object example of our lack of preparation is the fact that the bears ' main food source, salmon, have had massive population collapse in the areas we are looking at populating. One would think it would be logical to ensure recovery of the primary food source, before setting a population up for failure by locating them in an area where that has not been accomplished, and in fact there is evidence that the decline is ongoing with no arrest of the population free fall. Please complete step one before starting with step 258!

Correspondence ID: 938Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lake Stevens, WA 98258
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 08:18:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I spend a fair amount of time in the North Cascades enjoying their natural beauty. I am in favor of reintroducing grizzlies. I assume it will be done in areas with few people and safety measures in place. I trust that this will be done with those safety measures in mind, and then we can all benefit from a partial restoration of our damaged local ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 939Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Puyallup, WA 98372
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 08:18:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I fully support the reintroduction of Grizzlies into the North Cascades. As a Washington State native and avid outdoorsman, I am keenly aware of the importance of and need for Grizzlies as part of a healthy and diverse ecosystem. I am an avid hiker and frequent the backcountry of the pacific northwest. I believe with the proper education and monitoring, we can share this beautiful country with the magestic Gizzlies and allow them to once again survive and thrive.

Correspondence ID: 940Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Puyallup, WA 98372
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 08:23:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I fully support the reintroduction of Grizzlies into the North Cascades. I am keenly aware of the importance of and need for Grizzlies as part of a healthy and diverse ecosystem. I believe with the proper education and monitoring, we can share this beautiful country with the majestic Gizzlies and allow them to once again survive and thrive. At the end of the day, their primary goal is to survive, just like us.

Correspondence ID: 941Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Richland, WA 99354-1920
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 08:25:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am strongly against introducing grizzly bears into the North Cascades National Park. The introduction of grizzly bears would create a lethal hazard to backcountry users and neighboring communities. In 1995, Washington lawmakers mandated by law that grizzly bears "shall not be transplanted or introduced into the state." Please follow the wishes of the state residents and common sense by not introducing this apex predator into the North Cascades National Park.

Correspondence ID: 942Project:112008Document:132104
Address: University Place, WA 98466
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 08:42:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzlies should be reintroduced into the North Cascades!

Correspondence ID: 943Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98109
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 08:45:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please respect Washington State law and do not transplant or introduce Grizzly Bears to our state. "Grizzly bears shall not be transplanted or introduced into the state." Protection of grizzly bears--Limitation on transplantation or introduction--Negotiations with federal and state agencies, RCW 77.12.035 (1995).

The North Cascades National Park is a popular hiking destination for US residents as well as international visitors from my personal accounts hiking in the Park, and there is no known reliable mechanism in place to measure the number of day-use visitors inside the Park. Reintroduction of Grizzly Bears inside the North Cascades National Park will result in human carnage, and the draft Environmental Impact Statement does not reflect the facts on human visitation levels inside the Park.

Correspondence ID: 944Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mazama, WA 98833
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 08:50:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am a huge proponent for re-introducing the Grizzly bear to land where it once roamed freely and flourished. I know the bear has had a successful re-introduction in Montana/Glacier National Park and there is no reason that can't happen in the North Cascades. I know that the community would rally to support ranchers by creating funding to replace lost livestock if that were the primary issue. We can support both the bear and the ranchers here... we are a community that supports AND and not "either/or";

Correspondence ID: 945Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Blaine, WA 98230
United States of America
Outside Organization: Retired Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 08:54:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: NO on relocating grizzlies. NO, From Canada BC down to Washington state. Bad idea.

Correspondence ID: 946Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 08:55:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Thank you for asking for comments on the possibility of introducing grizzly bears to the North Cascades. Over the course of my life, I've lived not only in Washington for two decades, but also in Alaska for two decades, along with continued trips around the wilderness of Alaska (and Washington).

I am a lover of wilderness and things that are wild, and understand what is required for the health of ecosystems. I'm also intimately acquainted with fatal interactions between wildlife and humans. It is unclear why there is an interest in reintroducing a markedly dangerous animal into an area which is visited in greater numbers every year by humans, many of whom come from the city (and many of those from other cultures) with little or no experience or understanding of bears.

In articles about the health of ecosystem, there is no indicator that the ecosystem has suffered as a result of no longer having the grizzly present in Washington. Washington has many other apex predators which accomplish the requirements needed for a healthy ecosystem. At the same time, we have noticeably higher number of people taking advantage of public lands and wilderness areas, a positive trend toward an awareness and appreciation that will help us to continue to protect those lands.

Anybody who has lived in grizzly country, especially who spends time outdoors, knows the dangers. Montana gives an excellent case study of a place more heavily visited than Alaska, and has a litany of terrible stories to share-- which are managed only by those working in the public lands who are well trained in managing these animals. Rangers learn to discourage bears through active involvement. We now have public lands which are understaffed, and in the North Cascades harder to access, and we are unprepared for this kind of responsibility.

Why are we considering this reintroduction, putting humans at risk? The ecosystem does not need it. We are not prepared to handle it. It seems likely only that well meaning wilderness lovers are harkening back to earlier times preceding human caused extinctions-- I understand that, of course. But we are to in those days. And more people not only may but will be hurt in interactions in the wild- and discouraged from being IN the wild.

As a lover of the wilderness and wild things, I strongly oppose this reintroduction.

Correspondence ID: 947Project:112008Document:132104
Address: MAPLE FALLS, WA 98266
United States of America
Outside Organization: Elevated Backcountry Recreational Groups(Official Rep.)
Received: Oct,01 2023 09:06:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am a partner in a business and permit holder, Elevated Backcountry, that operates in the Mt. Baker National Forest. We teach mountain skills including avalanche safety, mountain navigation, first aid and riding skills. Our students are members of the motorized winter recreation population.

While this population is relatively small in comparison to non-motorized winter recreationalists, it is a sizable contributor to the winter recreation economy. In 2023, there were 22,929 registered snowmobiles in the state of Washington. We have built our business to serve our community through courses designed to maximize the learning outcomes for students and take advantage of the spectacular and unique venues available to our program in the Mt. Baker area.

I am generally in support of the idea behind this proposal, in that the grizzly bear enjoyed freedom to roam the North Cascades historically, and if possible, should enjoy this again. There are elements in this plan that give me pause.

My primary concern and main point of this comment is to state my opposition to all aspects of this program that have the potential to impact and reduce the size and scope of our existing operating zones, specifically established SnoParks and riding areas in locations adjacent to the North Cascades wilderness areas. This includes provisions in the proposal that are associated with the Endangered Species Act and other rules that may affect permitted businesses and operational options.

Our business, reputation and core course components are built around the terrain accessed in the Canyon Creek, Glacier Creek, Anderson-Watson and Mt. Baker NRA designated riding areas. We oppose any policy changes that could result in reduction in these historically granted riding areas.

I sincerely thank the Forest Service for approaching this plan with the goal of seeking public input. I respectfully submit my comments.

Correspondence ID: 948Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Blaine, WA 98230
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 09:12:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: This is a bad idea. No grizzlies in WA, please!

Correspondence ID: 949Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Vancouver, WA 98661
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 09:35:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzly Bear's are a historical apex predator in the North Cascades. To preserve that ecosystem, they should be reintroduced.

Correspondence ID: 950Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 09:58:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzlies and black bears are different species, and each species has a unique role to play in nature. We need to maintain as much biodiversity as possible in wild places like the North Cascades in order to keep them resilient, especially given threats from climate change.
Although grizzlies are often thought to be voracious predators, most of their omnivorous diet consists of insects, sedges and leafy vegetation, plant roots, and berries, whose seeds are distributed through their droppings. A large portion of the meat that is consumed by grizzlies comprises ground squirrels and other small mammals, and carrion killed by other predators, such as wolves, or harsh winters. Grizzly bears are prolific diggers in their search for roots and burrowing small mammals, thereby aerating the soil and maintaining vibrant meadows.
Culturally and spiritually, grizzly bears are important to many of the Indigenous peoples in the Pacific Northwest, who have coexisted with grizzlies for thousands of years. We are grateful for the knowledge and deep respect these peoples hold on behalf of grizzly bears, who are often seen as teachers, guides, and symbols of strength and wisdom.
Last, we have a moral obligation to restore grizzlies as a wilderness icon and a key part of our natural heritage.

Correspondence ID: 951Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Battle Ground, WA 98604
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 10:13:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am in support of restoring a grizzly bear population to the North Cascades. I do not believe that humans should restrict or relocate native species (plants and animals) for selfish reasons. These reasons might include housing, ranching, or recreation areas.

Experts believe that as much as 30 percent of the world's plants and animals could be on a path to extinction within 100 years because of humans. Grizzly bears are currently classified as "threatened" because of human activity. Oil and gas development, recreational development, improper livestock grazing, road expansion, and poorly designed timber harvest all contribute to the human "take over" of grizzly bear habitat.

Please work to restore nature's intended balance of native species by restoring the grizzly bear population to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 952Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lopez Island, WA 98261
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 10:13:12

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears, like wolves, play an essential role in the ecosystem in the wilds throughout the country, including the Pacific Northwest. Human settlement has already displaced thousands of creatures and the land belongs to all the animals, not just humans. Please reintroduce grizzly bears to all the wild lands. If I or someone I love gets injured or killed by a grizzly bear, that is just a risk we take living in wild animal country.

Correspondence ID: 953Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sedro-Woolley, WA 98284
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 10:15:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The only upside to this idea is that after a few inevitable human casualties, the amount of traffic at the trailheads might be reduced. Other than that, wasting taxpayer money to reintroduce a deadly predator that was intentionally killed off (probably also taxpayer funded to some degree), seems like a pretty terrible idea. I imagine this plan will move forward.

Correspondence ID: 954Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98112
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 10:19:37

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I believe the grizzly bears have a right to exist in the North Cascades. The ancestors (humans) of the land respected these animals and they thrived up to the point where they were driven out. I believe they should be introduced again to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 955Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98019
United States of America

Outside Organization: [REDACTED] Seattle WA 98019 Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 10:20:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I completely support this plan.

Correspondence ID: 956Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Pasco, WA 99301
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 10:37:49
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Introduction of Grizzlies into Washington State is a terrible idea and should be reconsidered for public safety reasons

Correspondence ID: 957Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Council Bluffs, IA 51503
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 10:44:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I think it would be wonderful to try and reintroduce grizzly bears to a native habitat that was their own for so long. I do concur that the plan that offers the most flexibility is the best option, especially as this will be new. I do think though it is the right thing to do. We need to learn to live with nature.

Correspondence ID: 958Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Vancouver, WA 98662
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 11:03:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Yes they should be reintroduced

Correspondence ID: 959Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bremerton, WA 98312
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 11:06:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I really don't agree with this! I think this would have unintended negative effects on the ecosystem as a whole.

Correspondence ID: 960Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Manson, WA 98831
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 11:14:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As residents of the North Cascades we have seen the impact of the wolf " reintroduction " as an apex predator. The deer , elk and moose populations are suffering. Not to mention the impact on the livestock communities. It is beyond comprehension that someone, most likely living in the city, would want to introduce another predator to the environment! Especially when you are speaking about "problem" bears. If I am hearing this accurately, the "problem " bears would be relocated in the areas surrounding the people (yes,people live here) and they would no longer be a problem. It is ignorant to believe the bears behaviors would change with a relocation. In that instance they would be our problem. Please do your homework and stop making bad decisions that make you feel good about yourself! Consider the others that will be impacted. Both human and wildlife. If there are 3 options , as you have stated, I vote for doing nothing . Let nature do what nature does.

Correspondence ID: 961Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Carson City, NV 89701
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 11:25:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I think the Grizzly's should be reintroduced in the Cascades, as well as in the Sierra Nevada range, where I live.

Correspondence ID: 962Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Federal Way, WA 98023
United States of America
Outside Organization: None Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 11:33:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Reintroducing native species is always in nature's best interest. Having indigenous species return to their fold helps nature stay in balance and allows man to undo some of the damage he has done. Plus there is the opportunity to be able to see a species in their natural habitat and learn more about them and enjoy nature as it should be.

Correspondence ID: 963Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Issaquah, WA 98029
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 11:41:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a frequent visitor to our North Cascades, the beauty and magnificence is only increased by the presence of the natural residents, the grizzly bears. They provide valuable ecological services to the natural state of the forests.

Correspondence ID: 964Project:112008Document:132104
Address: MAPLE FALLS, WA 98266
United States of America
Outside Organization: Elevated Backcountry Recreational Groups(Official Rep.)
Received: Oct,01 2023 11:44:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am a partner in a business and permit holder, Elevated Backcountry, that operates in the Mt. Baker National Forest. We teach mountain skills including avalanche safety, mountain navigation, first aid and riding skills. Our students are members of the motorized winter recreation population.

While this population is relatively small in comparison to non-motorized winter recreationalists, it is a sizable contributor to the winter recreation economy. In 2023, there were 22,929 registered snowmobiles in the state of Washington. We have built our business to serve our community through courses designed to maximize the learning outcomes for students and take advantage of the spectacular and unique venues available to our program in the Mt. Baker area.

I am generally in support of the idea behind this proposal, in that the grizzly bear enjoyed freedom to roam the North Cascades historically, and if possible, should enjoy this again. There are elements in this plan that give me pause.

My primary concern and main point of this comment is to state my opposition to all aspects of this program that have the potential to impact and reduce the size and scope of our existing operating zones, specifically established SnoParks and riding areas in locations adjacent to the North Cascades wilderness areas. This includes provisions in the proposal that are associated with the Endangered Species Act and other rules that may affect permitted businesses and operational options.

We have built our business, reputation and core course components around the terrain accessed in the Canyon Creek, Glacier Creek, Anderson-Watson and Mt. Baker NRA designated riding areas. We oppose any policy changes that result in reduction in these historically granted riding areas.

I sincerely thank the Forest Service for approaching this plan with the goal of seeking public input. I respectfully submit my comments.

Correspondence ID: 965Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Monroe, WA 98272
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 11:50:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Option A.

I believe that forced reintroduction is going to result in grizzly conflict with humans, and dead grizzlies. Possibly dead humans.

Correspondence ID: 966Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Maple Falls, WA 98266
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 11:50:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly Bear introduction into Whatcom county is detrimental to our families, wildlife, and livestock. Grizzlies affect our economic baseline--skiing, mountain biking, ranching. You can only kill a bear, if it kills your livestock first?

In the Maple Falls/Glacier area, we have enough issues with black bears on biking trails, being in people's yards and reported being on back porch.

These communities are trying to positively grow and become a safe haven for families to thrive.

Our area has ENOUGH issues with Ranch Quarry, abundance of pedofiles (7 within 2 miles of my home) and drugs.

We need to solve the social issues before adding grizzlies to the mix.

Correspondence ID: 967Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 11:52:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Humans were responsible for removing grizzlies from the North Cascades and it's our responsibility to bring them back home, and if we don't take action now, we risk losing grizzly bears from the North Cascades forever. I'm a person who cares about wildlife, and I want my future children to experience grizzly bears as an important part of our regional culture. As a conservationist, I know grizzly bears provide important ecological services, like distributing seeds and aerating alpine meadows as well as mitigating overpopulation of various species. Finally, as an avid hiker who values the wildness of the North Cascades. I want grizzly bears to be a part of that wildness again. There is plenty of space for both of us. Proper planning will lead to minimized impacts for everyone involved, and I believe Option C to be our best option. Thank you for your time!

Correspondence ID: 968Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Frontier, ND 58104
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 11:56:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am for more wild grizzly bears in more areas. People have to watch out near them. It is risky.

Correspondence ID: 969Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Lynnwood, WA 98037
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 11:58:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: If grizzlies are reinstated, which I'm for, there needs to be very stiff penalties to deter poachers. Bears have incredible healing powers, including gallbladder and other organs. They were here first were they not? But then many of us know how humans were treated.

Correspondence ID: 970Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mazama, WA 98833
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 12:01:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: This is the most stupid idea ever. I live in Mazama. We don't want a bunch of grizzly bears roaming around. We got enough trouble with the overpopulated black bears the State Of Washington refuses to allow us to manage.

Reintroduce Grizzly Bears to Downtown Seattle. They used to live there, so might as well bring them back right?

Correspondence ID: 971Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Republic, WA 99166
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 12:01:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I absolutely do not suppose the introduction of Grizzly Bears to Washington State. Just three days ago WDFW along with Stevens County Sheriff with assistance from the USDFW captured a Grizzly from the Onion creek area approx 10 miles north of Colville Wa. The bear was raiding a homes chicken coops and killed birds. Non lethal methods were tried to no avail. The bear was trapped and relocated.
The bears are already here! No more predators of ANY kind. I've had wolf interactions on my property, cougars and coyotes roam my area along with black bears. The Colville confederate tribes have reintroduced Lynx to Ferry county over the last several years (50)
NO MORE PREDATORS!
My family and pets along with many of my close friends deserve safety and as much as I love our animals
NO MORE PREDATORS!

Correspondence ID: 972Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Sequim, WA 98382
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 12:20:47
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We wholly support restoration of the Grizzly Bear in the North Cascades. The restoration of the wolf population in Yellowstone is a great example of the benefits of returning apex predators to an ecosystem. I am a lifelong Washington state resident.

Correspondence ID: 973Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sequim, WA 98382
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 12:27:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Our family wholly supports restoration of the grizzly bear population in the North Cascades. It's beyond time to eliminate cattle herds from public land, despite the long tradition of ranching in the West, and economic considerations benefiting humans should be the lowest priority when protection of the environment and wildlife is at stake. The restoration of the wolf population in Yellowstone is a prime example of the benefits of returning apex predators to an ecosystem, and likewise we are greatly heartened by the increase of wolverines and fishers in their natural habitats. Nature first!

Correspondence ID: 974Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Walla Walla, WA 99362
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 12:35:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Yes, Grizzly bears should be returned to Washington's North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 975Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 12:40:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: First, I am a retired Fish and Wildlife Biologist, GS12, step 10, with over 20 years working with listed species. I was Chief of the Recovery and Habitat Conservation Branch at the NCW USFWS Office in Wenatchee for about 6 years. I also have an MS in Biology, emphasizing Animal Behavior, and an MS Thesis on black bear behavior. I personally have encountered over 2 dozen wild grizzlies and never had a problem. The one "charge"; I have experienced was a male black bear during the term of my thesis study and was a "bluff charge"; by a bear that had previously been antagonized by a junior researcher.

The North Cascades area is sparsely inhabited and visited only by a few backpackers each year. Human-bear interactions will certainly be uncommon and, providing avoidance measures are adhered to, easily avoided.

. Numerous studies have shown the beneficial effects of apex predator re-introduction, by species as diverse as dingoes (Moseby, K.E., Crowther, M.S. & Letnic, M. Ecological Role of an Apex Predator Revealed by a Reintroduction Experiment and Bayesian Statistics. *Ecosystems* 22, 283-295 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10021-018-0269-6>); wolves (Wolf reintroduction, predation risk, and cottonwood recovery in Yellowstone National Park Author links open overlay panel) William J. Ripple a, Robert L. Beschta)& Biomass Flow and Scavengers Use of Carcasses after Re-Colonization of an Apex Predator

Camilla Wikenros ,Håkan Sand,Per Ahlqvist,Olof Liberg, Published: October 23, 2013,

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0077373>. A brief search on Google Scholar will quickly provide many more references and sources.

The National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS) data show that bears were less likely to predate upon livestock than

domestic dogs (<https://downloads.usda.library.cornell.edu/usda-esmis/files/5712m654p/2v23vw87z/j96023321/CattPredLo-05-04-2001.pdf>)

Grizzly bear attacks on humans are statistically rare (Bombieri, G., Naves, J., Penteriani, V. et al. Brown bear attacks on humans: a worldwide perspective. *Sci Rep* 9, 8573 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-44341-w>).

Therefore, I request you do due diligence and avoid being categorized as arbitrary and capricious, and make a decision based on the newest and best data and re-introduce grizzly bears into the north Cascades ecosystem.

Thank you!

Correspondence ID: 976Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seatt,e, WA 98107
United States of America

Outside Organization: None Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 12:51:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear National Park Service:

I have read and considered the introduction to the proposal to return grizzly bears to Washington State. I quote from Page vii:

"Restoration actions that result in an increased grizzly bear population could also affect recreational opportunities for visitors who do not wish to encounter grizzly bears."

The wording should be changed from "could" to "will" - if we have grizzly bears re-introduced to Washington, it is inevitable that they will come in contact with humans.

The first dead hiker will make nasty headlines/Facebook/Tweets/etc.

I do not want grizzlies re-introduced to Washington State.

Correspondence ID: 977Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Burien, WA 98148
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 13:06:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: These bears are very dangerous. What is more important a few more bears and a few less hikers or less of a fear that our children won't be attacked while traveling our beautiful mountains. How about adding a few more black bears instead? Our state will survive just fine with out adding more of these dangerous bears to our wilderness. Why don't you add one to your back yard and see how that works out.

Correspondence ID: 978Project:112008Document:132104

Address: SEATTLE, WA 98118
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 13:07:58

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft plan. I have serious reservations about all three options.

First of all, the concept that we will be restoring the original ecosystem has a serious flaw in it. The original ecosystem did not include a large and developing human presence.

Second, I was quite troubled with the introduction of wolves in the Rockies a few years back. That issue was that the species which was introduced was not the original species, but the large and more aggressive Canadian Timberwolf. The results have not been encouraging and the states now have to hire hunters to control the population.

Third, despite its other challenges, the ecosystem is doing pretty well without the grizzlies. Clearly, they are not a keystone predator as described in the Serengeti Principal. I do not see any pressing need to restore the grizzlies any further than where they have spread at present. The danger of dangerous human encounters, livestock predation and further reduction of the challenged deer and elk herds would argue against introducing more grizzlies.

Sincerely,

Correspondence ID: 979Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Oso, WA 98223
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 13:28:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Truly personally I believe this idea is very detrimental in many ways

As the impact of grizzly bears in our surrounding areas will also have so many repercussions in tremendous lways. First of all a bit of about who I am. My Grandfather was [REDACTED] and in his year's as a lifetime resident of Darrington he was known as a legendary bear/cougar hunter back prior when hound hunting was permitted... When I was growing up as a youth I sat a listened with open ears of the many amazing situations he undertook while performing the tasks he encountered... Also he was asked for help constantly in helping with nuisance animals that were causing problems locally... The exiting tales he told would have my attention over & over as I was to young to participate and before I could have been of age to participate unfortunately his health declined and all I could do was sit & listen to him tell & repeat his stories over & over again but word for word they never changed a bit... In my opinion from my knowledge & understanding grizzly bears in our surrounding areas would not be beneficial in any way but down right very possibly harmful & ultimately could be very,very dangerous in many ways!! This is my opinion on how. First off when I grew up in Darrington as a youth I spent countless day's in the woods picking cones & mushrooms from daylight to dark! Also yes I know time's have changed but we also spent day's finishing & hunting or hiking in groups of us teens exploring every surrounding highland lake we could find... With grizzlies being returned im sure that the youths now will not be able to have the same experiences we had... Back then we were allowed to fortunately have the ability of protecting our selves but time's unfortunately have changed... No more hunting rifles on our truck's gun racks at school these day's because time's have changed.. Bears don't stay put & will travel many miles in finding their needs! Please for the sake of safety,impact & research how bearspray isn't working as well at all... Thanks!

Correspondence ID: 980Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Fort Wayne, IN 46845
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 14:25:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I love that you are helping out the Grizzly Bear. I want to see more large predators protected throughout the country. They are keystone species in their respective ecosystems, and their absence has caused problems. Young people have been cheated out of their birthright to see these magnificent creatures.

Correspondence ID: 981Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lynden, WA 98264
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 14:50:47
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I think this plan is beyond dumb!

Grizzlies have NEVER had a significant presence in Whatcom County. I've live here for 64-years and hiked these hills since I was a kid, and I have NEVER met anyone who encountered a grizzly. I've encountered black bears when I was young, but never a grizzly in this county. Likewise with all other hikers I met and all the old-timers, much older than me that I've known. Not a single one ever saw a grizzly in Whatcom County!

You say this is because of overhunting in 90s. I call nonsense on that as total disinformation. My period of highest hiking activity was in the seventies and eighties. Never a grizzly did I meet. My dad who worked in the forest service back in the fifties also NEVER saw a grizzly in Whatcom County his entire life! He was born in Washington in 1914 and worked most of his life in the woods for the CCC, the forest service, and as a logger. Neither did my uncle who worked in fire watchtowers in the forties ever see a grizzly in Whatcom County. They all saw plenty of black bear, never a grizzly. So, it has nothing to do with hunting in the 90s. All that did was diminish a few grizzlies that you likely WRONGLY transplanted here based on your belief in your superior college education about grizzlies, and they mostly probably died due to killing each other because you didn't know what you were doing.

I am willing to bet that, other than transplanted grizzlies or the occasional stray from the Canadian Rockies, there have never been grizzlies here. The strays come and go and never choose to stay long. Do you even have a single skeleton that is a hundred years old of a grizzly found in Whatcom County? I am willing to bet no such skeleton exists because grizzlies have always been that rare around here. You may have heard tales from old Indians about them, but they are nothing other than tales, no more reliable than any other tales, if you've heard them at all. I haven't, and I work for the Lummi tribe.

What I love about Whatcom county is that you can hike in the woods without packing a 45 because you never have to fear encountering a mad grizzly. I have, as I said, encountered black bears, and they have never caused me trouble -- not even a mama black bear when I wound up between her and her cub. I backed off, and she called to her cub to come down out of the snag it had run up, and just continued on her way, foraging the berries around me.

We have a shortage of salmon, and your answer is to bring in more salmon eaters? We have no problems due to a lack of this top predator. Deer and elk herds are well managed, and if they did overpopulate, that problem could easily be solved through human hunting. I don't hunt, but it is one of the most natural and longstanding human activities in the world that is true to our basic nature as evolutionists claim that hunting is exactly why we developed superior brains to other apes and an upright stance. We were supposedly the ape that developed a taste for meat, but lacking tooth and claw, we had be be more clever to get it by using tools. So, manage wildlife that way if herds do overpopulated. Keep Whatcom County safe by keeping grizzlies that have never been significant here out.



Correspondence ID: 982Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98133-8723
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 14:54:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm for introducing a grizzly bear population into the North Cascades with a protected status under the ESA. Ranching and hunting interests in Central and Eastern Washington disproportionately promote the ills of apex predators in Washington ecosystems. Onerous is placed on bears and wolves for even the perception of harm to livestock and deer populations without any consideration for the health of the native ecosystems. As the North Cascades are one of the lesser visited natural areas in the continental United States, they make an excellent home for such large animals. As a Washingtonian and frequent NCNP user I fully support their reintroduction.

Correspondence ID: 983Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Issaquah, WA 98027
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 15:00:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We are totally against bringing back the Grizzly Bears to the North Cascades. The ecosystem does not need this to make everthing work in harmony. Things are working fine how they are. There are way too many people up in the woods enjoying the beauty. Grizzlies are too dangerous. Why would we need to do this? If things aren't broken they don't need to be fixed.

Thank you for your time,
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 984Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Blaine, WA 98230
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 15:01:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As usual with an agency or agencies filled with biologists, the analysis is very complete when it comes to effects on animal species and the ecosystem and short on the analysis and impacts on humans, culture and economics. In fact says that with the introduction of the bears will be favorable to those who like the idea of grizzlies in the wild. I think very few people wish to interact with grizzlies in any sort of uncontrolled outdoor experience, maybe if it is a long distance sighting. Because the possibility of encounters exists, however small, the same regulations, restrictions, and bear resistant containers will be required as if there were many. How has the introduction and repopulation of grizzlies in heavily used recreation areas changed with the increasing number of bears? Even if grizzlies are released in the remote portions of the park, where will they likely expand to as their numbers increase, what is their range, have you modeled that, what has happened in other areas? At what point in the population increase does human encounters become more likely and where? Does the carrying capacity and 200 bear goal consider increasing human activity, development pressures, economic changes, and climate change? The map shows wide expanded of area which are actually dissected by roads, trails, recreation and other facilities and concentrated areas of human use, are there potential conflict areas? It will do no good if the bears are reintroduced and there are more adverse human interactions requiring more regulation. What are the mechanisms for potential changes to the plan if things don't go as planned for whatever reason. Certainly more flexibility with the use of experimental populations is a good one in your preferred alternative. A more thorough analysis of human and social factors is needed.

Correspondence ID: 985Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Custer, WA 98240
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 15:15:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Bad idea. This area is not ready to handle grizzly bears. Folks who have moved here over past many years did not move here prepared to deal with grizzlies. They are beautiful, but very dangerous animals. Our infrastructure is not set up to keep bears and people reasonably apart. We have black bears coming down into more populated areas now due to forest fires and drought. They are difficult enough. Grizzlies would be a threat to pets and people.

Correspondence ID: 986Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Blakely Island, WA 98222
United States of America
Outside Organization: taxpayer Unaffiliated Individual(Official Rep.)

Received: Oct,01 2023 15:30:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This would be a total waste of taxpayer dollars. Apart from the fact that there is a healthy population of griz in BC that are free to cross into WA at anytime, they are already here! They will expand their territory just fine on their own, no need to spend our money to do it.

Correspondence ID: 987Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Silver Spring, MD 20910
United States of America

Outside Organization: Home Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 15:41:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello, I think that grizzlies should be re-introduced to the North Cascades. They are (should be) an integral part of that ecosystem. The likelihood of negative interactions with humans would be quite small. I believe they should be protected by the Endangered Species Act.

Thank you, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 988Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Oak Harbor, WA 98277
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 16:03:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Everyone who wants to have grizzlies in the Cascades should read the book Bear Attacks. There is no good or safe reason to have them here in Washington at all. You are asking people to be able to stop an apex predator from attacking their homes, pets, livestock and families with what?!. What happens when they start breeding? I can't even stop a mouse from getting in my house let alone a grizzly bear.

Correspondence ID: 989Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 16:03:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I want to acknowledge that I'm not a biologist, and I don't have the training to speak to the details of this issue. What I do have is my perspective to share.

My husband and I have lived in Whatcom County for 20 years. We spend a substantial amount of time recreating out of doors and this is one of the reasons we moved to this area. In the summer we backpack almost every weekend when weather and smoke allows and longer trips when possible. I have mixed feelings about the plan to re-introduce grizzlies to the area.

Over the years, our hiking experiences have been negatively impacted by the effects of climate change and overuse of the trails. Climate change has limited the time we can spend in the mountains, shifted where we go, and generally burdened the experience mostly due to wildfire activity and smoke. The overuse of trails combined with technology has forced us deeper into the mountains in order to find and experience of wilderness. The reintroduction of grizzlies would be another element complicating the mountain experience for those of us regularly recreating in the North Cascades.

We see black bears every year during our time in the mountains. We have never had a problematic encounter, and we don't carry gun or spray. I feel that hiking with grizzlies would be a very different experience, and I wouldn't feel comfortable doing many of the trips we do now.

I very much see humans as part of the ecosystem and on a rudimentary level, understand the importance of a healthy ecosystem. The role of grizzlies in a healthy ecosystem is less clear to me. There are already problems with human and wildlife encounters due to habituated bears usually caused by irresponsible human behavior. I feel that adding the grizzlies to an environment where more and more people are frequenting will only add to the risk for problem encounters which then puts the same bears we are trying to help at risk. I would support a plan that protects the grizzly populations that currently exist without reintroducing to new areas.

Correspondence ID: 990Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Redmond, WA 98053
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 16:13:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not rerelease grizzly bears in the North Cascades. There are other predators like wolves that can fill that role without being such a huge danger to campers and hikers.

Bringing grizzly bears back will make the area far more dangerous for humans.

Correspondence ID: 991Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Garfield, WA 99130
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 16:32:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The last thing this state needs is more predators. WDFW commissioners are trying to ban predator hunting all together. And now people are thinking of adding grizzlies? Our ungulate populations are already low. We don't need another predator species added to our ecosystems.

Correspondence ID: 992Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bothell, WA 98021
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 16:35:08

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This proposal is dangerous and detached from reality. Would make people scared to live in those areas and be outdoor. We don't need more dangerous predators based on some abstract policy that may seem very cool from someone's desk in DC or Olympia. Why don't we reintroduce the T-Rex?

Correspondence ID: 993Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lihue, HI 96766
United States of America

Outside Organization: Personal Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 16:37:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Aloha, I live in Hawaii but am originally from Washington State. We have apex predators here and honestly it puts a damper on things sometimes. Can't be avoided. Occasionally somebody gets bit or eaten.

Bears will be bears so if a decision is made to do this and seed these animals within the park then I hope everyone's prepared to see large sections of the park closed due to bear activity. That means campgrounds, trails, picnic areas.....closed due to bear activity.

So, no to GBs.

Thank you

Correspondence ID: 994Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kent, WA 98032
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 16:45:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I consider myself an environmentalist and my father was a Boy Scout master. My parents met in the Sierra Club. I have done a fair amount of day hiking and backpacking in the Cascade, Olympic, and Sierra mountains. On multiple occasions I have seen black and brown bears, who have never threatened me or members of my group. However, I *never* want to meet a grizzly bear while out hiking. Reintroducing them to their previous areas is one of the stupidest things I have ever heard of.

I hope the first person who gets mauled by a reintroduced grizzly bear sues the National Park Service, so that others may explore the woods in greater safety. Mark me down as a vote against grizzly bears.

Correspondence ID: 995Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Shoreline, WA 98133
United States of America

Outside Organization: None Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 16:55:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a U.S. citizen and an avid hiker in Washington state, I strongly support reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades. Our wild lands benefit from full restoration of native species, and grizzlies are clearly an crucial element in a well-balanced ecosystem.

I understand that indigenous tribes consider the grizzly to be an important part of their culture, and that informs my support for returning the brown bears to federal land.

Thank you for your serious consideration.

Correspondence ID: 996Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 17:12:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Yes, we should! I've camped all my life here in Washington, among other states. When I was a Child we would see the Bears come in to are camp site. We would flee to the trailers and once the bear realized there was nothing in the camp site for them, they would move on. We are going into there land, and when camping out hiking in the mountains, you should expect to see wild animals, and know what to do when you in counter them. So please bring the bears back to the mountains to their home.

Correspondence ID: 997Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98127
United States of America

Outside Organization: North Cascades Conservation Council Conservation/Preservation

Received: Oct,01 2023 17:20:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To quote Joe Scott, International Programs Director for Conservation Northwest, "The grizzly bear is still the consummate North American wildlife icon. The grizzly has immeasurable ecological and cultural value for our ecosystems and communities. We have a unique opportunity and obligation in the PNW to co-author a significant conservation success story - to restore the grizzly to a small but important part of its traditional home."

The North Cascades is one of North America's premier intact ecosystems, but it is incomplete without grizzly bears.

This is the second attempt by the agencies to restore grizzlies to the NCE after a 2015 process was halted by the Trump administration in 2020. At the time, more than 159,000 members of the public wrote comments supporting the reintroduction of grizzlies.

"The time has come for the grizzly bear to return to its habitat to take its place in the indigenous ecosystem," said Scott Schuyler, policy representative for the Upper Skagit Tribe, whose territory lies within the recovery zone. "The Upper Skagit successfully coexisted with grizzly bears for thousands of years, and we should once more."

The two gentlemen I have quoted above have said this better than I can. I could not be any more eloquent on this subject.

Correspondence ID: 998Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Tacoma, WA 98402
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 18:00:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Yes please reintroduce grizzly bears!! Thank you for working to restore the ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 999Project:112008Document:132104
Address: seattle, WA 98112
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 18:29:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I have hiked, backpacked and climbed in the North Cascades National park, Mt. Baker and Snoqualmie forests, Cascades, Rockies and many remote areas in British Columbia and Alberta.

I support option C of the grizzly bear restoration plan. For far too long humans have encroached on the habitat needed for a healthy ecosystem. We shot, trapped and eliminated animals based on economic needs, sport or fear. It is time we restore the populations of large apex predators like grizzly bears. I also support financial restitution to ranchers, orchard owners and farmers if there is loss or damage from a grizzly bear. This may help garner support from these groups that have historically been against grizzly bear restoration.

As a hiker, climber and backpacker I have encountered bears over the years and have not had a negative experience. I used to hang food and now use a bear proof food container. I support the forest service installing bear boxes in popular back country camp sites to reduce human / bear contact. It's also my belief that many in the back country use poor judgement and lack basic knowledge to reduce bears becoming used to humans.

Thanks and all the best.

Correspondence ID: 1000Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellevue, WA 98005
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 18:30:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The Eastside has a pretty significant problem with brown bear in the area. Additionally the Seattle Metropolitan growth plan calls out the fact that the region will expect tremendous growth by 2050 and beyond. While I am not opposed to the reintroduction of the grizzly to their ancient lands, you should consider the fact that the area is poised to receive record migration and growth in the coming years and the instances of human and wildlife interactions are only going to increase. If we are going to reintroduce an apex predator we should appropriately fund the agencies involved to ensure that human and wildlife interactions are properly managed

Correspondence ID: 1001Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Marysville, WA 98270
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 18:30:37

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: AMERICAS

October 1, 2023 9:19 PM UTC

Grizzly bear attack in Canada's Banff National Park leaves two dead. I can think of 2 reasons today why it would be a real bad idea to put these grizzly bears in OUR parks and forests. In the above headline replace the word two with your spouse, children, or siblings and you should get a clue as how asinine this proposal is. I think it would be better to explore why you have funds to pursue such foolishness.

Correspondence ID: 1002Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Edmonds, WA 98026
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 19:08:01

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Jason Ransom, the Wildlife Program Lead at the North Cascades National Park Service Complex, needs to be relocated to the unemployment line. We shouldn't subsidize whackjob environmentalists who have whacked out, and insane, plans which benefit no one and nothing. Just another huge waste of taxpayer dollars.

Just look at Glacier and Yellowstone. The grizzlies are now overpopulated there, and they kill people every year.

Correspondence ID: 1003Project:112008Document:132104

Address: seattle, WA 98133
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 19:16:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To Whom this comment may reach,

I and my partner are avid backpackers and spent as much time as possible in the back country both in Washington Oregon Montana and Idaho. We travel all over the west to backpack in the back country away from the beaten path . We have hiked in Yellowstone and have seen many Grizzly and encounters a few close up . we are aware of the impact of reintroducing a pro Mary predator back into an eco system, as was done with Wolves, Its usually a positive Impact on the eco system and and does freak out the average hiker somewhat. I am in favor of this reintroduction as is my partner and I understand that ranching folks will put up a huge bus. My hope is that if the ranchers are compensated for the long term effects of a loss of a stock animal they will be satisfied. They are a difficult bunch so good li luck with that part of the equation. You have two YES votes come us in seattle its about time the bears get back to roaming the natural territory they once had !

██████████

Correspondence ID: 1004Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Midland, WA 98445
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 19:16:19
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I definitely think grizzlies should be brought back to their lands. All animals should be allowed to return/roam their natural ranges.
Humans have been taking over the wilderness for decades. The majority of people not giving a second thought to where will the wildlife go now that we (humans) have taken their homes, their food and the secure places in the wilderness they chose to live and raise their children.
If people where in the animals situation they would retaliate. Unfortunately when animals retaliate, humans kill them.
Look at what the world has come to already. It will not get better unless people do the right, responsible thing for all animals.

Correspondence ID: 1005Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 19:20:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades of Washington. Specifically, I support the preferred alternative (Alternative C) as described in the Draft EIS dated September 28, 2023.

Correspondence ID: 1006Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bothell, WA 98011
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 19:24:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As someone who frequently hikes, the thought of an increased grizzly bear population in the North Cascades is concerning. Observing the events in places like Montana and Idaho, it's clear that more bears can lead to more dangers. Grizzlies have every opportunity to migrate from BC or Idaho without human intervention. I urge you to let nature dictate its path.

Correspondence ID: 1007Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Ellensburg, WA 98926
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 19:33:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The potential reintroduction of grizzly bears in the North Cascades is alarming for many of us who frequent the area. The experiences of states like Montana serve as a cautionary tale. Grizzlies have every opportunity to migrate naturally, so human intervention seems unwarranted.

Correspondence ID: 1008Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Lynden, WA 98264
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 19:34:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Absolutely against the re introduction of grizzly bears. Dangerous for our hikers and outdoor enthusiasts. It would destroy our eco system.

Correspondence ID: 1009Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Dallas, TX 75209
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 19:36:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support option C of the proposal to restore grizzly bears to the NCE range.

Grizzlies are a vital part of our natural environment and should be restored in the most responsible way possible. Option C allows land managers the flexibility needed to ensure to long-term survival and thriving of grizzlies in this area of the world. Choose option C and support the grizzly.

Correspondence ID: 1010Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98512
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 19:39:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am opposed to the proposal to bring Grizzly bears to Washington State.

Correspondence ID: 1011Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98106
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 19:39:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to support of reintroduction of grizzly bears into the North Cascades Ecosystem. I wrote in support a few years ago, and my support in 2023 continues. I believe bringing back this animal into our region will bring many benefit to the ecosystem (as we have seen with wolves in Yellowstone NP).

Correspondence ID: 1012Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Missoula, MT 59808
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 19:43:31

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Until recently I lived in Washington for many years. I felt compelled to voice my concerns about the potential reintroduction of grizzly bears in Washington. It's undeniable that grizzlies are already making their way into the state from neighboring regions. The absence of physical barriers means they can migrate naturally. Given the state's challenges in managing its existing wildlife, introducing another apex predator seems counterproductive. Now living in Montana - and seeing the alarming number of grizzly bear conflicts (many of which are leaving people in critical conditions or causing death) - introducing grizzly bears into Washington, with it's considerably higher population and the density of hikers in any given area at a time, does not read as conducive to public safety.

Correspondence ID: 1013Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lacey, WA 98516
United States of America

Outside Organization: None Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 19:47:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I stand opposed to introducing the Grizzly to the Cascades. The hazards this animal may cause and the limits on hunters and firearms make the risk too high

Correspondence ID: 1014Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Covington, WA 98042
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 19:59:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I oppose the re-introduction of grizzly bears to Washington state. They are a threat to hikers, wildlife and livestock. The Western News edition on Sept 26, 2023 noted that "Two more Lincoln County (Montana) grizzlies had to be euthanized"; These grizzlies had become habituated and were breaking into cabins, garages and a trailer. Even after the bears were moved near the Canada border they traveled back to the same area to seek food sources.

Please do not re-introduce grizzly bears.

Sincerely, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 1015Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Eugene, OR 97404
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 20:10:01

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Oregon has a very real problems currently with predators and the deprivation of their prey. With cougars and bears and then came along wolves. There are to checks and balances. By adding the grizzly bear you are compounding the problem. Why add to a bad situation that is in a downward spiral with more predators that can't be controlled? Oregon has a very negative track record when it comes to managing their wildlife. This would be one more step backwards. I am completely against this idea.

Correspondence ID: 1016Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kennewick, WA 99338
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 20:14:24

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I oppose relocating even more grizzly bears into Washington State as they are NOT endangered. Further human interference will lead to even further loss of mule deer, whitetail deer, elk and moose. Your agenda is very easy to see through and it needs to STOP immediately.

Correspondence ID: 1017Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 20:18:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am a lifetime resident of Whatcom county. (72 years). I am totally in favor of the reintroduction of Grizzly bears in eastern Whatcom county. I believe the fears expressed by people are unwarranted as these bears will be in totally wilderness areas.

Correspondence ID: 1018Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 20:21:12

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am against reintroducing Grizzlies to eastern Whatcom County. The reasons are twofold. One is because the conditions that resulted in their extinction here in the first place are still present and more so, which can only result in an an adverse environment for them to survive in. And two, human populations are closer to their territories than ever. As a result, eastern Whatcom Co. has more recreational visitors than ever. There WILL be dangerous confrontation and human or livestock killings that will put these poor animals directly in someone's crosshairs, either a poacher and their dogs, a DFW agent, or some other nightmare death. Introduce them why? So they can breed beyond their available territory until they're forced into human territory and hunted and shot dead? Over and over? This will be as the wolves in the lower 48 are, mercilessly hunted and terrorized and disrupted in their ability to live a normal Bear life. What do you think the lifespan of a grizzly would be around north Cascades? My guess is 2-4 years of constant fear. Please DON'T BRING THEM HERE. Life would be hell for them, Please.

Correspondence ID: 1019Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Maple Valley, WA 98038
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 20:30:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: You know that grizzlies kill people, but you're still willing to give it a try and see what happens. It's ridiculous. You know what will happen - that's why you're looking for bears who have had no history of "human conflict". What a polite way to put it. Do you personally want to be the first case of "human conflict"? How about your family? How about your kids? It's time to give up this romantic notion of what used to be. Life is better now. We don't need to go back.

Please DON'T restore grizzlies to the North Cascades. They are killers and you know it.

Sincerely,


Maple valley, WA.

Correspondence ID: 1020Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mesa, AZ 85209
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 20:34:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As someone who frequently hikes, the thought of an increased grizzly bear population in the North Cascades is concerning. Observing the events in places like Montana and Idaho, it's clear that more bears can lead to more dangers. Grizzlies have every opportunity to migrate from BC or Idaho without human intervention. I urge you to let nature dictate its path.

Correspondence ID: 1021Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 20:55:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Do not release, reintroduce, relocate, or take any other similar actions to increase the number of grizzly bears in Washington state. This is a vote for No Action.

Correspondence ID: 1022Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Banks, OR 97106
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 20:56:37

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The Plan document and Impact Statement was very informative and well written. My overall thoughts are that potential negative impacts of reintroducing grizzly bears into the NCE outweigh the potential good. In particular:

-Grizzlies are a highly political point of concern. My basic understanding is that Washington's Dept of Game already have troubles balancing the resource, public perception, and the opportunity from a hunting perspective. While the hunting prospects are nowhere near consideration, I think adding grizzlies to the mix would further complicate the already controversial issue.

-Are prey species strong enough to sustain a potential reintroduction. My understanding is that there is a healthy representation of predators on the landscape already.

-Potential prey, human, and livestock conflict largely outweigh the good of reintroducing grizzlies.

-Money/funding. I don't believe the cost of said reintroduction plans are an effective use of dollars in Washington's current state.

In summary, I am not in favor of the reintroduction plan and think the efforts of bolstering grizzly bears should remain in the existing ecosystems outlined in the Plan.

Correspondence ID: 1023Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Dallas, TX 75212
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 21:02:58

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Strain on Wildlife Management: The WDFW Commission has not maximized recreational opportunities for sportsmen as directed in their mandate. With recent decisions on black bear and potential changes to mountain lion hunting, many conservationists fear the commission is failing to manage its wildlife properly. Introducing more grizzlies would exacerbate this issue. To be clear, reintroduction would not mean a grizzly bear hunting season. The point here is that the state is already under strain from mismanagement of its large population of existing predators beside grizzly bear.

Correspondence ID: 1024Project:112008Document:132104

Address: colbert, WA 99005
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 21:04:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a life long washington resident and avid outdoors person, I think reintroduction of grizzly bears in the north cascades is a terrible idea. I've spent numerous days back country in and around the north cascades and the lack of grizzly's brings joy to the area that will be permanently lost upon their reintroduction of that apex predator. Human/bear interactions will become a regular occurrence over time and attacks will become a normalcy due to managements inability to reintroduce fear of humans into these animals once they become to comfortable in and around humans, human garbage and food sources derived from human existence. Do not introduce these animals into washington state.

Correspondence ID: 1025Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Yacolt, WA 98675
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 21:15:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think we need to figure out how to manage the predators we have before we introduce more. And shooting from helicopters by professional paid hunters is not the answer. Bring back hounds for cougars and black bear. Let the regular hunters take care of the exploding population of predators so we can rebuild our ungulate populations. We do not need another apex predator on scene. Especially one that is protected from hunting and causes trouble and legal investigation when killed in self defense. I say no to the introduction of Grizzly Bears to the state of Washington.

Correspondence ID: 1026Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Maple valley, WA 98038
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 21:18:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Do not force grizzly bears on the state of Washington if they need to come back here for habitat it will happen organically. Playing God for whatever cryptic motives you have is not necessary.

Correspondence ID: 1027Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Camano Island, WA 98282
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 21:20:19
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I don't think we should be thinking about re-introducing grizzly bears to the cascades at this time. We are already dealing with the mismanagement of carnivore populations in the state. Until we find balance I completely disagree. We live in one of the most densely populated and smallest states on the West Coast. The landscape is fragmented and fractured and ungulate populations are already suffering. We already have some grizzly bears in the state naturally, now is not the time to re-introduce them.

Correspondence ID: 1028Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 21:26:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello,

I disapprove of grizzly bears being reintroduced to the north cascades. Humans are very arrogant and selfish beings to think we can out smart mother nature. Grizzly bears are some of the most free roaming wild animals on this planet and if they wanted to return to the north cascades they certainly would have. Leave the bears alone. Leave the wild animals and wild places to their own. Humans are not capable of solving the problems that they themselves created. Please for the sake of these beautiful wild animals do not haul them away from their native home to be "reintroduced" to the north cascades.

Thank you for your time.

■

Correspondence ID: 1029Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Oakville, CA 94562
United States of America
Outside Organization: United States Citizen Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 21:40:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The North Cascades have always been a haven for outdoor enthusiasts like me. It's come to my attention that grizzly bears already exist in this range, as noted by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. Introducing more would not only threaten the fragile mule deer population but also increase the risk for those of us who love the outdoors. I'm against any plans to reintroduce grizzlies in Washington. The recent incident in Stevens County, where a grizzly bear was captured, is a testament to the growing predator challenges in Washington. Our state is already grappling with managing wolves, cougars, black bears, and more. Considering the strain on our ungulate populations, I cannot support the idea of reintroducing grizzlies into the state.

Correspondence ID: 1030Project:112008Document:132104

Address: College place, WA 99324
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 22:14:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Washington state already has grizzly bears. Areas like North Cascade National Park will have them naturally if they do not have them at this point. Washington's fish and wildlife department has not proven themselves capable of properly managing predators as things stand now and adding even more grizzlies into the mix is a bad idea

Please do not add any more grizzlies to Washington, regardless of location

Correspondence ID: 1031Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 22:21:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm totally in favor of returning Grizzlies to all the places where we killed them to extinction. They belong in the North Cascades to keep it wild and natural. I agree with the draft report.

Correspondence ID: 1032Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Vancouver, WA 98664
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 22:48:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in full support of the reintroduction of Grizzlies into the North Cascades. Keeping the NCNP in it's most natural state will be what makes the park stand out from others.

Correspondence ID: 1033Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bothell, WA 98012
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 22:50:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not support reintroducing grizzly bears into the north cascades. There are far too many people recreating in the north cascades national park and pasayten wilderness area. The numbers of people continue to rise every year, and will inevitably lead to deadly grizzly bear encounters. There are just too many people - the park and pasayten are

roadless, but they are no longer truly 'wilderness' areas as the frequency and sheer volume of people recreating in the backcountry are too great for animals to behave as they did when it was untouched. Truly, it is impossible to restore these areas, especially with large apex predators - it irresponsible, to say the least, as you know for a fact it would only be a matter of time before a us citizen is killed by a reintroduced grizzly in the NCE. Look at the grizzly/human deaths and injuries in BC, Montana, and Wyoming. Once mostly uninhabited, these states are now developing at a high rate- Grizzlies and humans cannot coexist without lifes being taken. It's sad. But it's true. Those times are long past. There are just too many people in our state.

Correspondence ID: 1034Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Everson, WA 98247
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 22:52:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please don't introduce more grizzly's into Washington state. Washington state already has grizzlies in the Northeast corner of the state.

Correspondence ID: 1035Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 23:06:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I have sent comments on the issue of Grizzly introduction before, and have even set up scent stations with hopes of capturing a picture of a Grizzly in the North Cascades with a team lead by Dr. Bill Gaines a few years ago. We never got a picture on the multiple game cameras which was very disappointing. I am very much for re-introducing/restoring Grizzlies to their former habitat in the North Cascades, WA. (I wouldn't mind them also being placed in former ranges in OR and CA, but that's another day.) I know a lot of folks think that Grizzly bears will make humans nervous and scared if they are hiking or backpacking, but Grizzly bears deserve to be in land that they were removed from. I agree with Native Americans that the bears are an important cog in the ecosystem and without them, the North Cascades land isn't in harmony. We can learn to live with them as happens in Montana, AK, Canada and other areas that can support the Grizzly in the wild areas.
Please restore and protect these amazing animals.
Thank you, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 1036Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Collinsville, IL 62234
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 23:08:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Throughout the growth of this nation and especially in the era of westward expansion, grave harm has been done to natural ecosystems and wildlife populations. Much of this damage is irreparable, however when an opportunity to right a long-standing wrong presents itself, it should by all means be taken. The reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades ecosystem will not restore it to its former state as that is long lost, but it will allow for a healthy renewal of this environment and this species. I speak not only as an avid lover of the natural world, but also as a trained biologist who knows that active conservation is a worthwhile endeavor. You will no doubt hear from many special interest groups who will contend that grizzlies pose a significant risk to their communities and their livelihoods. I can understand how people hold this position, but it is not one based in scientific & historical evidence nor is it based on mutual respect for wildlife and other stakeholders. It is not right to hold hostage the enhanced viability of this ecosystem and its great natural wealth for generations to come based on the ignorance of some and the monetary interests of others. The grizzly bear has a right to

inhabit the ecosystems it was extirpated from wherever possible, and we have an obligation to make that happen so that human and apex predator can coexist as we have done for many thousands of years. Thus, I implore that the Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan be fully supported and that an experimental population of grizzly bears be established in the North Cascades Region. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 1037Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98108
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 23:18:03

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am against this idea. The last thing we need is one more animal that actively wants to eat and maim humans in Washington state. There is a reason they were hunted out 160 years ago. They attack people way more than mountain lions. Please no. I hike all over Washington and don't want to have to start to be worried about me and my daughter getting dragged out of our tent and slowly eaten over an hour.

Correspondence ID: 1038Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sammamish, WA 98075
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,01 2023 23:21:03

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzlies once roamed where Seattle downtown is. They don't coexist easily with people, and the fact that they've been displaced from places where people live is not at all surprising.

Much of North America is completely unspoiled and freely available to grizzlies. Alaska is still 99% wild, and there are many places where grizzlies outnumber people. The northern Canadian provinces are unspoiled too, as is much of British Columbia. But WA is not as wild as these places, and it will be inevitable that predator grizzlies and people will come into conflict, and people will get killed.

A friend of mine was badly mauled by a grizzly while hiking in Yellowstone park, and was lucky to survive. A death of a hiker in the greater Yellowstone Area due to a grizzly encounter occurred just this July. I am a keen hiker myself and have spent time on the PCT in northern Washington, near Ross Lake, and in Mazama and Winthrop. I've greatly appreciated the fact that these kinds of encounters cannot happen in WA, as there are no grizzlies here.

People are precious, more than grizzlies. Grizzlies are not lacking in natural habitat in North America. That is why I oppose the artificial reintroduction of grizzlies to Washington State in the strongest possible terms.

Sincerely,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 1039Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98274
United States of America

Outside Organization: American Bear Foundation of Washington Conservation/Preservation(Official Rep.)

Received: Oct,01 2023 23:27:56

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The American Bear Foundation, Washington chapter, strongly disapproves of introducing grizzly bear into the North Cascades. Grizzly bear are currently migrating on their own from Idaho and BC. The very popular and busy North Cascades will no doubt lead to lethal removal of grizzly and likely fatalities of hikers and hunters like we have seen in Montana, Wyoming and Idaho. Further more, just this week in Stevens county Washington, a grizzly was captured and

relocated. Lastly, Washington currently has a booming predator population and a struggling ungulate population depending on the species. Adding this apex quickly and unnaturally will only exacerbate this issue. Again, we do not support this rule. Let them migrate naturally.

██████████
President AFB Wa

Correspondence ID: 1040Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98274
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,01 2023 23:30:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do not support introducing grizzly bears into the north cascades or any where in Washington

Correspondence ID: 1041Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America
Outside Organization: University of Washington University/Professional Society
Received: Oct,02 2023
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am in favor of either option B or C, in which grizzly bears are reintroduced to the North Cascades. Of the two, I have a weak preference for option B, since option B includes the option to remove problem bears involved in conflicts. Designating the population as experimental/non-essential does not seem needed in order to mitigate conflicts in this ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 1042Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Torino, UN 10129
Italy
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 02:03:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Good morning,

grizzly bears need to come back in North Cascade territories.

grizzly bear is a native species of North cascade territories and need to come back in its original land.

Thanks,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 1043Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Lehi, UT 84043
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 05:07:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I felt compelled to voice my concerns about the potential reintroduction of grizzly bears in Washington. It's undeniable that grizzlies are already making their way into the state from neighboring regions. The absence of physical barriers means they can migrate naturally. Given the state's challenges in managing its existing wildlife, introducing another apex predator seems counterproductive.

Correspondence ID: 1044Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sultan, WA 98294
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 05:15:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We do not need grizzlies to be reintroduced. They have been working there way here for years. If they are meant to be here they will find there way here. Our deer and elk have had a hard enough time with all the wolves and cougars. Please do not reintroduce grizzlies back in Washington

Correspondence ID: 1045Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Brier, WA 98036
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 06:01:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No, do not introduce grizzly bears into the Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 1046Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Woodland park, CO 80863
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 06:19:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not think that a human forced grizzly bear reintroduction into Washington is a good idea for a couple reasons; the first being that grizzlies are already naturally migrating into Washington from surrounding states and provinces making this a wasteful use of taxpayer dollars that could instead be used to benefit public lands and all wildlife as opposed to just one predator species. Second I have personally spent a lot of time in grizzly bear country in Wyoming and Idaho and genuinely do not enjoy those experiences (hiking, backpacking, etc) as much as I do in grizzly free areas like Colorado and Utah. I recommend Washington considers the psychological impact on hikers and other outdoor enthusiasts of reintroducing such a species.

Correspondence ID: 1047Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Everson, WA 98247
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 06:19:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am not in favor of re-introducing grizzly bears into the North Cascades area. There are too many people using the trails for hiking and camping now in our area. We have noticed a lot more people hiking trails in the last couple of years than we've ever seen before. Someone will end up getting injured or killed by the bears. People's safety needs to take priority. No grizzly bears please!

Correspondence ID: 1048Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Vancouver, WA 98686
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 07:21:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Washington is not ready for a planned grizzly reintroduction. The WDFW have failed to manage current wildlife populations and we are in the beginning stages of seeing their failed policies in action. A reintroduction would only make matters worse here in the state

Correspondence ID: 1049Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 07:22:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello,

Reintroducing Grizzlies to the North Cascades is a mistake and misguided attempt at controlling the planet by looking in the mirror instead of looking forward. The cascades are not the same mountains that they were when Grizzlies thrived there in the past. The human to bear interaction is already high in the area with only black bear. The daily visits of people deep into the cascades is exponentially higher than it used to be and is increasing annually at an accelerating pace which will cause risk to both human and bear populations.

Please do not bring Grizzlies back to the north cascades.

Thank you,

Correspondence ID: 1050Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Port Orchard, WA 98367
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 07:33:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am always going to fight to advocate for bear welfare. Yet, I cannot support the reintroduction of the grizzly bear. Washington state already hosts this formidable predator. With the challenges the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife faces in managing the rising numbers of black bear, cougar, and wolves, introducing a larger and more aggressive predator seems like a step in the wrong direction.

Until the commission can properly manage the existing predators in this state adding more would be a detriment to the already struggling ungulate populations. As a conservationist, I am strongly opposed to this proposal.

Correspondence ID: 1051Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Orting, WA 98360
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 07:34:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Washington is already home to a variety of predators including wolves, cougars, black bears, and coyotes. Washington's ungulate populations, such as elk, deer, moose, mountain goats, and the endangered woodland caribou, are under strain. Introducing more apex predators would further imbalance its delicate ecosystem. Again, much of this is a consequence of decisions made within the state to properly manage existing species.

Bringing grizzlies in would also destroy the population of the other animals while the state's Wildlife Commission is out to ban predator hunting altogether.

Correspondence ID: 1052Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Yakima, WA 98901
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 07:39:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Much prefer natural growth/migration, if it occurs, to any kind of managed reintroduction.

Correspondence ID: 1053Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ider, AL 35981
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 07:54:10

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support re-introducing grizzlies into the North Cascades. I also support any future plans designed to give grizzlies back their natural habitat. I support keeping grizzlies on the Endangered List. I hear the arguments from the opposition. But in that opposing voice is fear narrative, propagated by those with selfish and self-serving intentions.

Grizzlies are not the monsters that some portray them to be. Replacing that fear with respect and education will create an environment where human and bear can live together. Dominance is never an answer to any problem.

Re-introduce the Grizzly Bears!

Protect and defend the Grizzly Bears!

Protect and defend Grizzly habitat!

Correspondence ID: 1054Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Pateros, WA 98816
United States of America

Outside Organization: Chelan Fire & Rescue Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 08:07:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As someone that lives in the foothills in the cascades and have had both mountain lions and wolves kill deer on my property this reintroduction has a much likely higher chance to impact my family than 99% of those commenting. I am a avid hunter, hiker and farmer so again this will impact me more than most. All that being said i fully support the most aggressive reintroduction of grizzlies in the North Cascades.

Thanks for your time

Correspondence ID: 1055Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Chelan, WA 98816
United States of America

Outside Organization: Lake Chelan Llamas Business(Official Rep.)

Received: Oct,02 2023 08:10:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We have a ranch in the area and our family hails back to our 1907 homesteading grandfather. While we are admirers of grizzly bears, we definitely do NOT, that is we do NOT, want them in our region out of definite safety concerns for us, our children, grandchildren, and our livestock..

Correspondence ID: 1056Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mercer island, WA 98040
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 08:13:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No no no no no no no no.

Please do not introduce grizzly bears into the Cascades.

No no no no no no no no.

No.

Correspondence ID: 1057Project:112008Document:132104

Address: OROVILLE, WA 98844
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 08:19:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears should not be reintroduced in Washington. I live in the Okanogan Highlands and close to the areas that will be impacted by the presence of these animals. I believe the safety of residents, rancher's livestock and the general public that want to use the land where the government wants to release grizzlies is much more important than the short-sighted wishes of a few environmentalist and government agencies. Those parties wanting to release these bears don't have to live with the very real threat and danger of being forced to live in close proximity to these apex predators. I strongly oppose this and everyone of my friends and neighbors that live in the Chesaw Washington area) also oppose the introduction of these bears where we live, work and play.

Correspondence ID: 1058Project:112008Document:132104

Address: OROVILLE, WA 98844
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 08:22:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears should not be reintroduced in Washington. I live in the Okanogan Highlands and close to the areas that will be impacted by the presence of these animals. I believe the safety of residents, rancher's livestock and the general public that want to use the land where the government wants to release grizzlies is much more important than the short-sighted wishes of a few environmentalist and government agencies. Those parties wanting to release these bears don't have to live with the very real threat and danger of being forced to live in close proximity to these apex predators. I strongly oppose this and everyone of my friends and neighbors that live in the Chesaw Washington area) also oppose the introduction of these bears where we live, work and play.

Correspondence ID: 1059Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kalama, WA 98625
United States of America

Outside Organization: N/A Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 08:33:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Washington can't even manage the wildlife they have now properly. This commission doesn't need anymore issues. They are a train wreck at best. Washington in NOT ready to manage another large carnivore. We already have them in the state no need to do what is already taking place.

Correspondence ID: 1060Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spanaway, WA 98387
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 08:43:08

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We do not need to bring more grizzly's to Washington state as they are already here.

Correspondence ID: 1061Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98112
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 08:45:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am thoroughly against reintroducing grizzly bears to the North Cascades National Park. I have enjoyed the beautiful nature that the North Cascades has to offer for many years and have always felt safe knowing that there weren't any apex predators in the park. I am able to thoroughly be at peace within the park and take in the beauty of it all.

Reintroducing grizzly bears to the park would limit my time there. I do not feel safe in grizzly country even though I carry bear spray and have been trained in how to use it. I've visited many of the US National Parks, including Glacier National Park almost every year. Each time I visit Glacier, I am on alert and in a heightened state of stress because I am aware that I am an intruder to the bears habitat and that they are the apex predator in the ecosystem. I don't feel safe visiting national parks with large grizzly populations. The amount of fatal and gruesome grizzly attacks have been increasing in recent years. As a recent example, a couple and their dog were killed hiking while in Banff National Park of Canada, who were very experienced in the Backcountry.

Please do not reintroduce grizzly bears. There are plenty of areas in nearby proximity to the Pacific Northwest that have grizzly bears if people need to see them and study them. Please leave this beautiful safe and popular area alone and free of Grizzlies. Please also respect the Washington State statute that banned the reintroduction of grizzly bears in the state. Reintroduction is not what the people want.

Correspondence ID: 1062Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Portland, OR 97218
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 08:47:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Don't do it. What are they going to eat? The endangered salmon? The caribou (absent)? The diseased elk herds (dwindling)? Maybe the growing wolf population...? This idea is bad and will cause human-grizzly conflicts that will result in the destruction of problem bears. Let's just allow grizzly bears to expand their territory on their own, which likely already includes Washington state. Doing nothing will save both human and grizzly lives, and it's the least expensive option as well.

Correspondence ID: 1063Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Roslyn, WA 98941
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 08:49:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Introducing aggressive animals in close proximity to people is not safe for the people or the animals. Be prepared for more stories like this one; when this happens in the North Cascades, the people arguing for this artificial re-introduction should have to explain their reasoning to the loved ones of their victims.

Grizzly bear kills couple and their dog in Canada <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-us-canada-66985549>

Correspondence ID: 1064Project:112008Document:132104

Address: salem, UN 97317
France

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 08:49:45

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think that species who belongs to a specific geographic are in great need to be reintroduced so as to reach an ecological balance disrupted by humans over the centuries. This with the caveat that they are not brought back only to be hunted again a few years from now. This reintroduction should be paired up with public education on how to share our territory with these magnificent creatures.

Correspondence ID: 1065Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Missoula, MT 59803
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 08:52:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am in support of reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 1066Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Sprague River, OR 97639
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 09:11:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Our family has been in the PNW for five generations and the outdoors and the North Cascades are where we enjoy backpacking and climbing. I cannot enjoy those activities in BC because of grizzlies. Black bears are not a problem, but grizzlies are deadly dangerous. I do not want grizzlies re-introduced to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 1067Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Portland, OR 97211
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 09:16:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do not support moving more grizzlies into the north cascades. Grizzly bears are protected, and will already find ways to move into suitable habitat on their own. Forcing their reintroduction is not something I support for animals not facing serious threats to their existence. Grizzly bears are doing very well in the glacier and GYE ecosystems, no known threats exist to their survival on those landscapes.

Please do not move grizzlies into North Cascades National Park, let them get there on their own.

Correspondence ID: 1068Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Chelan, WA 98816
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 09:21:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: It is a terrible idea to reintroduce Grizzly bears. The native Mule deer and the numbers of Moose would have a much tougher time trying to survive.

Correspondence ID: 1069Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Port Orchard, WA 98367
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 09:21:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Washington State is neither ready, nor in need of grizzlies to be reintroduced into the state. Grizzlies are naturally migrating into the state naturally. Natural migration allows existing ecosystems to adjust to the addition of an additional apex predator to the landscape. In addition, the current department of fish and wildlife commission is neither able nor willing to actively manage the current predator populations in the state. Human and wildlife conflicts are stacking up

while ungulate populations struggle as a result of a commission that is actively disregarding the departments staff and biologist recommendations and making rulings guided by social pressures instead of science or mandate guidance. The commission has violated multiple laws and position guidelines to enact policies benefiting a niche minority of the population who place their personal values above proven management practices and best available science. Recent rulings have eliminated a long-standing Blackbear management hunt in spite of support from the hunt by the departments leading predator biologist and director of the Department of Fish and Wildlife. Blackbear are currently the most successful big game species in North America with populations actively expanding in every area that the bears exist, and Washington ranking in the top 5 Blackbear populations in the country. Currently the department is being burdened with petitions from animal welfare activist groups to further tie the departments hands when responding to depredation cases and calling for elimination of mountain lion recreational hunts when conflict removal numbers continue to climb in the state.

Montana, Wyoming and Idaho, all states who have abundant habitat and prey populations as well as historic support of department management of large predators, are currently unable to adequately manage their existing grizzly populations and are seeing higher numbers of conflict removals as a result. When the grey wolf populations were considered recovered in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem (GYE) the state game departments were prevented from effectively managing the predator for 10 years due to litigation from animal welfare activists. Currently, grizzlies in those states have pushed well past recovery objectives and the states are not able to manage them as a game species as was intended. The fact states with adequate prey populations, suitable habitat and historic support of effective management practices are not able to manage these large predators should completely take the proposal to reintroduce this controversial species off the table. How would a state that has none of those essential factors ever have a chance at successfully reintroducing grizzlies to our already imbalanced fragmented ecosystems?

Due to these reasons and many more, I feel that it would be not only inappropriate bur irresponsible to reintroduce Grizzlies into Washington state at this time. With a fish and wildlife commission who is not held accountable to following department guidelines and is enacting policy based on personal agenda and social pressure, the forced reintroduction of an additional apex predator would put further strain on the departments already taxed resources and staff. The department has not yet been able to implement effective means of managing the current populations of the last apex predator that was introduced, the grey wolf, and adding grizzlies to that charge would push the department well past their capacities, setting up not only the department but prey species for catastrophic failure. I hope you take these factors into account when making a decision on whether or not to force the reintroduction of grizzlies into a state who in neither able nor willing to effectively manage their current predator populations.

Correspondence ID: 1070Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 09:29:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I oppose introducing grizzlies into the North Cascades. I believe that if they want to be there, they will find their way there. Allow nature to take its restorative course if she so chooses. Furthermore, from a hiker's perspective, one less predator in the woods is a good thing.

Correspondence ID: 1071Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lynden, WA 98264
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 09:31:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: due to the increased probability of human / wildlife conflicts and the dangers of introducing another apex predator to the Cascades, I am in favor of alternative A: No Action. Let the Bear population increase naturally to limit the possibility of loss of life. We already see human / wildlife conflict due to Cougars and Black Bears and recent deaths from these interactions within the State. It strikes me that cost of life and societal impacts are not adequately considered when making these decisions.

Correspondence ID: 1072Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 09:32:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We would love to see Grizzly bears introduced into Whatcom county. Nature is always welcomed and respected. Please greatly consider this natural beauty for whatcom county. Plus it might help to keep the deer population at bay.

Correspondence ID: 1073Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98112
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 09:34:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I fully support grizzly bears being reintroduced to the Cascades. The wilderness belongs to animals, and we are visitors in their home.

Correspondence ID: 1074Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Portland, OR 97203
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 09:34:58

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Having worked in that area in the 70s, I do not feel using the area to introduce grizzly bears from other regions a prudent idea. If North Cascades National Park is an environment that will support grizzlies, they will naturally migrate from British Columbia as fires in that area have consumed some of their habitat. The reintroduction of wolves to the area, although I initially thought it a good idea, has caused much consternation among the residents of North Central Washington.

Correspondence ID: 1075Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98109
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 09:45:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: 2 killed in suspected grizzly bear attack in Canada's Banff National Park

Updated 10:46 AM EDT, Mon October 2, 2023

--

Two people are dead after a suspected grizzly bear attack in Canada's Banff National Park, officials said.

Rescuers were first alerted to the incident around 8 p.m. Friday after receiving "an alert from an inReach/GPS device indicating a bear attack," the national park said in a statement.

The alert said the incident happened in the Red Deer River Valley area of the park, which is in the Canadian Rocky Mountains.

"Parks Canada immediately mobilized a Wildlife Human Attack Response Team whose members are specially trained in responding to wildlife attacks," Banff National Park said in the statement. "Weather conditions at the time did

not allow for helicopter use, and the response team travelled through the night to the location by ground."

Police tape blocks off part of West Yellowstone, Montana, after a fatal bear attack in July.

A grizzly bear that killed a woman earlier this year gets euthanized after breaking into a house with a cub to steal food. The response team arrived at the site around 1 a.m. Saturday and found two people dead and a grizzly bear displaying aggressive behavior, the statement said.

Parks Canada staff euthanized the bear "to ensure public safety," and Royal Canadian Mounted Police officers arrived at the scene to assist in transporting the victims to Sundre, Alberta, about 75 miles northwest of Calgary, officials said.

"This is a tragic incident, and Parks Canada wishes to express its sincere condolences to the families and friends of the victims," the statement said.

The deadly suspected grizzly attack in Canada happened just weeks a grizzly bear linked to the death of a woman in July near West Yellowstone was euthanized in Montana after breaking into a home through a window with a cub and taking a container of dog food.

In 2020, the same bear was also involved in an encounter that injured a person near Henrys Lake State Park in Idaho, Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks said in a news release.

The male cub who was near the adult grizzly was captured and was being held in Helena at the agency's wildlife rehabilitation center before it was set to be transferred to a zoo, officials said.

And last month, portions of Custer Gallatin National Forest near Big Sky, Montana, were closed after a person was attacked by a grizzly bear while hunting, officials said.

Banff National Park, Canada's first national park, is a popular attraction for tourists, known for its picturesque turquoise waters. Parks Canada notes the park is "home to hundreds of species, including grizzly bears,

Correspondence ID: 1076Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ephrata, WA 98823
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 09:55:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Introducing another apex predator into Washingtons eco-system will bring far more problems than we (WA citizens) have now with wolves. Grizzlies also kill people. I just read an article today where a Grizzly bear killed a couple and their dog in Banff National Park Canada. The food supply for this large carnivore will be in direct conflict with the many wolf packs in our state which have already decimated elk and deer populations in many NE Washington counties. The wolves are also pushing cougars into southern counties, another carnivore in competition for food.

Grizzlies will also pose a threat to many hikers, campers, hunters and rural communities in the north cascades, in fact a woman has been dealing with a mother and cubs killing her farm animals for years in Colville. The WDFW told her it wasn't a grizzly. Now a grizzly has been trapped by the WDFW in Colville "the Onion Creek area after killing her chickens. Where did they take this grizzly?

Wolves have already caused hundreds of thousands in livestock damage, what do you think grizzlies will do? They are not afraid of people and people are on the bears menu. BEAR SPRAY does not work against the large carnivores.

This foolishness needs to stop. Washingtonians should decide, not the federal government or some person/ organization living in another state. It won't directly affect them.

Please do not do this.

Correspondence ID: 1077Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Deming, WA 98244
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 09:58:21

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzly bears into the North Cascades ecosystem. I live in rural Whatcom County in the foothills of Mt. Baker. Since moving here 20 years ago, I have educated myself to learn to live with wildlife, such as black bear and cougar, and how to avoid conflict with them. I believe education is a crucial component to the grizzly bear restoration plan to minimize conflict and harm to humans, the bears themselves, and to domestic animals. Grizzly bears once freely roamed this land and are an important part of the ecosystem, and I believe we need to learn to live among them.

Correspondence ID: 1078Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Battle Ground, WA 98604
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 10:03:48

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We should be very very hesitant about introducing Grizzlies to the National Park. Grizzlies are already found in WA state and will make their way their eventually, we do not need to encourage them.

Just this last weekend (weekend of 9/30) two people and their dog were killed by a grizzly in a Canadian park. If grizzlies find their way naturally to the park so be it, but we should not be encouraging or wasting our money on such a dangerous pursuit.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 1079Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98107
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 10:07:15

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the return of Grizzley Bears to the North Cascades ecosystem. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 1080Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mill Creek, WA 98012
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 10:08:52

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support reintroducing grizzly bears under section 10(j) of the Endangered Species Act that would provide local communities more flexibility to manage the grizzly bear population with additional wildlife management tools.

Correspondence ID: 1081Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lynnwood, WA 98037
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 10:16:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Reintroducing Grizzly Bears to the North Cascades could pose a safety concern for campers and hikers. This is especially true around the Lake Diablo and Ross lake area. The North Cascades are also very popular areas for prospecting for minerals and gemstones which are often located off the beaten path deep in the woods where Grizzly Bears are likely to reside if reintroduced into planned areas of the North Cascades. Bear spray will do little if a bear decides to make a meal out of you. I would like to know if there has been a study done on the positive for reintroduction of Grizzlies or someone just decided it's a good idea to bring them back in the areas. The last time there was a population of 100-200 (the number goal fish and game is aiming for in the future) there was a lot less people that visited the areas that fish and game want to release the bears.. I don't think it would be wise to bring back the bears in the North Cascades, too many people doing recreational activities. The moment someones life is lost it will have been to late. Think carefully if this is a smart move. I think the area is too occupied by people most of the year. That's my thoughts, my opinion. I'm sure others share my concern as well, my friends think the same as I do, that's where part of this came from, our discussions about the reintroduction of Grizzlies in the North Cascades. Some of them said they would stop going to campgrounds in those areas as for fear of brown Bears.

Correspondence ID: 1082Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Portland, OR 97213
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 10:19:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I highly support the reintroduction of grizzly bears into the NCE.

Correspondence ID: 1083Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Tacoma, WA 98406
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 10:20:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Regarding the proposal to reintroduce grizzly bears to the north cascade national park. Grizzly bears should not be brought into the park. If they choose to move into the park more over time so be it, but we should not encourage this. Grizzlies are dangerous to the public when they grow in numbers as they have in much of the west. There are more attacks and negative encounters every year. Their protected status prevents them from being hunted and developing a sense of danger from humans. They also harm the deer, moose, and elk populations. Having hiked and backpacked in heavy bear county throughout the west , Canada and Alaska it is a blessing to not have to worry about grizzlies when hiking in Washington state. We should not encourage more of them until they are better regulated on a national level. There should be experienced predator wildlife biologists involved in this decision as well as the local community around the park . This is a bad idea in my opinion. Please consider my comments as you move forward.

Correspondence ID: 1084Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Shoreline, WA 98133
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 10:31:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Love me our NP, NCNP, and bears in general. That said, Humans are kinda dumb. You're going to continue to get people leaving food out, taking dogs off leash, and generally creating an environment that is conducive to Grizz threatening the well meaning hikers and families.

I am AGAINST introducing Grizzly to NCNP. For reference I visit the park 4x times per year and recreate between the Puget sound and the Methow Valley on a yearly basis.

If Grizz were introduced, I would be less likely to take my family of 4 to the park for recreation purposes.

Correspondence ID: 1085Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Portland, OR 97232
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 10:39:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I was born and raised in Washington state and I still hunt and fish there on a regular basis. I do not think Washington State is ready for a grizzly bear re-introduction.

Currently and in the recent past WDFW commissioners have proved that they are not qualified to manage large predators. I.e.they voted to cancel spring black bear season even though that scientific data shows that the black bear population can definitely sustain a spring harvest.

Please do not introduce another large predator that Washingtonians will have to deal with, while having a wildlife commission that will not support them in managing this predator even when scientific evidence (or human safety) supports management.

It has been proven in the Yellowstone area and the Glacier park area that it is very difficult to de list grizzly bears, even if they reach set population metrics. With how hard it is to de-list and Washington's anti predator hunting wildlife commission, grizzly bears in Washington would most likely never be able to be managed correctly.

Let Grizzlies come to Washington naturally but do not force us to have to deal with an introduction.

Correspondence ID: 1086Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Portland, OR 97211
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 10:41:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am in support of reintroducing Grizzly bears to the North Cascades ecosystem

Correspondence ID: 1087Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Cataldo, ID 83810
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 10:48:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The recent grizzly bear incident in Stevens County and countless incidents in Montana and British Columbia is a clear indication of the challenges we face with predators in Washington. Washington state is already stretched thin managing various predators. Given the pressures on our ungulate populations, reintroducing grizzlies seems unwise. How many more human casualties and disfigurements will it take for this to make sense that we do not need to speed up the process.

Correspondence ID: 1088Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Concrete, WA 98237
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 10:49:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I believe the Grizzly Bears should be allowed to come back into the North Cascade Eco system by Natural Recovery! There is currently opportunity for Grizzly Bears to moved down from British Columbia if they wanted.

The current hunting laws would protect them in order to establish a population.

Moving Grizzly Bears from a different Eco system would impact the current wild life in the Cascade range area. The transplanted bears would not have been imprinted the Cascade Eco system. They would cause decrease food sources whether it be plant based or protein from wildlife or fish! This increase need for protein will force more elk, deer and like animals to move out the mountains down into populated areas within the Cascade range. There is already current issues with the increased Elk herds staying in lower populated areas. In time I believe they would also learn how to seek and catch Salmon as they swim up rivers to spawn. It will change the other predator ranges such as black bear, wolves, cougars and others as they seek food and living spaces.

In closing I would like to say let Nature take her own course! If Grizzly Bears are intended to be in the North Cascade ranges they will come on their own!

Correspondence ID: 1089Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Deer Harbor, WA 98243
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 10:56:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the draft plan and environmental impact statement that takes a major step in bringing grizzly bears back to a suitable ecosystem spanning from Washington State into British Columbia.

The North Cascades is one of North America's intact ecosystems, but it is incomplete without grizzly bears. The grizzly has immeasurable ecological and cultural value for our ecosystems and communities. We have a unique opportunity and obligation to restore the grizzly to an important part of its traditional home.

The NCE is one of two federal grizzly recovery areas without an established population of bears, and natural bear migration is unlikely to repopulate it. Instead, based on research, wildlife biologists suggest safely relocating existing bears into the North Cascades.

In 2020 more than 159,000 members of the public wrote comments supporting the reintroduction of grizzlies. Grizzlies and humans coexist elsewhere and many people recognize that grizzlies were here before us and we should make room for them.

Correspondence ID: 1090Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98506
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 10:59:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am a 4th generation Washingtonian from a family who's recreated in our great outdoors over over 100 years. I grew up in the Cascade mountains and have visited them countless times. I strongly oppose this restoration project.

I have one response to the proposal to reintroduce grizzly bears into the North Cascades: FOR WHOSE BENEFIT? For the bears or for humans? It's abundantly clear that where the bears USED to live has radically changed such that reintroduction equates to not to saving bears but *killing* bears. Restoration is impossible given how radically that ecosystem has changed with people now penetrating every part of what was once wilderness.

The National Park is doing nothing but setting these magnificent animals up for eventual euthanizing because it is CERTAIN that bears will attack the humans who are already occupying what is supposed to become new grizzly bear habitat. We only have to look at the endless euthanizings that occur elsewhere each year to know where this wrong-headed proposal is going:

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/2023/10/02/grizzly-bear-killed-couple-national-park-canada-euthanized/>

I ask biologists and park officials and anyone making decisions on this to ask themselves: "For whose benefit?" because the clear answer to this question is not "the bears."

Thank you for considering my concerns,


Olympia, WA

Correspondence ID: 1091Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Vancouver, WA 98664
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 11:02:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Bring them back! They belong in their natural habitat. And, just so you know, I am an avid hiker and used to also backpack.

Correspondence ID: 1092Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Maple Valley, WA 98038
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 11:06:31

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Basically, the blood of every single human that is killed by a re-introduced grizzly in Washington state will be 100% on the hands of the grizzly bear recovery specialists, and by all the misguided souls who think it is a good idea to overrun the Washington state constitution and the will of the people of Washington, who by a vast majority do NOT want these apex predators in our state.

Correspondence ID: 1093Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 11:15:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I downloaded the draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan and appreciate the opportunity to comment as a resident of Washington State who enjoys outdoor recreation and appreciates the rights of animal species to live in their traditional range. However, I am writing not in support of the alternatives to reintroduce the bears and instead, support the "No Action" alternative. I base this opinion on two factors: (1) the phrase "wilderness character" is misleading because the heavy use of the region by PCT and other hikers now has inevitably changed the character of the environment. This is one of the flaws in the Wilderness Act because, in a "Heisenberg Principle" manner, people inevitably change the character of a region. (2) the phrase "native habitat" is also used and I am not sure the habitat can now be defined the same way as in the period when the bears were extirpated. It may be that the bears naturally filter in from BC on their own and adapt to changed conditions, but I do believe there is no such things as management of bears or management of the natural habitat. There is only management of people. Until the increasing population of our state and increased demand for outdoor recreation is contained, I do not see a good future for released bears under this plan. I personally am starting to evaluate the potential harm I do by wanting to hike in more remote areas and am trying to limit my hiking to areas closer to population centers.

Correspondence ID: 1094Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Burns, OR 97720
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 11:16:15

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: After reading the EIS. I prefer Alternative A: No Action

I believe natural recovery is the best solution for restoration of this area. Our climate and human population density is completely different from historic times when the bears were present.

The project goal of 200 bears in this area seems excessive considering the current recreation use and the number of campgrounds. Assuming bears and humans can coexist is unrealistic. Just look at Montana, with the increase in bear numbers there is an increase human death and injury.

There is also no mention of how the keep the population at 200.

There is also no mention what the estimated cost to the taxpayer is for this effort. I would like my tax dollars spent on more multiple use projects.

This EIS is a idealistic Disney like approach and the reality is that an apex predator will not follow your idealistic views.

Correspondence ID: 1095Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ridgefield, WA 98642
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 11:19:56

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am against reintroduction of grizzly bear populations in Washington state. While I empathize with the well-meaning ecological intent of this action, grizzly bears pose a real and serious threat to outdoor enthusiasts, as evidenced by the deaths of two hikers and their pet in Banff National Park at the hands of a grizzly his past weekend. The same threats that have eradicated their population will result in pressure (specifically a need for territory, food, etc.) to attack humans if they are reintroduced to the state. This is a bad idea and will needlessly risk lives of WA residents.

<https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/grizzly-bear-kills-couple-canada-banff-b2422207.html>

I would like to request this comment not be publicly posted for privacy reasons.

Correspondence ID: 1097Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Salem, OR 97306
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 11:29:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of grizzly bears to their rightful habitat in the North Cascades. I believe it is important to acknowledge the role of the government and citizens (from colonization onwards) played in decimating the population of grizzly bears. I also believe it is of utmost importance to do all we can to protect local populations of all vulnerable species. Our ecosystems are out of balance because of our actions. It's time to try to fix our mistakes.

Correspondence ID: 1098Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Springfield, OR 97477
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 11:36:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: It is time to recover the grizzly bear population to public lands in Northern Washington State. These lands and grizzlies belong to all Americans and decisions about their recovery are not the sole purview of local private interests. Science, not politics should drive all decisions about grizzly recovery.

Correspondence ID: 1099Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Toledo, WA 98591
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 11:42:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Nature is already restoring the balance on it's own. Don't waste valuable resource and money on this issue when there are other far more important and pressing issues.

Correspondence ID: 1100Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Portland, OR 97229
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 11:44:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Greetings,

I think Alternative A is the best course of action. Do nothing and let recovery happen naturally if it does at all. Understanding that transporting bears out of areas that might already have endemic diseases among the bear population that we might not completely understand how it may affect the limited local population. The resources needed for a reintroduction program and the post reintroduction management can be better allocated to help manage the ecosystem in it's current and most recent state. I would prefer that resources go into caribou preservation in WA, although their historic range in the Selkirks is likely out of NPS management.

I recreate in OR, WA and MT, in areas that have both black bears and grizzlies. I don't mind having grizzly bears on the landscape and appreciate the place they have in the ecosystem. However, I think we have many places that are doing just fine without the re-introduction of grizzlies - and we are not well prepared for the (new) impact it might have. I think Golden Gate Park is a prime example of a place where grizzlies were extirpated, that we wouldn't try to re-introduce them to try to go back to how things used to be.

Respectfully,

Correspondence ID: 1101Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Roseburg, OR 97470
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 11:50:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Let the grizzly bears reintegrate themselves.
Look at the problems Yellowstone NP is having with ranchers killing bears that cross park boundary.
At North Cascades NP the bears probably cross back and forth to BC.
Increasing grizzly presence could endanger PCT hikers and other recreation users. [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 1102Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98112
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 11:55:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am deeply concerned about the proposal to reintroduce grizzly bears into NCNP, and I believe it poses significant challenges for both the local community and the bears themselves.

For the People:

Lifestyle Adjustments: Washingtonians have cultivated a way of life that embraces the outdoors, often without the looming threat of grizzly encounters. Activities like solo trail runs, hiking without bear spray, or simply enjoying the tranquility of nature without constantly making noise have become second nature. Introducing grizzlies would necessitate a drastic change in these habits.

Accessibility Concerns: While the risk of fatal bear encounters remains statistically low, the mere presence of grizzlies can deter many from exploring the outdoors. This could disproportionately affect families, the elderly, and those new to outdoor activities, creating a psychological barrier that limits their engagement with nature.

Economic Implications: The outdoor recreation industry, a significant contributor to Washington's economy, might face challenges. Tourists unfamiliar with bear-safe practices might opt for destinations perceived as safer, impacting local businesses that rely on tourism.

For the Bears:

Inevitable Human Encounters: With a dense population in Washington, especially around the Puget Sound area, human-bear interactions are not just probable but inevitable. Such frequent encounters can be stressful for the bears and lead to unpredictable behaviors.

Changed Landscape: The Washington of today is vastly different from the time when grizzlies roamed freely. Urban development, highways, and increased human activities have transformed their former habitats, making it challenging for them to thrive.

Relocation and Worse Outcomes: History has shown that when wild animals frequently encounter humans, it often doesn't end well for the animals. Whether it's being captured and relocated multiple times, or, in unfortunate circumstances, being euthanized for posing threats, the bears are likely to face adverse outcomes.

Genetic Considerations: Reintroducing a small population of bears can lead to genetic bottlenecks, which can have long-term implications for the health and diversity of the bear population.

In conclusion, while the idea of reintroducing grizzlies might seem appealing from a conservation standpoint, the practical implications for both humans and bears are concerning. I urge you to reconsider this proposal and evaluate alternative conservation strategies that ensure the safety and well-being of both the community and the bears.

Warm regards,



Correspondence ID: 1103Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Cleveland Heights, OH 44118
United States of America
Outside Organization: Self Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 11:55:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To whom it may concern,

We have been awestruck by the North Cascades area. After learning about bears, we realized lot of the public fears are overblown. Attacks are rare and humans are often at fault. My wife and I fully support plans to reintroduce Grizzly bears into

the National Park ecosystem as it proved very successful in other places already.

Thank you for considering our input,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 1104Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Rock Island, WA 98850
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 12:01:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: NPS,

As a hunter I understand the need and desire to continue bring our ecosystem back to the days of wildlife being in all their native range. The unfortunate reality is this isn't always possible.

If you aren't aware of what is going on in WA state with our predators I can give you some insight as to how most hunters feel. We are very upset and have no faith in the WDFW commission. Currently, the WDFW commission has ended black bear spring hunting, which was never on the table to end, with no return in sight. While the WDFW biologists and department as a whole support this hunt and would like this hunt to return seeing as how we have a large population of black bears. This hunt was taken by an old-standing rule saying if they do not have enough votes to completely pass a rule change, the season is cancelled. The rule change that was in question was simply carrying over ever current rule but changing only the year. With an even number of commissioners at the time (Gov. Jay Inslee had failed to fill a commission member seat for nearly a year at this point) the count was tied at 4-4 and the rule change failed, ending a long standing hunt that was around for well over 30+ years. The commission is currently looking at banning cougar and black bear hunting in general in 2024. They have projects showing that the abundance of predators is causing extreme stress on the ungulate population in WA. I feel this re-introduction would only make this problem worse for ungulates. Especially since the WDFW commission is outright anti-hunting and trying to eliminate proven science based game management.

The Northern Cascades area around Okanogan county is a main mule deer migration area and wintering area. I worry grizzlies would cause major problems during the mule deer birthing season and future fawn recruitment. I currently live in Douglas county, but my hunting areas range all along the Cascade Mt Range to the ID-WA border. Grizzly bears are currently in the NE corner of WA, as most people are aware of. I have friends in Colville WA and they are extremely upset with the predator population control in their area.

The hopeful return to all animals back into their native habitat is a cause that I support in general. But not all of the native habitat is available or usable any more due to humans. This causes conflicts, strain on resources and many other negative outcomes.

With grizzly bears carrying an Endangered Species designation it would allow another apex predator onto the landscape with no way to manage these bears properly if the population were to meet objective or surpass objective.

As a hunter, I do believe these animals deserve to be on their home range. Same as elk, buffalo, deer, wolves and every other animal. But I believe these animals need to be managed properly. Currently in WA state we do not have the means to do this with the current commission in place and their desire to abolish hunting in general. I am against this reintroduction until the WDFW commission is not outright trying to ban predator hunting and hunting in general in WA state.

TL:DR

I DO NOT support the reintroduction AT THIS TIME in the North Cascades due to WDFW commission's stance on predator hunting.

Thank you for reading as much or as little as you did!

Correspondence ID: 1105Project:112008Document:132104

Address: BURLINGTON, WA 98233
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 12:10:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly Bears in the North Cascades is a bad idea. We can look at other areas where they have flourished and it's hard to rationalize anything positive coming out of a reintroduction. First of all, our State Dept of Fish and Wildlife has a terrible record of managing the resources that we already have. Washington should be rich with wildlife but currently management has decimated wildlife populations throughout our state. We don't need anything more praying on our already weak deer, elk and other wildlife. Not to mention the dangers to recreationalist that use those areas for hiking and camping. Don't get me wrong, I'm a hunter and would love to bag a nice grizzly if there was a season but I'm fine going somewhere else to it. I just read this morning where two people and a dog were left for dead in Banff National Park in Canada. Why play Russian Roulette with the citizens of Washington. Eventually someone will die but none of the people making these decisions will take responsibility. Bad idea from the get go.

Correspondence ID: 1106Project:112008Document:132104

Address: maple valley, WA 98038
United States of America

Outside Organization: Point Defiance Zoo & Aquarium Business(Official Rep.)

Received: Oct,02 2023 12:10:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello,

I wanted to strongly encourage the Park Service to support the proposed action plans and reintroduce Grizzly bears into the North Cascades. I have followed other reintroduction efforts (such as the Burying Beetle) and have seen the success in the flexibility of the nonessential experimental populations, however I worry that this status may not provide enough financial support for the reintroduction efforts of a large carnivore. I read a great book called the Carnivore Way by Christina Eisenberg and it helped me understand that due to their large range, grizzlies will need more wildlife overpasses/tunnels installed along the highways running through the North Cascades in order for the population to utilize the habitat. Grizzly bears and other large carnivores are a vital part of our ecosystems in Washington and I support their coexistence with the humans that call our state their home. Lets keep Washington Wild!

Thanks for your time,

Correspondence ID: 1107Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tualatin, OR 97062
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 12:12:10

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly support restoring grizzly bear populations in the North Cascades. These omnivores play a critical role in the health of the North Cascades ecosystem. As the climate changes, it is critical that we do all we can to ensure that our remaining natural environments are as healthy as possible and restoring grizzlies should be part of these efforts.

Additionally, as we've seen with other species restoration efforts, revitalizing charismatic megafauna populations can attract tourism which in turn can support local rural communities. This is certainly true of the highly popular Katmai Grizzlies

"Fat Bear Week." There's no reason to expect that grizzly bears in the North Cascades would be any less of a draw for tourism to Northern Washington.

Correspondence ID: 1108Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Malaga, WA 98828
United States of America
Outside Organization: WA Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 12:12:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Again and again we, the People, speak out against this concept of bringing a deadly apex predator to live among us in our back yards. Yet again and again, despite overwhelming scientific and public evidence and disdain, the drive to bring Grizzly bears to this state, at the extreme risk to human life continues to resurface.

There is no need nor a want to have these dangerous creatures in the forests and mountains we love to recreate within. Only harm and hurt will be the outcome of this eventuality due to the Federal dollars the politicians crave, all of whom will not be living with bears in their backyards in Olympia.

If they truly believed in this concept they would bring the bears back to Olympia and Seattle but of course they will bring them to Eastern Washington for us to suffer as they kill our livestock, wild game populations and any person foolish enough to go hike within the bears territory.

For the love of God and what is right, please do NOT bring Grizzly bears here!

Correspondence ID: 1109Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 12:25:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly Bear attacks on humans are becoming more frequent and are often deadly to both parties. As a Backpacker in the North Cascades I feel introducing Grizzly Bears back into this habitat is risky and will cause death to humans who frequent this area.

Correspondence ID: 1110Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Vancouver, WA 98685
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 12:34:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As someone who hunts and spends a lot of time outdoors around big game, I would strongly caution against the reintroduction of Grizzly Bears to the North Cascades. The State of Washington and WDFW struggles to effectively manage the Black Bear population and human to bear encounters are becoming more frequent and dangerous. With the recent closure of the spring bear hunting season, it should be expected that black bear populations will continue to grow impacting the overall ecosystem. Grizzly Bears are apex predators and without an effective management plan (including a viable hunting season), their population will explode, further changing the current ecosystem and causing danger to humans. I was recently in Alberta Canada and was tracked and charged by 2 boar grizzly bears with 24 hours of each other. Their lack of an effective management system is creating a bear population that is not only unafraid of humans, but actively hunting them. If Washington state goes down the same path, people will be in danger.

Correspondence ID: 1111Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Arlington, WA 98223
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 12:37:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: These Animals eat and kill people. You would be playing with people's lives and safety. As many campers and hikers and fisherman visit the North Cascades each year, this would be completely irresponsible for putting people's lives and safety at risk. This is public safety issue, this cannot happen. Links added below are just a few of many examples. These unfortunate soul's deaths did not happen peacefully, this is a horrific and torturous as well as gruesome way to have your life ended. Think very hard before something this irresponsible is actually carried out and executed against public safety. Thank you

<https://www.msn.com/en-us/news/world/tragic-two-people-dead-after-grizzly-bear-attack-in-canadas-banff-national-park/ar-AA1hjdkV>

<https://www.deseret.com/utah/2022/7/21/23272819/grizzly-bear-attack-montana-woman-scared-off-bear-before-bear-returned-killed-camping-investigation>

<https://apnews.com/article/grizzly-bear-attack-yellowstone-montana-d1ecb3cb3539751422196fc0ce61bb27>

<https://www.sfgate.com/national/article/Mauled-cop-was-riding-mountain-bike-at-full-speed-10983474.php>

<https://www.cbsnews.com/news/grizzly-bear-attack-yellowstone-kills-backcountry-guide/>

Correspondence ID: 1112Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 12:47:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in favor of (re)introducing Grizzly Bears to the region under active option B.

Correspondence ID: 1113Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 13:09:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am not in favor of reintroducing grizzlies into the north cascades. Our predators are already out of control. I have seen this personally as an avid outdoorsman and hunter. We do not need grizzlies coming into town and killing people on the pct and many other back packing trails.

Correspondence ID: 1114Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bothell, WA 98012
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 13:17:03

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bear kills couple and their dog in Canada

Updated Mon, October 2, 2023 at 10:34 AM PDT · 2 min read

3k

A couple was killed by an "aggressive" grizzly bear in Canada's Banff National Park, park officials said Sunday, marking at least the second fatal grizzly attack in North America since July.

At about 8 p.m. on Friday, Parks Canada Dispatch in Banff National Park received an alert of a bear attack from a GPS device. The alert location originated from within Banff National Park, in the Red Deer River Valley, officials said in a news release.

A team specially trained in responding to wildlife attacks was mobilized. Unable to use a helicopter because of poor weather conditions, the team travelled through the night to reach the location by ground. Officials arrived on-site at about 1 a.m. and discovered two people who were already dead. While in the area, the team encountered and euthanized a grizzly bear "that displayed aggressive behavior," officials said.

The Royal Canadian Mounted Police arrived on the scene at 5 a.m. and helped transport the victims to Sundre, Alberta.

Officials did not identify the victims but a family member told CBC News the people who died were a couple who were experienced backcountry hikers. The family member said the couple's dog was also killed in the attack.

"They lived for being in the backcountry and were two of the most cautious people I know. They knew bear protocol and followed it to a tee," the family member told CBC News in a statement.

Kim Titchener, a friend of the family and the founder of Bear Safety and More, told Reuters that only 14% of grizzly bear attacks are fatal, but that human-bear encounters are increasing as more people head outdoors.

"It's really just the reason why we're seeing more attacks, which is more people heading outdoors and unfortunately not being educated on this," she said.

Bow River at Banff National park near Lake Louise. / Credit: JOE KLAMAR/AFP/Getty Images

Last month, a grizzly bear that had fatally mauled a woman on a forest trail west of Yellowstone National Park in July was killed after it broke into a house near West Yellowstone.

Also in July, a 21-year-old woman who was planting trees was seriously injured by a bear in British Columbia, Canada. Officials could not locate the animal but believe it was a grizzly bear that attacked the woman. Earlier this month, a hunter in Montana was severely mauled by a grizzly.

Following the weekend attack at Banff National Park, officials closed an area around Red Deer and Panther valleys, Parks Canada said.

"This is a tragic incident, and Parks Canada wishes to express its sincere condolences to the families and friends of the victims," officials said.

This is what the NPS wants for Washington. The NPS and the Forest Service, and the sick weirdos who work there, salivate at the prospect of Washingtonians being killed by grizzlies.

Correspondence ID:	1115Project:112008Document:132104
Address:	Coburg, OR 97408 United States of America
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual
Received:	Oct,02 2023 13:20:40
Correspondence Type:	Web Form

Correspondence: Apex/keystone predators, yes. Include "grizzlies" but on one condition only and that is severely limiting PEOPLE using the North Cascades. Use a first-come/first served or lottery drawing for issuing permits and make those permits relatively expensive (and add parking fees as well!). Add even steeper fines and possibly mandatory jail time for violations of the kind increasingly reported in the news - harassing any and all wildlife, environmental destruction including by both human-powered and motorized wheels, using the North Cascades back country for illicit purposes including drug manufacture and transporting, etc. Where grizzlies are allowed to balance the ecosystem, humans would continue to disrupt that balance, plus the increasing numbers of North Cascades users mean direct wildlife encounters will be the eventual result - usually to the detriment of any and all wildlife and especially top predators. In the past before moving to Oregon I hiked the North Cascades extensively over two decades, and it was getting over-used even back then. Introduction of grizzly bears would provide the perfect opportunity to start LIMITING human use. Thank you for considering this even though I'm no longer living in the area. Oregon Public Broadcasting brought the issue to the attention of Oregonians and SW Washingtonians.

Correspondence ID: 1116Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98177
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 13:22:52

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in favor of the reintroduction of grizzly bears in the North Cascades ecosystem. I have hiked in grizzly country in Montana, Alaska, and British Columbia, and am aware of the risks involved, which I find an acceptable part of being someplace wild. After reading the document, I am in favor of Alternative C.

Correspondence ID: 1117Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98119
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 13:25:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am not in support of the grizzly bear restoration plan.

Correspondence ID: 1118Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tacoma, WA 98409
United States of America

Outside Organization: Tahoma Audubon Society Non-Governmental

Received: Oct,02 2023 13:47:31

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm writing to express my strong support of returning grizzly bears to the North Cascades.

I love the outdoors and visit/camp in the North Cascades many times a year. Its an incredible landscape that I love. Yes, it will be a little scary to think of encountering a grizzly bear because they're an enormous and powerful animal! Ultimately, they're supposed to be there. The ecosystem will benefit from their presence.

Predators are a part of the ecosystem too- -I also support reintroducing wolves to as much of their historic range as makes sense if you guys get around to it, and who cares what ranchers think- -maybe they shouldn't be grazing they cattle on tax payers' land...

Anyway, to be honest, opposition to this proposal seems to come from a neocolonial mindset. We can't wipe out whole populations just to make ourselves more comfortable. That kind of proprietary attitude toward nature is one that needs to be left in the past.

Thank you,
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 1119Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Olalla, WA 98359
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 13:53:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: YES! Please reintroduce the grizzlies back into the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 1120Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 13:55:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Yes please!!! I am a professional naturalist, writer, and filmmaker based in the Methow Valley. I hike extensively in the proposed area in order to study, research, and write about local ecology. I have a deep understanding of local ecology and the community's connection to wilderness, and I fully support this proposed action.

Correspondence ID: 1121Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98109
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 14:00:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I have a cabin in Aeneas Valley. People attract bears with fruit dumps and shoot the bears on the first morning the season opens. No bears near me for four years.
Introduce the brown bears in the N Cascades according to plan. They belong there. Monitor well and closely.
Rumor has it that 400 grizzly bears will be dumped off all at once right where people camp and hike. You have to attend to those rumors if the bears are to survive.
It's a human problem as much as a bear issue.

Correspondence ID: 1122Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Salem, OR 97306
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 14:06:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I believe that the reintroduction of the Grizzly is an important step towards restoring the traditional precolonial ecologies of the Pacific Northwest. In bringing the Grizzly back, we stand to benefit from the special relationship that the bears have with the land as protectors, seed distributors, and as predators. While Grizzlies certainly pose a danger to people who live around them, we live in a time where communicating the risks and relationships we face living around wild animals has never been easier. Through digital communication and intense community collaboration, I believe that we can foster a mutual understanding of the risks of contact between both Grizzlies and Humans, and create a world in the Pacific Northwest that works for both of us.

Correspondence ID: 1123Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Yakima, WA 98901
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 14:06:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I oppose reintroduction of grizzly bears into Washington state. Grizzly bears may well be endangered within the state of Washington, but grizzlies are far from endangered in North America. there are healthy populations in Alaska, Canada, Wyoming and Montana. The idea that a species needs to be returned to any habitat where it ever existed is silly. Should we reintroduce cougars to Central Park in New York?

I have regularly camped and hunted in the North Cascades for 38 years. I believe that the safety of myself and my friends will be in jeopardy if grizzlies are reintroduced. If the species find their own way into the area, then so be it, but having the government intentionally endangering people is unacceptable.

Correspondence ID: 1124Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ferndale, WA 98248
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 14:07:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: There's no guarantee that grizzlies released in to the North Cascades will remain there. I would consider agricultural centers such as the Skagit valley to be at risk. What would be the point of releasing grizzlies to then have to euthanize them after bear v human encounters when they are just being bears. Example:
<https://www.bellinghamherald.com/news/nation-world/world/article279985524.html>

Correspondence ID: 1125Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ellensburg, WA 98926
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 14:19:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The "No Action" alternative is my preferred selection. Continue to provide and improve habitat connectivity for the species to recolonize on its own, as it appears to be doing so with the recent captures of two grizzlies in WA (2021, 2023).

Correspondence ID: 1126Project:112008Document:132104

Address: WENATCHEE, WA 98801
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 14:33:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of grizzly bears into the NCE. The disappearance of a keystone species in the NCE will have irreparable, long-term effects. Humans can learn to live with the grizzlies, similar to how other areas in bear habitat have done. To deny reintroduction of grizzly bears to the NCE, based on the business or other human interests, is short-sighted and selfish to future inhabitants of the NCE.

Correspondence ID: 1127Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Quilcene, WA 98376
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 14:40:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to express my opposition to the introduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades National Park.

My reasons are as follows:

1. Grizzly bears are unpredictable and dangerous. While hiking in Alaska we were always tense. The constant call of "hey bear" broke any tranquility to enjoy.
2. The presence of Grizzly bears would preclude for me the opportunity to hike with my grandkids in the North Cascades.
3. Funds for reintroduction of the bears can be better used elsewhere. For example, improved trail maintenance!
4. The recent deaths of a married couple and a dog by a grizzly bear mauling in Banff Provincial Park exemplify my concern.

██████████ 10/2/23

Correspondence ID: 1128Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 14:46:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support restoration of native ecology and predator-prey relationships in the North Cascades, including the restoration of grizzly bears.

Correspondence ID: 1129Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Burien, WA 98166
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 14:53:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am a steward of our natural areas, a conservationist, a nature-nerd, lover of the outdoors and natural ecosystems, but I do NOT support the reintroduction of Grizzly Bears into WA state. This state is way too populated for an aggressive species such as grizzly bears to cohabitate with. I do not trust that the wildlife commissions and agencies will be able to properly handle such a reintroduction in a way that is safe for the people who recreate in our Parks or who live adjacent to them. Grizzly bears have already migrated their way into parts of the state and have already shown to be an issue. I understand they used to be a species that once roamed the mountains here freely, but I think it best for the overall big picture that they no longer have such a presence in Washington. The deer species will decline, more incidences of people and dogs getting attacked will rise, and ultimately bears will have to get put down anyways.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

██████████

Correspondence ID: 1130Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Beaverton, OR 97005
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 14:55:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Wanted to voice my support for this effort to restore the grizzly population.

Correspondence ID: 1131Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Portland, OR 97206
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 15:14:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the plans to reintroduce grizzly bears to the North Cascades. I would provide a defense of this position, but I think the submitted plans do that well enough. Thank you for your time.

Correspondence ID: 1132Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Clinton, WA 98236
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 15:28:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Strain on Wildlife Management: The WDFW Commission has not maximized recreational opportunities for sportsmen as directed in their mandate. With recent decisions on black bear and potential changes to mountain lion hunting, many conservationists fear the commission is failing to manage its wildlife properly. Introducing more grizzlies would exacerbate this issue. To be clear, reintroduction would not mean a grizzly bear hunting season. The point here is that the state is already under strain from mismanagement of its large population of existing predators beside grizzly bear.

Predator Balance is Essential: Washington is already home to a variety of predators including wolves, cougars, black bears, and coyotes. Washinton's ungulate populations, such as elk, deer, moose, mountain goats, and the endangered woodland caribou, are under strain. Introducing more apex predators would further imbalance its delicate ecosystem. Again, much of this is a consequence of decisions made within the state to properly manage existing species.

I do not support the plan to artificially introduce grizzly bears to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 1133Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Quincy, WA 98848
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 15:30:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Washington State DOES NOT NEED A NEW PREDITOR!!! if Grizzly bears find there way into the state great. they have every right to live where they want. We do not need to introduce another large predator to our eco system that is already struggling to maintain a healthy population of game because we have introduced other large predators (WOLFS) and FAIL to keep others in check!

Correspondence ID: 1134Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Pasco, WA 99301
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 15:35:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm glad to see Grizzly Bear relocation in the North Cascades being considered. I am all in favor of your 10(j) designation. Also referred to as Nonessential Experimental Population, (giving agencies greater management flexibilities).... Yes! to a great plan well over-due.

Correspondence ID: 1135Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Everett, WA 98208
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 15:56:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Nothing good will come from adding the grizzlies to the north cascades. I have seen a grizzly kill a moose in ancrage Alaska. Adding them will end in tragedy

Correspondence ID: 1136Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 15:59:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I've lived in WA all my life, and been an active adventurer exploring the North Cascades since 1970. I started guiding in 1977, leading people on rivers & mountains with boats, boots, bikes, & skis. I feel privileged and blessed to have shared this paradise with others. Many highlights for myself and clients/students have been animal sightings: the Skagit Salmon welcomed me just last week. Bear sightings are rare, but especially memorable-- I've been lucky a few times locally.

Grizzlies are a key link in our ecosystem and must be reintroduced and protected along with the land and resources they need to thrive.

Thank you

██████████

Correspondence ID: 1137Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tonasket, WA 98855
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 15:59:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: You all living in urban areas have no problem "introducing" grizzlies back into rural areas in north central Washington State. You won't have to live with them. My take on this is first introduce grizzlies to the National Mall in Washington D.C. and if that works out to everyone's satisfaction, introduce them to Discovery Park in Seattle as a second test. Then, if everything works well, then let's introduce them to the North Cascades. I am not talking about the grizzlies that move around as they will, I'm talking about the government keeping their inept hands out of the whole grizzly bear issue. Just this past week a grizzly was found near Colville WA and they moved it away -- and you all want to bring more in -- unnaturally. Talk about the left hand not knowing what the right hand is doing.....

Correspondence ID: 1138Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kenmore, WA 98028
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 16:00:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No re-introduction. Wast of taxpayer money and they are already here.

Correspondence ID: 1139Project:112008Document:132104

Address: North Bend, WA 98045
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 16:01:12

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The EIS statement is flawed. It mentioned only two attacks of Grizzlies in 42 years. There have been 4 fatal attacks in the US alone since 2021 and many more non-fatal interactions. This was a simple Wikipedia search which has names and dates and locations. I am personally aware of additional attacks (specifically WY elk hunters) in addition to the Wikipedia listings.

With FWS required to investigate these attacks and interactions, I find it implausible that the authors were unaware of these

incidents. This would call the objectivity of the authors into question. Minimizing the safety impact for those of us living in the recovery area.

Correspondence ID: 1140Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98118
United States of America
Outside Organization: N/A Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 16:06:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears have been part of the North Cascades landscape for thousands of years, and I would be so grateful to have this restoration project finally start. As an avid trail runner and backpacker, the North Cascades is a place I visit 7-10 times per year throughout the summer and fall months. This part of the world is so special, and deserves to have a truly wild and connected ecosystem. Grizzly bears are a vital part of creating that web!

I have spent lots of time hiking in Alberta, Alaska, and Montana where grizzly populations are much more robust. Knowing I am hiking and playing among these magnificent creatures actually makes me more aware and responsible. If I am hiking in grizzly country, I take extra special precautions when it comes to food storage and cooking. It also encourages me to hike in groups instead of solo. I believe that having grizzly bears more present in the North Cascades will force all people who use these lands for recreation to be more responsible. Learning to co-exist is an essential part of keeping these lands truly wild, and I think this project deserves to be given a true chance.

Correspondence ID: 1141Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98506
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 16:07:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I firmly oppose the reintroduction of grizzly bears into the North Cascades. It's evident that grizzlies are already finding their way into the state with recent incidents like the young grizzly in Stevens County. I believe in natural migration and proper management/conservation. The existing challenges with the black bear, cougar, and wolf populations in Washington highlight the need to avoid adding more pressure on our wildlife. As someone who frequently hikes, the thought of an increased grizzly bear population in the North Cascades is concerning. Observing the events in places like Montana and Idaho, it's clear that more bears can lead to more dangerous situations. Grizzlies have every opportunity to migrate from BC or Idaho without human intervention. I urge you to let nature dictate its path. The North Cascades have always been a haven for outdoor enthusiasts like me. With grizzly bears already existing in this range, as noted by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, introducing more would not only threaten the fragile mule deer population but also increase the risk for those of us who love the outdoors. I'm against any plans to reintroduce grizzlies in Washington. The recent incident in Stevens County, where a grizzly bear was captured, is a testament to the growing predator challenges in Washington. Our state is already grappling with managing wolves, cougars, black bears, and more. Considering the strain on our ungulate populations, I cannot support the idea of reintroducing grizzlies into the state. I felt compelled to voice my concerns about the potential reintroduction of grizzly bears in Washington. It's undeniable that grizzlies are already making their way into the state from neighboring regions. The absence of any physical barriers means natural migration can and is occurring. Given the state's challenges in managing its existing wildlife, introducing another apex predator seems counterproductive and an absolute terrible idea for conservation.

██████████ - outdoor enthusiast, recreator, fisherman and hunter.

Correspondence ID: 1142Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98155
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 16:13:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I believe that option C would be the most realistic and effective method for restoring the population of Grizzly Bears to the North Cascades. Option A seems the easiest, but least effective. While option B seems like it would be effective in simply restoring Grizzly Bears, I believe that there would not be a lasting effect. Option C, although it holds back slightly on the scale of restoration, it seems to look at the problems that could arise during the process, one of which was human and bear interactions. Option C is a more careful and maybe even slower process, but I believe it would be a smoother process as a whole, not just for the bears, but also for the environment, and the human population.

Correspondence ID: 1143Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Portland, OR 97219
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 16:14:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a PCT hiker who enjoys the North Cascades, I am concerned about human safety and potential conflicts with grizzly bears. It would be advisable to discuss and budget for the installation of bear safe lockers along highly visited recreational corridors.

Correspondence ID: 1144Project:112008Document:132104

Address: AUBURN, WA 98092
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 16:17:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I grew up in Omak Wa. and in the past 60 years have spent a fair amount of time in the north cascades. It was nice to never have to worry about the grizzlies .It is a good thing there are no living dinosaurs or the native American would want them reintroduced the only reason for the relocation is that the native Ameicans want it. Don't waste the money!!! We don't need the problem.

██████

Correspondence ID: 1145Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Puyallup, WA 98372
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 16:23:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am an environmental scientist with a degree in wildlife ecology, a lifelong resident of Washington, and a supporter of healthy wildlife populations. I 100% support the no-action alternative and from a professional perspective could in no way ever support reintroduction. Currently, grizzly bears do inhabit the remote regions of north central and northeast Washington. By introducing bears from out of state, you are destroying the locally adapted genetics and life histories that have evolved in this region. Additionally, grizzly bears from larger populations continue to expand their range each year. Grizzly bears are now present in northern Idaho and occasionally seen in northeast Washington. Population expansion is complex and a natural process, in which range expansion selects for animals capable and adapted to new territories and environments. By short cutting this natural process you are removing natural habitat selection that will 100% occur in time. The desire to have grizzly bears present in higher numbers now is misguided and based on a false understanding of the temporal scale of nature. A decade is nothing in terms of range expansion and population success- though humans often see this as a long time. Grizzly bears are expanding their range naturally, and will occupy suitable habitat throughout Washington in time as no barriers to this migration exist. Releasing bears with different genetics or local adaptations is not necessary and does not result in high performing locally adapted populations. There is no substitute for allowing natural processes occur on their own. Reintroduction also risks the destruction of the local distinct genetics of existing bears, which would be destroyed forever with reintroduction. In addition, reintroducing bears to a new area that they are not well adapted to will likely mean increased reliance on human based food sources and thus increase human-bear conflict.

Correspondence ID: 1146Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Waterville, WA 98858
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 16:27:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: There is a reason grizzly bears were driven out of Washington state. They are dangerous. We have so many trails and public areas in the forests now, where people love to go to hike and camp, and reintroducing grizzlies into these areas ensures that there will be human-grizzly conflicts. It's bad enough to encounter brown or black bears and cougars, but to encounter a grizzly would be far more terrifying and deadly. Please spare the public and keep the bears in reserves like Yellowstone and out of our state.

Correspondence ID: 1147Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Sammamish, WA 98074
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 16:43:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please don't do this. I love the peace of hiking and running the Cascades without the threat of possible death overshadowing me. PLEASE, PLEASE don't bring grizzlies back to our region.

Correspondence ID: 1148Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Darrington, WA 98241
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 16:46:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I thought this issue was closed last year. As a resident of the town of Darrington I am extremely worried about these bears being released in our area. I don't have the knowledge of the people that have actually hiked the area you are talking about but they commented last time about how there is no food source for them around here. No fish, no berries etc. I asked last time and I'll ask again. When these bears come to our property to get "food"; are we allowed to shoot them to protect ourselves and our pets? Because I sure as hell don't want these damn things near me and mine. We already have black bears in our orchards every fall. Cougars walking thru our front yard. The last thing I want or need is this type of animal in our orchards. I lease property to board horses and do not want to be responsible for anything happening to any of them either. This is a horrid idea to release them too close to a populated town. And they will be coming looking for food that isn't available in the area they were released in. I am as big an animal lover as the next person but not when it comes to killers like this.

Correspondence ID: 1149Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Tacoma, WA 98464
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 16:48:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: YES for grizzlies!!!

Correspondence ID: 1150Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Edgewood, WA 98371
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 16:51:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I oppose the grizzly bear restoration plan into the North Cascades National Park because the park service will limit and restrict access for humans into those same areas.

If the park service would not limit and and restrict human access due to grizzly bears presence and restoration then I would have no objection to the plan.

Correspondence ID: 1151Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Chelan, WA 98816
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 16:53:49
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a lifelong resident of Washington State I can assure you that bringing in grizzly bears would hinder the landscape. Washington does not have very good wildlife management as it is and the quantity and quality of our ungulates is the result. Our predator populations are getting worse by the year and the fish and game commission is not doing us any favors. Grizzlies are already present in Washington, bringing more in would only hurt the ecosystem more.

Correspondence ID: 1152Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98112-3138
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 16:54:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: FABULOUS NEWS!!! Thank you so, very much for all of your thoughtful work to restore Grizzlies!

Correspondence ID: 1153Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Walla walla, WA 99360
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 17:01:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We should not be adding large carnivores into a already disrupted ecosystem. The north cascades are a popular destination for many and the added popularity would only add to human bear interactions. Along with people recreating in the area the wintering habitat should these bears seek lower elevations for food puts them directly into the methow valley which is also an ever popular destination during the fall and winter. If grizzly bears are to show up on there own it is one thing but to purposely place them we should avoid.

Correspondence ID: 1154Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98122
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 17:07:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I would love nothing more than grizzly bears to be returned to the North Cascades ecosystem. While the North Cascades is one of the least visited and most remote parks in the United States, I have been fortunate enough to take several trips into the North Cascades backcountry and am thus part of a group who might encounter a grizzly should they be reintroduced successfully. I have also been fortunate enough to see a wild grizzly in Montana, an unforgettable highlight of a life outdoors, and I strongly advocate in favor of that opportunity for future visitors to North Cascades, ideally for generations to come. With proper education and equipment, risks of negative human-wildlife interaction involving bears can be successfully mitigated; bear spray is widely available on arrival in the vicinity of Glacier National Park in Montana, and I

would like to see key access points to the North Cascades ecosystem similarly equipped. To conclude, as an avid backcountry enthusiast, I am strongly in favor for the return of grizzly bears to the North Cascades ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 1155Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Pennington, NJ 08534
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 17:14:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: For the Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan, alternative C, designating the grizzly bears in the US portion of the NCE and surrounding areas as nonessential experimental population (NEP), would allow for greater management flexibility and efficient establishment and conservation of the NEP while promoting social tolerance and human safety. The authorization of research and recovery actions and relocation of the bears allows for conflict to be effectively managed. The grizzly bears have a immense impacts on other wildlife (fish), character of the wilderness, visitor use/recreation experience, safety, socioeconomic, and ethnographic reproduces. In choosing alternative C, these issues and impacts can be mitigated in a mode that is properly catered to the situation.

Correspondence ID: 1156Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Eugene, OR 97405
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 17:15:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Just yesterday, in Banff, two people were killed by a grizzly bear. These animals are more dangerous than the black bears that roam the PNW.

If these grizzly bears are to me allowed to roam freely, what mitigation will you provide? Will hikers and campers be safe? Will everyone need a firearm to go for a hike? Will you provide funeral expenses?

Correspondence ID: 1157Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 17:22:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in favor of restoring Grizzly Bears to the NCE, and am in favor of Option C.

Thanks,

Correspondence ID: 1158Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 17:22:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in favor of Option C.

Thank you,

Correspondence ID: 1159Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Vancouver, WA 98685
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 17:23:01

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Incidents like the one reported in this article on 10/2/23 from Banff NP, Canada will be the inevitable result if this misguided proposal is actually adopted and put into effect. This "cautious" couple reportedly "knew the bear protocol and followed it to a tee". That didn't save them, nor did the GPS signalling device or the "specially trained" bear attack response team. The "ecosystem" is doing fine without grizzlies and so are the people of Washington State. There are good reasons why Washington law prohibits WDFW from introducing grizzlies. So abandon this foolhardy proposal and let well enough alone.

Correspondence ID: 1160Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Brier, WA 98036
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 17:24:08

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not support grizzly reintroduction.

Correspondence ID: 1161Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tonasket, WA 98855
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 17:25:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I went to a meeting provided for this subject in Okanogan WA and there is no proof grizzly's ever lived in the North Cascades..per National Park Service information. There was a big turn out on this meeting of people that live in the affected areas and the meeting wound up being overwhelming "No Grizzly bear introduction". This is not a reintroduction as I keep reading about this subject such as in <https://www.yahoo.com/news/biden-admin-moves-unleash-apex-165833125.html> but an introduction. There are Farmers, Ranchers, Orchards, Agricultural Production areas that don't want them "introduced" which is what it would be since they are Non Native Bears. We already have apex predators. enough.. black bears, cougars, animals that have always lived in Central Washington... grizzly's would mess up our ecosystem and endanger the people, crops and animals that live their. The majority of people that want this won't live in the mess this would make. Let them be introduced to the areas where these people live.

Correspondence ID: 1162Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Portland, OR 97217
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 17:28:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Yes, please bring grizzly bears back to Washington State!

Correspondence ID: 1163Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Milton, WA 98354
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 17:28:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm a big fan of wildlife in general and of grizzly bears in particular, but I find this plan expensive and unwise, considering the current climate. While the thrill of seeing a grizzly in the wild is undeniable, it's also undeniable that grizzlies attack and kill humans, and when it happens, the bear's life is typically taken as well. Not only that, but we continue to see increasing human/wildlife interactions in our national parks that are harmful to the wildlife and the humans alike. Because of this, I suggest that we focus on education on proper behavior when encountering wildlife instead, which needs a lot of attention and improvement before we could safely return grizzlies to the North Cascades--for the safety of grizzlies no less than that of humans. To simply reintroduce grizzlies at a time of increased parks visits from those very new to outdoor recreation is absolute folly.

Correspondence ID: 1164Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Blaine, WA 98230
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 17:38:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

I am opposed to "restoring" grizzly bears to Whatcom County. Recent Canadian news reports of grizzly bears appearing in two British Columbia towns, Nelson and Quesnel, coupled with the fatal grizzly attack of two hikers and their dog in Banff National Park, serve to reinforce my opposition.

In closing, I offer the modest observation that a well-intentioned initiative to restore grizzly bears to an area they historically populated represents human efforts to tamper with nature as unwittingly arrogant as whatever led to their removal.

Thank you.

██████████

Correspondence ID: 1165Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Lake Stevens, WA 98258
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 17:53:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am in favor with Alternative C. I think that bears should be reintroduced to the area and that the label of Endangered Species Act section 10(j) designation would be helpful in having this transition be successful. More attention would be brought to the bears and protecting them while they transition to a new environment and in theory help them acclimate.

Correspondence ID: 1166Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Lynnwood, WA 98036
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 17:55:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a resident of Washington state I do not want to experience additional risk when recreating outdoors; especially with my family. Washington state already has a predator management problem, adding apex predators to the landscape would be detrimental to the wildlife population of the state, public safety, and agriculture conflict. Other states have large and increasing populations of grizzly bears. These states experience attacks on people recreating in the outdoors, with some people dying in these encounters. There are zero reasons to reintroduce grizzly bears into Washington.

Correspondence ID: 1167Project:112008Document:132104

also allows there to be more protection and management efforts to protect visitors and wildlife if needed. As tourism goes up, the 10(j) plan also works to protect those tourists. Plan C will not only be great for tourists but great for the ecosystems in the Northwest.

Correspondence ID: 1172Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sublimity, OR 97385
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 18:08:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This sounds like a terrible idea. I am an avid backpacker and hiker in what is left of the Oregon Cascades. Much of it has burned, and more continues to do so each year. Where exactly are these bears going to live? In burned out areas? Because that's all we're going to have left. And this will also spell the end of my days venturing into the woods, if there is even a chance eof running into a grizzly. No thanks.

Correspondence ID: 1173Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Portland, OR 97214
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 18:08:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the preferred alternative, this provides the most flexibility for land managers while working towards grizzly bear and ecosystem recovery. I am a frequent recreational user of the North Cascades wilderness areas, and I feel that the presence of grizzly bears would enhance my appreciation of the area and allow the area to function as a true wilderness. As in other remote and wild parts of the country, recreational users and residents can learn to coexist with grizzly bears.

We owe a significant debt to the Tribal communities and to natural systems which we have irrevocably damaged over the last couple hundred years. This is a small and necessary step towards repairing this historic harm.

Correspondence ID: 1174Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 18:08:58

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: A main concern as someone who visits the North Cascades frequently is the population growing to a size that gets out of hand and starts making it difficult to visit, camp and enjoy these locations. Looking at the Montana/Yellowstone area, they restored their grizzly population and are seeing an uptick in deaths and injuries due to grizzly bear attacks. The BC area also has issues with grizzly bear population and management of these bears to keep them away from tourists, campers, and those in the backcountry. They have to place restrictions on camping and increase their management of the situations to try to keep visitors safe. They also have to euthanize certain bears who become a danger to visitors, which doesn't seem fair to the bears.

Choosing to restore a population is human intervention in the ecosystem and there can be unforeseen outcomes of such a situation, it seems the risks outweigh the benefits. If you introduce bears and they become a threat, or start becoming protective of this new land/food sources, it could lead to more potential euthanization which is then creating the opposite effect on what you are trying to achieve.

The North Cascades are made up of both the National park but also the National Forests, and there's less resources in the National Forest to help manage if the grizzly population got out of hand. Those resources/money/workers could be used to help benefit the forests & parks in other ways that have greater benefits.

It doesn't feel like there are any 'stand out' reasons to reintroduce Grizzly bears into the North Cascades, so as a frequent visitor of these lands, I don't stand behind this restoration plan.

Correspondence ID: 1175Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tacoma, WA 98405-3439

United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 18:23:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I wholeheartedly support the reintroduction of grizzly bears in the North Cascades. We are lucky to have a large wilderness, and I'm excited about having healthy populations of large keystone predators such as grizzlies and wolves in the ecosystem. My family and I often recreate in the North Cascades. We want as many bears as practical reintroduced and we support the preferred option. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 1176Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Anacortes, WA 98221

United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 18:24:03

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: There have been human fatalities due to grizzly bear attacks in both Banff NP and near Yellowstone NP this season.

The North Cascades NP is near population centers, and attracts large numbers of recreational backcountry visitors. Black bears in the North Cascades have already learned to take advantage of human food sources, resulting in human-bear conflicts. A reintroduction of grizzly bears to this area is certain to set the stage for even more human-bear encounters, and with grizzlies, those encounters are more likely to be fatal.

As long as humans are present in or near the North Cascades, the presence of grizzlies will result in death for both humans and bears. The human presence in and around the North Cascades means this is NOT an appropriate place to reintroduce an apex predator.

Correspondence ID: 1177Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Carnation, WA 98014

United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 18:24:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please take note of the grizzly bear attack that just recently happened in Canada and killed 2 people.

Correspondence ID: 1178Project:112008Document:132104

Address: LYNNWOOD, WA 98087

United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 18:33:10

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Option A is the only feasible option that assures bears and humans can live in harmony. The area is not suitable for the numbers proposed in any option. There is no fence between Canada and the US. Bears will populate where the habitat is conducive on their own.

Correspondence ID: 1179Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sorrento, FL 32776
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 18:38:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The presence of grizzly bears migrating into Washington from places like BC and Idaho is undeniable. Without any physical barriers, they can naturally inhabit the state. Given the difficulties in managing the current wildlife populations, I believe it's in the best interest to refrain from reintroducing more apex predators.

Correspondence ID: 1180Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Idaho Falls, ID 83401
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 18:56:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: With another person killed just outside of West Yellowstone this summer, and two more in Banf National Park just today, do we need more grizzly bears on the landscape? I think not and don't support more bears in Washington state. If grizzlies naturally migrate there, then so be it, but to add more is just going to cause more human bear conflicts. If you care about bears, remember in the long run, they lose in these conflicts. All the bears mentioned in the opening sentence were killed.

Correspondence ID: 1181Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Poulsbo, WA 98370
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 19:05:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No thank you!!!

Your efforts to crowd everyone into cities and "return nature to nature" is never going to work in America.

Correspondence ID: 1182Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ravensdale, WA 98051
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 19:31:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think the course of action on the grizzly population in the No. Cascades is NO ACTION. The few that exist might repopulate, but introducing more will certainly end with people or bears being harmed.

Correspondence ID: 1183Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 19:38:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The best path forward for the grizzly bear is straight back to Canada. Send those bears north. Spend your time on pine martins or something less lethal.

Correspondence ID: 1184Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellevue, WA 98007
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 19:42:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: After reading through the different proposed alternatives, I believe that alternative C is the best option. This plan calls for bringing in Grizzly bears to the North Cascades, a species of bear that already exists there, but in low numbers. Since the new bears would be of the same species, I don't think they will have too much of an issue getting acclimated to their new ecosystem. The best part of alternative C is that the bears will be restored under a section from the Endangered Species Act. This will make sure to clearly define what "take" of the bears would mean. With proper planning and some time, I think alternative C would help boost the population of Grizzly bears in the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 1185Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Scio, OR 97374-9778
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 19:45:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I believe grizzlies bears should be reestablished in parts of their native range as long as plans are in place to manage conflicts appropriately.

Correspondence ID: 1186Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 80526
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 19:52:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in favor of Alternative C as outlined in the Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan.

Correspondence ID: 1187Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 19:54:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: <https://m.youtube.com/watch?v=4XwaUQtuDO0>

Couple and dog killed by grizzly bear in Alberta, Canada this week.

Correspondence ID: 1188Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Frisco, TX 75034
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 20:02:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please introduce grizzle bear back to the ecosystem and also if possible wolf as well.

Correspondence ID: 1189Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Monroe, WA 98272
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 20:03:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a regular visitor to the North Cascades, the potential increase in grizzly bear population is alarming. The incidents in states like Wyoming serve as a cautionary tale. With no barriers preventing grizzlies from migrating from places like BC, it's best to let nature take its course.

Correspondence ID: 1190Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Silverdale, WA 98383
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 20:07:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My only concern is that Washington will do the same thing as Montana. Where once the grizzlies have a high population to the point they should be hunting to control the numbers that they won't allow hunting of them. There should be a set population density to the effect of when that number is met the endangered species protection is removed and a lottery drawing for hunting tags where all funds produced from the lottery goes towards conservation of the bears.

Correspondence ID: 1191Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Monroe, WA 98272
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 20:08:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The presence of grizzly bears migrating into Washington from places like BC and Idaho is undeniable. Without any physical barriers, they can naturally inhabit the state. Given the difficulties in managing the current wildlife populations, I believe it's in the best interest to refrain from reintroducing more apex predators.

Correspondence ID: 1192Project:112008Document:132104
Address: University Place, WA 98466
United States of America
Outside Organization: self Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 20:26:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzlies roamed the North Cascades for eons before man moved in. Yes, they deserve to relish the region now as they did more than 100 years ago

Correspondence ID: 1193Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mount Hood Parkdale, OR 97041
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 20:41:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please don't bring in grizzly bears. They will find their way there from growing populations elsewhere. They are already protected. The people that live adjacent to the North Cascades probably don't want them transplanted there if a vote was taken. If folks that don't live there want to hike and camp among grizzly bears, there are places in the west where they can do that. Suddenly dropping apex predators into an ecosystem must be quite a shock to the other wildlife, that have not had experience with such an animal.

Correspondence ID: 1194Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Colorado Springs, CO 80919
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 20:46:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bear restoration is critical for rewilding and establishing self-sustaining ecosystems, pre-Columbus ecosystems. I support this reintroduction program but also I want to make an appeal to make this plan more ambitious. The current plan would take 60-100 years for grizzlies to reach the goal of 200 bears. Also, since grizzlies reproduce slowly and do not expand their ranges quickly, there needs to be consideration for having a plan that allows and encourages grizzlies to expand south through the Cascades. We need healthy grizzly populations.

Correspondence ID: 1195Project:112008Document:132104

Address: MARBLEMOUNT, WA 98267
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 20:46:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am deeply concerned about this given the conflict of black bears and humans in our area. Unfortunately Marblemount is an area where people do not deal properly with their trash and this results in conflict as bears seek out food in human areas. Introducing a more aggressive bear to the area will only create more hazardous interactions between bears and people.

Correspondence ID: 1196Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Aloha, OR 97078
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 20:50:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please reintroduce as part of long term process.
As long as they are absent, the circle of life is broken.
Man needs to do everything to assist a return to historical grizzly territory.

Correspondence ID: 1197Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98122
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 21:07:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I recreate in the Cascades regularly - climbing, mountaineering, skiing. There are many inherent dangers in my hobbies, and I do not want to have to worry about another danger - grizzly bears - while I am in the backcountry. I am comfortable with my knowledge of and ability to avoid interactions with black bears, I don't want to be scared of something else.

Correspondence ID: 1198Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Portland, OR 97212
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023 21:18:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzlies need to be re-introduced to suitable ecosystems in the Pacific Northwest. The number needs to be enough to ensure genetic diversity as individuals spread, as we cannot count on mixing with existing populations. 100 bears, at least.

Correspondence ID: 1199Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98144
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 21:28:58

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am responding as an avid backpacker and volunteer backpack leader. I have backpacked in areas with brown bears as well as black bears.

- In general, I am very supportive of reintroducing brown bears back to their native habitat.

- However, if we do this without putting in infrastructure to allow animals and humans to successfully cohabite together, we are being irresponsible.

- As I consider the quality and quantity of bear hangs and bear boxes in Canadian parks where I've backpacked, our bear boxes are far more limited at popular sites. Need to increase facilities to prevent habituated bears at all camping locations in the North Cascades National Park as well as other popular non National Park locations. Consider stronger regulations around use of Ursack/hard sided bear canisters.

Correspondence ID: 1200Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Issaquah, WA 98029
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 21:30:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We already have grizzlies in Washington state and more will populate in the state over time. We do not need a forced reintroduction. In fact, it is the last thing we need. They are poorly managed in states like Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming and a couple was just killed in Canada from a grizzly. Until states are allowed to responsibly manage grizzlies, Washington state does not need more of them.

Correspondence ID: 1201Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Shelton, WA 98584
United States of America

Outside Organization: Peacock Hill Farm Business(Official Rep.)

Received: Oct,02 2023 21:37:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I don't believe we should be spending resources to address an an issue that may very well backfire. If the ecosystem in the Pacific Northwest is favorable, then the bears will tend to repopulate naturally. They are a high end predator that will take advantage of what resources they can find most easily. The black bear in the Smokey Mountains are evidence of how the bears can adapt to living with humans in close contact. The thought more aggressive bears being reintroduced to an area of increasing human population is frightening.

I have been in Alaska where you don't dare go out without bear spray and in some situations a fire arm.

It's not the black bears, its the brown. Please don't do something we will regret later.

Correspondence ID: 1202Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sedro Woolley, WA 98284-9287
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 21:37:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a lifetime Washington State resident I strongly oppose restoring grizzly bears in the North Cascades of Washington through intentional relocation. The natural and human world is significantly different than it was when grizzlies were here before. We do not have the ungulate or small prey populations to sustain the current level of apex predators, let alone up to 200 grizzlies as proposed.

There is the occasional bear that wanders in from adjacent states or provinces and that is fine. If those populations are healthy and strong enough and the bears move in and take up residence then I am fine with that. Otherwise, do not waste time, energy, and public funds on a project that is strongly opposed and unwanted by Washington state residents, particularly in and around the areas where you're looking to place them.

On another note, all black & brown bears are omnivores. Just because a bear's diet is largely made up of plants & bugs does not make them "mostly vegetarian" or "more vegetarian" than other bears. By mass, volume %, or kilocalories intake plants may be a higher source of food value but this should not be manipulated and twisted to portray that you are only selecting and placing "mostly vegetarian" grizzlies into Washington State.

Correspondence ID: 1203Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Auburn, WA 98001
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 21:39:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: absolutely, we must have the grizzly bears returned to washington state. this state is empty without them. we must make reparations to the grizzlies for the atrocities inflicted upon them by the nefarious colonizers. grizzlies have historically been treated horribly by non natives to this country and it's time to do the right thing and return these alpha bruins to their natural kingdom in washington state

Correspondence ID: 1204Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Vancouver, WA 98661
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 22:14:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I fully support the restoration of grizzlies to their natural habitat and of the options listed I support option B- where these animals are recognized as a threatened species and protected as such. These creatures were destroyed by human greed not natural occurrence and have a right to be brought back to their homes.

Correspondence ID: 1205Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 22:18:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not want grizzlies reintroduced to the North Cascades. From what I have read their numbers are stable, even thriving, in Alaska, Montana and Canada so do not believe it is necessary to expand to the north cascades. I like that that there are some areas to hike and backpack in the mountains where they are not an issue. If there population was low, it might be necessary, but that doesn't seem to be the case.

Correspondence ID: 1206Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98274
United States of America

Outside Organization: Washington Bikes Non-Governmental

Received: Oct,02 2023 22:48:24

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I favor the "no action" alternative, letting grizzlies gradually migrate into the US north cascades from the Canadian side, for the following reasons:

1. The unique geography and flora and fauna of the US north Cascades favor grizzlies in the north and disfavor them in the south of the region. The farther south, the more human recreational activities occur such as hiking, mountain biking, fishing, hunting and winter sports, including along highway 540 leading to Mt. Baker and along highway 20. There is also more logging, agriculture, and construction the farther south. The north has larger areas of wilderness with less human changes. If this region is good habitat for grizzlies, they will naturally enter the region from the north. If it is not, grizzlies will not enter the region, perhaps because of inadequate food due to human changes to the ecosystem.

2. Conflicts with humans and livestock are inevitable, and well documented where grizzlies have been reintroduced in Montana and Wyoming. The fewest conflicts are in limited access national parks, like Yellowstone. There are no such limited access parks in the north Cascades.

3. As compared to the grizzly areas in Montana and Wyoming, there are far more nearby large population centers like Bellingham, Mount Vernon, Sedro Wooley, Wenatchee. There are also many small towns right in the path of reintroduction, such as Concrete, Glacier, Mazama and Winthrop. Therefore a slow conservative approach to reintroduction is prudent.

Correspondence ID: 1207Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Pullman, WA 99163
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 22:59:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: While I generally support environmental actions I am not in support of re-introducing grizzly bears. The ecosystem of the area is doing quite fine as it is without grizzly bears. Introducing grizzlies does not benefit humans as they would rarely have the opportunity to see any grizzly bears. Instead, humans only suffer the negative consequences of grizzlies and non of the benefits. Camping, backpacking, and hiking becomes more complicated and less enjoyable when you always have to be bear aware. It is nicer to enjoy nature when you don't have to fear bear encounters.

Correspondence ID: 1208Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98107
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023 23:30:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I lived in a small town in Oregon for nearly 50 years. I am now living in Seattle for the last 12. I am very much in favor of restoring Grizzlies to the North Cascade. They are very important to that ecosystem. Humans are creating the biggest problems in most areas where people are being killed. That is obviously not the issue in every single case. Many humans think it is fun to interact with bears. They leave their food and trash around and don't use proper containers for food when camping and don't hang it in trees etc, etc. I don't know what the funding amounts to for rangers in the North Cascades National Park. When I hiked deep into Glacier National Park with my, at the time, two preteen kids there were many Rangers present. We went prepared and although we did not camp, we stayed in the Park Chalets. There were Rangers around and paying attention to where the bears actually were on many occasions. Gone were the garbage dumps that were problem in days gone by. Bears belong on this Earth, period, end of story. Humans must learn to be prepared and if they can't , well they go at their own peril.

Thank you

Correspondence ID: 1209Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spokane, WA 99224
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We should absolutely be reintroducing these poor animals back into the wild where THEY belong! They are only gone because selfish and ignorant people killed them all out of fear and greed with not a single shred of possible negative consequences or effects to our ecosystem. To put it simply: if you are wandering around the mountains and get attacked by a bear, it is NOT THE BEAR'S FAULT! The bears lived here long before invading Europeans decided to colonize and massacre the entire continent. WE did that! PEOPLE killed them. And now that we have even a minute chance to fix one of our many, MANY blunders, we are refusing?!?!?! That is unacceptable! Next all of the scared opposers to this reintroduction will be saying we should kill all of the sharks, too, because those evil and malicious creatures "might" hurt someone who feels entitled to their places of living. Why stop there?! Kill all the birds, too! They poop on our cars and that inconveniences us. HOW DARE THEY!!! Cut down ALL the trees as well, because they block the invader's path and view and they "might" fall on someone's house or garage. You know what? I'm sick of all the bugs, too, so let's poison every single thing they depend on so we don't have to be concerned with the pesky things that "might" bite or sting us.

You g**d*mn people are unbelievable. You've got no problems shooting and murdering a human if they trespass on your property or wander into your homes, but the thought of a WILD ANIMAL hurting you or yours when YOU'RE the ones trespassing on THEIR property is just too much to handle. You ignorant, gun-toting fools have your automatic weapons with virtually limitless bullets, but you're all scared sh**less when it comes to the possibility of *actually needing to protect yourselves with those weapons, instead of just stockpiling them to compensate for all your little insecurities.

I'd laugh if I didn't feel so g**d*mn sorry for the lack of folds on your brains. It's pathetic, really. You should be embarrassed for yourselves. Your level of ignorance is astounding and if I didn't see it in person with all the policies and arguments that crazed-right wingers make then I would truly believe that level to be impossibly achievable.

Correspondence ID: 1210Project:112008Document:132104
Address: San diego, CA 92104
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 02:34:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Other national parks like yellowstone and denali national park already coexist with grizzlies. Humans cannot control every aspect of nature and there is some assumed risk when going into the wild. If the parks were to block off everything that was a risk why do they promote self rescue when needed. In regards to livestock loss statistics would need to be presented on how many bears are killing their livestock making significant losses. The ecological benefits in other animal reintroduction programs show that predator reintroduction is possible. Similar to the wolf reintroduction program in yellowstone. Bottom line. Bring back the bears! - [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 1211Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Alexandria, VA 22310
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 03:02:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The North Cascades are good for bears for many reasons, including a plentiful supply of huckleberries, a highly diverse ecosystem, and very few roads, particularly in the core of the region, conservationists said. Grizzlies are "nature's gardeners," spreading nutrients and seeds and helping the ecosystem. Encounters between grizzlies and humans are rare in areas where the bears currently live.

From my understanding of this draft if bears were reintroduced, the plan could bring in 5 to 10 bears every year, with the hope of reaching a population of 25 -- a "minuscule" number for the ecosystem's size. I would love to see the grizzlies back in their natural habitat. Thank you for your time.

Correspondence ID: 1212Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Cody, WY 82414
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 03:07:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Nope. There is no need for this and it leads nowhere good - we know. It's not necessary the question is why is this so important to people - it's not Disneyland.

Correspondence ID: 1213Project:112008Document:132104
Address: The Dalles, OR 97058
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 04:33:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Currently in the news there have been reports of Grizzly attacks. Hearing about the population of bears (not Grizzlys) in Oregon's eastern area, it appears the areas are already saturated. I see no reason to add another large predator to the mix.

Correspondence ID: 1214Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98126
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 05:04:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Reintroducing grizzly bears to Washington state is being hailed as a noble conservation endeavor, but I will voice dissent and highlight the potential risks it poses to innocent residents, tourists, and hikers.. Grizzly bears, as apex predators, come with inherent unpredictability and their reintroduction into areas frequented by humans is a recipe for peril.

Grizzly bears' territorial instincts and maternal protectiveness can quickly escalate encounters into life-threatening situations for hikers, campers, and residents. This recklessness will undoubtedly result in grievous injuries or even loss of innocent lives.

The potential negative economic ramifications cannot be ignored. Fear of bear encounters may well dissuade tourists from exploring the scenic wilderness of Washington state, causing harm to local businesses and communities dependent on tourism.

The strain on wildlife resources is another grave concern. Grizzlies require vast territories and substantial prey populations, which may disrupt the delicate ecosystem balance, endangering other species.

Lastly, the management of human-grizzly conflicts would demand substantial resources - both financial and time-consuming. Taxpayers would be burdened with funding these endeavors, potentially diverting funds away from more pressing needs.

While conservation efforts are laudable, the heedless reintroduction of grizzly bears to Washington state is a decision fraught with perilous consequences for innocent citizens and the environment.

Correspondence ID: 1215Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Fleetwood, PA 19522
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 05:24:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Yes! Let the Grizzly Bears back into the North Cascades Ecosystem!

Correspondence ID: 1216Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Lynden, WA 98264
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 06:06:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do not allow these bears to be released in Whatcom County.
We are a very active community and these bears will cause more harm than good!
Many folks will stop utilizing the trails .
They are can be too dangerous and predictable to allow in a highly populated and active area.
I urge you leaders to vote against this!

Correspondence ID: 1217Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Aubrey, TX 76227
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 06:26:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Washington has enough trouble managing the the predators they already have on their landscape. Adding another apex predator will only exacerbate their issues. Additionally, we've seen significant issues with grizzly bear reintroduction I'm other locations and the inability of controlling agencies to get them off the ESA listing is a strong indication they should not be introduced elsewhere. If they can't be successfully removed and delisted in such suitable habitat as the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem then they are not likely to be successful here.

If/when you can get them delisted in the areas they have already been reintroduced then maybe it will be appropriate to look at this reintroduction and redirect those resources to this project.

Correspondence ID: 1218Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Asbury, NJ 08802
United States of America
Outside Organization: Comeback Farm Organic Produce Business(Official Rep.)
Received: Oct,03 2023 07:06:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Greetings! I am a young person, who cares deeply about protecting our beautiful ecosystems and I thank you for all that you do. I respectfully ask you to please support safeguarding beautiful grizzly bears, and ensuring their populations are able to thrive and be introduced to areas where they historically belong in the Cascades. Together, we can make a diverse haven for these incredible animals to thrive, and support overhaul biodiversity. Thank you!

Correspondence ID: 1219Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Corvallis, OR 97330
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 07:15:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please fix the problems up and down the west coast with salmon populations before embarking on this venture. If grizzlies find their way into Washington, that's fine, and would more likely represent the natural order of things. Reintroduction should NOT occur, at least not until other prey species populations are stronger - if ever.

Correspondence ID: 1220Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Preston, ID 83263
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 07:28:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm am opposed to the re-introduction of Grizzlies to the state. Wildlife department data and sightings already so the migration of the bears into the state... Idaho and Montana are just a hop, skip and jump away and it's already happening. Here in Idaho we continually are battling with grizzly attacks on campers, hunters and outdoor enthusiasts. Bringing more in would create a scenario of putting an ambulance at the bottom of the issue cliff instead of a rail at the top. Please let's spend the money this would take on good wildlife initiatives instead.

Correspondence ID: 1221Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 07:28:49
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Big no to grizzly bears in Washington. Let's not introduce APEX predators into the cascades nd them to Unconia!

Correspondence ID: 1222Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Concrete, WA 98237
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 07:32:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The "need for action" section states that grizzlies should be reintroduced for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations of people. In reality, very few people would benefit from grizzly bears being in the NCE. The opportunity to see a grizzly bear is not worth the fear, anxiety and real injury/death that will result from grizzly bears being present in the NCE. I want my children to be able to be outside without the concern of dangerous grizzly bears in the neighborhood.

I live in the NCE, am passionate about the environment and want to see reasonable ecosystem restoration. The NCE is not a pristine habitat- it is degraded by human settlement, logging and hydro-electric projects. Ecosystem restoration should focus on resolving and minimizing those impacts. Grizzly bear re-introduction is not going to result in meaningful ecosystem restoration and is only going to scare and upset the local public.

I have friends who work for the North Cascades National Park Service. I only hear negative things about the funding, staffing levels, management, culture and work environment in the park service. I do not have faith that the park service is adequately staffed or funded to responsibly re-introduce grizzly bears and manage the impacts of said actions.

I would strongly support the "No Action" alternative A.

Correspondence ID: 1223Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Walla Walla, WA 99362
United States of America
Outside Organization: None Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 07:35:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears should be reintroduced into the North Cascades as a protected species under the Endangered Species Act. Grizzlies were and should be again a critical part of a healthy ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 1224Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Clackamas, OR 97206
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 07:37:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please reintroduce endangered grizzly bears to our region! Our ecosystems need more apex predators. This was their home before it was ours, and since the local tribes want the bears back, we should follow their lead.

Correspondence ID: 1225Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Abilene, TX 79605
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 07:38:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The North Cascades have always been a haven for outdoor enthusiasts like me. It's come to my attention that grizzly bears already exist in this range, as noted by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. Introducing more would not only threaten the fragile mule deer population but also increase the risk for those of us who love the outdoors. I'm against any plans to reintroduce grizzlies in Washington. Grizzlies have every opportunity to migrate from BC or Idaho without human intervention. I urge you to let nature dictate its path.

Correspondence ID: 1226Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98273
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 07:51:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Releasing grizzly bears in the north cascades is a bad plan and I am strongly opposed to the plan. Read the news--another 2 people were killed by grizzly bears in Canada recently and then the bear had to be killed. It's not as rare as the supporters of this plan lead us to believe. It doesn't make sense to reintroduce grizzlies when they will have to be killed when they kill humans and livestock which they will.

Correspondence ID: 1227Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Pendleton, OR 97801
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 07:58:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the "Do Nothing" option. Even with all the effort spent in the Greater Yellowstone Area and the fact that the NPS' own website says, "Grizzlies have made a remarkable recovery" they remain listed hampering the states ability to manage them using the North American Wildlife Management model. There's no reason to spend a bunch of money and effort when activists will never allow the animals to be de-listed.

Correspondence ID: 1228Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mazama, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 08:01:08

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No reintroduction! Let migration occur, if it occurs, but don't supplement populations.

Correspondence ID: 1229Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Duncanville, TX 75137
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 08:07:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I fully support reintroduction of the grizzly to the north cascades. The inclusion of this species helps balance the environment with an apex species and brings back an animal that existed there for eons. Man has proven he can live with them with little more frustration than living with other neighbors.

Correspondence ID: 1230Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98112
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 08:54:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This comment applies to both the EIS and 10(j) alternatives concerning grizzly bear reintroduction in the North Cascades. I have previously written in opposition to any reintroduction and do so again as proponents keep advocating otherwise.

To kidnap grizzlies from current habitat and plunk them into the North Cascades wilderness is an act of cruelty to the individual animal. They live in their present location because the ecosystem has allowed for their species propagation. The trauma of trapping, transportation, and relocation to a habitat not presently populated by their species in an unconscionable violation of the bear's quality of life.

The North Cascades habitat was once populated by bears, but this is when they could range far and wide into the river valleys and lowland areas that today are populated by humans. Their survival in the wilderness areas of the North Cascades will not be afforded this former access to food and terrain resources because of the human presence. They cannot be confined to the wilderness ecosystem, and their current scarcity in that ecosystem speaks to the lack of viability for survival there. Were it viable, natural populations would have occurred from contiguous habitat.

The North Cascades wilderness is being utilized in ever increasing numbers by humans. There are presently such remote possibilities of grizzly bear encounters that there isn't any culture of preparedness (such as carrying a weapon or bear spray) by those hikers, climbers, etc. To provide for the aforementioned traumatized bear to encounter the unprepared (or for that matter prepared) human is asking for trouble. A lawsuit for damages and harm to humans from such a confrontation would be entirely justifiable. There should not be an acceptance of any loss of human life in pursuit of reintroduction.

Other wildlife that is presently surviving, sometimes precariously, in the proposed reintroduction area may be adversely impacted by the grizzly reintroduction. The wolverine for example, has been able to survive in stressed numbers. Has there been a proper assessment of the impact that the grizzly reintroduction would have on the wolverine? If grizzly bears range into the reintroduction area from currently contiguous habitat, that is a different matter. But if the proposed reintroduction, facilitated by the human interference and use of trapping and transportation technologies adversely affects other wildlife, how is that justified?

There have been more than enough tax dollars spent in pursuit of reintroduction. It is a bad idea, and there should be no further resources spent on this matter.

Correspondence ID: 1231Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Cle Elum, WA 98922
United States of America

Outside Organization: Hunter Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 09:08:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The high density of Washington state hikers and campers don't need a threat of grizzlies in the mountains. I have a relative in Montana attacked twice in his life and survived. Washington does not need that threat brought on by beauracrates!

Correspondence ID: 1232Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Everett, WA 98208
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 09:25:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I believe that the North Cascades National Park is unique because it is true backcountry wilderness that is relatively close to a huge urban area. This provides quick access to wilderness for millions of people that may only have a few days available for an excursion. I have personally taken my family and Scout troops to North Cascades National Park many times for backcountry or dispersed camping. It has been wonderful to have an area where young scouts feel safe to learn and explore outside of a traditional campground. Our Scouts now never want to go to traditional campgrounds. They have learned how to use bear boxes and ropes, how to use backcountry toilets or properly bury waste, how to pack in and pack out everything they need. They learned what to do if they encounter wildlife such as black bears, cougars, etc. However, I feel that this would not have been possible if there were Grizzly Bears in the park. Parents would have been reluctant to send their children and the Scouts would have been so focused on their concern for Grizzly Bears, that they would have spent less time focusing on their experience and perhaps have backed out completely.

We are lucky to live in an area where within a days drive you can get to places that already have Grizzly Bears. This allows for those people interested in that experience to go and seek it out. However, it allows everyone that is not interested in camping or hiking with Grizzlies to enjoy the North Cascades. This is one of the least used national parks in our region and I fear that the reintroduction of large numbers of Grizzly Bears may diminish those number further. Or perhaps draw people to the park that are looking to interact with the Grizzlies in a damaging way.

Correspondence ID: 1233Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Denver, CO 80207
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 09:29:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I fully support North Cascades grizzly bear reintroductions in any/all capacities and view them as critical to a fully-functioning and vibrant ecosystem, cultural identity, and civic pride.

Correspondence ID: 1234Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 09:31:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is the dumbest idea we've ever had. Where do you think those bears are going to spread to? There aren't any predators to keep them in check.

When the headlines start coming out of all the people getting killed on the PCT I guess we know who to blame.

What was once a safe place to visit will be just like other states with grizzlies. I would be afraid to go on a hike, that is not the point of having a national park for all to enjoy.

It's only a matter of time before the bear population spreads putting more people in danger.

Correspondence ID: 1235Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Woodland, WA 98674
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 09:36:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am completely against the reintroduction of grizzly's to Washington State. We are not Idaho, Montana or Wyoming. Our State is smaller in land mass than all of those states, with less public land, and 6 million more people. A reintroduction of the largest North American Apex Predator to our State is just a recipe for disaster.

Correspondence ID: 1236Project:112008Document:132104

Address: ROCHESTER, WA 98579
United States of America

Outside Organization: N/A Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 09:37:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I would like to express my disagreement with the plan to reintroduce grizzly bears into the North Cascades Wilderness Area. I do not understand the logic involved in this decision. One does not have to go far to read news stories about people being mauled and/or killed by grizzly bears in areas where they have been re-introduced or live naturally. We do not need or want to have this happen in the North Cascades by placing bears in that area. As populations of grizzlies increase in other areas, they expand naturally as is evidenced by grizzlies being encountered in areas of Montana where they have not been seen for a century.

Further, there is a healthy population of grizzly bears in British Columbia, which borders Washington to the north. There are no physical barriers on that border and bears do not know or understand political boundaries. It would seem logical that if the bears wanted to live in the North Cascades because it is such wonderful habitat, they would already have crossed from BC and be here. The fact that they have not tells all that needs to be known.

I do not support killing them off if they disperse to this area naturally, however I also am strongly against artificially placing them in the environment to cause physical and economic destruction to those who live and recreate in that area.

Correspondence ID: 1237Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Woodinville, WA 98077
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 09:52:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Emphatic YES to restoring Grizzly Bears to their historic range in the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 1238Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Nine Mile Falls, WA 99026
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 10:01:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bear reintroduction should never be allowed to happen. Public safety is of the highest concern.

Correspondence ID: 1239Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Westwood, MA 02090
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 10:01:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am a past WA resident and user of the PCT. I'm in support of reintroduction of grizzlies. Reintroduction can have hugely beneficial impact to the ecosystem. I would support the action, providing we have a decent idea of how it impacts the ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 1240Project:112008Document:132104
Address: West Richland, WA 99353
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 10:18:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzly bears were present in Teton Valley, Idaho where I lived for 7 years. People knew they were around the Badger Creek area and took precautions. No one I knew could recall any attacks. Grizzlies belong in the North Cascades. Cattle do not.

Correspondence ID: 1241Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Puyallup, WA 98371
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 10:44:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do not add any Grizzly Bear to our Cascades. Today, two people and their dog were killed in Banff and last week a women in Yellowstone was killed. I have taken my nieces, nephews, and my children, and their friends backpacking into our backcountry here in Washington State for the last forty years. I feel safer in the backcountry than I do my own backyard. People without homes are living in the green spaces near homes in Washington State. When I take youth into our backcountry it lifts their spirits, grounds their soul, invigorates their bodies, ignites their curiosity, and leaves them wanting more. Yes, there are always risks when exploring the backcountry. I am responsible, and do my best to plan, manage, and weigh the risks before choosing our adventures. Let me tell you what our kids are dealing with in our junior highs and high schools. They spend the school day in crowded institutions. Their bathrooms are filled with kids vaping, smoking cigarettes, and weed. Their peers are more interested in saying indoors and playing video games on the couch. These kids are stressed and depressed. Some of the youth that I have taken into the backcountry have dealt with suicidal thoughts. When they get into the wilderness, it changes the scene, allows people to relax and not be inundated by the noise of the city and breathe air that is not tainted by someone else's method of decompression. Honestly, the wilderness has the ability to provide the healing that our youth are desperate for. Adding in Grizzlies to our North Cascades would be a step in the wrong direction for our current and future youth's mental health.

Correspondence ID: 1242Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Ferndale, WA 98248
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 10:46:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: NO! NO! NO! We have made it clear that we do not want grizzlies introduced into the North Cascade National Park. There are just too many of us humans in all the parks now. Someone is going to get killed. It is not worth it.

Correspondence ID: 1243Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98122
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 10:46:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Citizens of the US and Canada have repeatedly made the collective decision to provide amends toward historically marginalized populations of humans. Why wouldn't we do the same for other large mammals? We now realize that eliminating grizzlies from the North Cascades was wrong. We have the resources to facilitate a return to their natural habitat, so we should do it. I am a frequent user of wilderness areas throughout the North Cascades for recreational purposes and am 100% supportive of grizzly reintroduction, even if it may require changes and inconveniences on my part. This has worked in other areas and is the right thing to do here in Washington as well.

While certain groups may oppose the idea of living, working and recreating in grizzly habitat, once this process is set in motion they will quickly adapt to the new normal and realize there was little reason for concern.

Correspondence ID: 1244Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Missoula, MT 59802
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 10:47:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a person who lives in Grizzly Country, I understand the benefit of having these animals on the landscape. More intact ecosystems are critical to the health of a region for humans and non-humans alike. I fully support restoring this iconic animal to its historic range.

Correspondence ID: 1245Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sherwood, OR 97140
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 10:47:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: While I have a great respect for the objectives as stated in the Draft Restoration Plan, I must also respectfully disagree that human-enabled reintroduction makes sense. The simple fact of the matter is that 2023 is not the 1800s. Habitat encroachment (through both development and recreational use) has reached a point to where there will be guaranteed conflicts with humans. It's not about being rare... it's just a matter of time. Additionally, other animals have filled the roles of the grizzly in the absence... what will happen to the black bears once a superior predator is introduced? They will get pushed into human development or otherwise get squeezed out of the ecosystem. While the intent seems good, it feel irresponsible to intentionally introduce an apex predator manually knowing conflicts will occur. Should bears come back in from Canada and re-establish, that would be different entirely and should not be hindered. But let nature do it if it is meant to be. We cannot just un-do hundreds of years of habitat usurpation by simply air-lifting a few grizzly bears into an area... that simply doesn't make sense.

Correspondence ID: 1246Project:112008Document:132104

Address: oak harbor, WA 98277
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 10:53:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not support re introduction of grizzly bears in Washington, this is a very irresponsible thing to do, and would serve no purpose other than to please a small group of people who would not be impacted by this decision at all. Our ungulate populations are strained enough from our already overpopulated large carnivores on the landscape, adding grizzlies would just add gas to the fire. Human safety being another concern, grizzlies in other states are having more and more human conflict, why on earth would you want to spread that. Do not bring them.

Correspondence ID: 1247Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Los, CA 90022
United States of America
Outside Organization: PCTA Non-Governmental
Received: Oct,03 2023 10:56:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support reintroducing grizzly bears to bring more balance to the ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 1248Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 11:10:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Against any re-introduction of Grizzlies - introduces danger for outdoor recreation with public. Even experienced hikers at danger.

Read Vancouver Sun article from Oct 2, 2023: "Fatal bear attack on experienced hikers in Banff backcountry was likely 'predatory': expert 'It's possible (the victims) did the best they could, but sometimes there's not much you can do about it,' said a human-wildlife conflict specialist"

link:

<https://vancouversun.com/news/local-news/fatal-bear-attack-on-experienced-hikers-likely-predatory-expert/wcm/55bd0406-df88-476a-89c7-b369106d0f44>

Is the park service assuming liability for this re-introduction? Is making the park less appealing for the public to access it's remote spender necessary? Bad idea - Road to hell paved with good intentions.

Correspondence ID: 1249Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 11:11:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear state wildlife managers,

I appreciate the opportunity for the public to comment on this important piece of proposed conservation legislation.

As a resident of the state of Washington and recreational user of the Cascades, I believe that re-establishing a grizzly bear population in our great state is a necessary piece of conservation work to develop a more resilient Cascades ecosystem. The Cascades need their top predator back, and I hope that lawmakers prioritize the environmental benefits and conversation science over the perceived threats made by ranchers in the area. The bears were here first; we owe the species a shot to repopulate and restore the natural balance of the Cascades that existed for thousands of years before any European colonizers got here.

Correspondence ID: 1250Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98199
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 11:12:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: YES. Please begin the restoration of the grizzly bear population in the north cascades. They belong there as part of a complete ecosystem. I am a avid hiker and I know there is plenty of room in the north cascades for the bears to thrive and the humans to recreate.

Correspondence ID: 1251Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98506
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 11:21:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support Alternative C described in the DEIS for re-introduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem. The DEIS provides exhaustive analysis of the environmental effects of reintroduction, and Alternative C provides an efficient process for mitigating possible adverse effects on the trans-located bears and conflicts with ranchers and back-country users, though I think that encounters with bears are exceedingly unlikely even when the population reaches the goal of 200. I believe the primary benefits of re-establishing a bear population in the NCE are ecological, i.e. restoring the historically apex predator, but I fully support the cultural benefits that will accrue to Native Americans who have lived in this area for thousands of years. Thank you for the opportunity to comments.

Correspondence ID: 1252Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 11:21:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My husband and I support the reintroduction of grizzly bears into the North Cascades Ecosystem. We regularly recreate in areas where grizzly bears live including Alaska, Montana, and Wyoming and know how to coexist with these magnificent creatures. Grizzlies are an important to the health of the ecosystem, and the North Cascades will be truly wild with their reintroduction.

Correspondence ID: 1253Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Orting, WA 98360
United States of America

Outside Organization: Clean Food farm Business(Official Rep.)

Received: Oct,03 2023 11:29:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My comments as a commercial organic farmer in Western WA, regarding reintroducing Grizzly Bears in certain areas:

As I have seen with other species - this is not a harmless, no cost proposal:

- This can result in increased investment in fencing, deterrents, and hazing (which is usually prohibited), which can negatively impact farmers and ranchers like me and neighbors like me who are already working on thin margins.
- The introduction of grizzly bears may increase stress on herds and flocks of many kinds of livestock, leading to reduced fertility (due to the stress) and other immeasurable impacts.
- It may also pose a danger to people's safety during work and recreation activities.
- As usual, since we (real farmers) are only 1% of the population, if enacted this will increase economic burdens on farmers, making it harder for us to diversify, reducing viability and leading to further consolidation.

The Endangered Species Act (ESA) restrictions are quite harsh for farmers and ranchers like me since they may prevent us from making productive use of their primary business assets in and around the farm. Furthermore, the actions of the federal government make it clear that impacts caused by species on the ESA are to be borne entirely by the landowner unless state

governments are willing to step in and help compensate for losses. Loss mitigation efforts by the state fish and game mostly tie the hands of state employees and landowners and take too long to enact so crop and property damage occur. This proposal does not have effective provisions to help landowners and farmers to protect their business assets and crop production.

Please keep me posted on the status of this proposal.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 1254Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Not Hispanic or Latino, WA 99352
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 11:36:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We Washingtonians are still reeling from the introduction of wolves back into our state. Then hunters are now further restricted on hunting methods and opportunity for both cougars and bears in Washington. Now a plan to bring in even more deadly predators into our state that will not be able to be managed by hunting. What is the idea, do humans really need to be put into danger? All this so someone in their cush safe office can say "Ooooh we now have Grizzlies how cool are we?" WE NEED NO GRIZZLY BEARS.

Correspondence ID: 1255Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 11:56:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: What value does the reintroduction provide to the state of Washington and the local communities that will be affected by there presence. Nothing. This is a total feelgood idea. The predator population is out of control. How bad will our deer and elk populations suffer when these apex predators are released. Between the cougars, wolves and now possibly grizzly bears they stand no chance. If grizzly's come back on there own so be it. But introducing these in a densely populated state is irresponsible and unsustainable for our deer and elk populations. It sounds to me that the people interested in this idea do not spend much time outdoors. This state is overpopulated and recreational users and hunters alike will be put in danger all so the Feds can feel good.

Correspondence ID: 1256Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 12:00:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am absolutely AGAINST bringing grizzlies back, as a person who lives in the north cascades. Many of my hobbies (like others who live in the woods) are all about spending time outside in nature. I already have to contend with cougars and now wolves which, despite what all the westsider activists are saying, are most definitely back in our area (we have at least one on a trail came by our home), I don't need to add the super aggressive grizzly bear to the list of things to worry about. Mark my words, you bring them back, and in a few years all we'll hear about is PCT hikers being mauled.

Correspondence ID: 1257Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Vancouver, WA 98660
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 12:09:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This should not be a political or environmental issue. I am a citizen living in Vancouver WA and one who spends 5 mos per year in Colorado. Colorado is in the midst of reintroducing more wolves into non wolve environments. As usual, many of the voters (primarily in Denver) who approved this measure are not aware of the devastation the wolves will do to elk and deer herds but never the less think it is a great idea. Again, same same in Washington State regarding the grizz.

The North Cascades are one of the most hiked areas in the United States. As the recent incident in Banff highlights, even those who supposedly know what they are doing can be victims of an aggravated bear attack. Throw in protection of a kill or the bear feeling its young is threatened and the entire scenario in Banff is easy to understand.

Please let nature run its course. The bears will find their way into the area. Don't set people up for another incident such as the Banff one. We are no longer living in the 1800's. Recognize that like it or not. population growth makes the decision to re-introduce the grizz back into Washington's North Cascades a bad one but will cost a fortune and eventually, probably lives.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 1258Project:112008Document:132104

Address: ALTADENA, CA 91001-3428
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 12:12:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Speaking as a Pacific Crest Trail hiker who's spent time in this area, I think this may lead to dangerous hiker-bear encounters. There have already been sketchy black bear encounters in the region where bears displayed aggression and habituation to hikers based off reports I've heard from other PCT hikers. If this happens to reintroduced grizzlies, the results could be deadly. Unfortunately, I have met numerous PCT hikers and weekend backpackers in this region who do not practice any kind of bear protection for their food. I doubt this will change anytime soon which raises the risk of dangerous grizzly encounters if they are reintroduced.

Correspondence ID: 1259Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Concrete, WA 98237
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 12:17:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Let nature decide if Grizzly Bears should be reinterduced back in the North cascades Ecosystem. I know of nothing stopping Grizzly Bears from reintroducing and repopulating themselves. Humans think that things should be as they want it to be without considering other species that are effected and displaced by their actions. Please let nature itself decide.

Correspondence ID: 1260Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Selah, WA 98942
United States of America
Outside Organization: S. Martinez Livestock Business(Official Rep.)
Received: Oct,03 2023 12:18:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: From 2016-2019 in the GYE Recovery Zone there was over 800 conflicts involving grizzlies. A majority of those conflicts were between land and livestock owners. A majority of mortalities involving grizzlies were from

management. Introducing grizzlies back into the Cascades would be a costly project and negatively impact the citizens of Washington State. Managing them would prove to be another headache for WDFW similar to the wolf situation. I ask WDFW to reconsider their proposal to introduce grizzlies back into Washington State and instead focus on the matters they currently have in front of them.

<https://wyomingwildlifeadvocates.org/grizzly-bear-conflict/#1620844493233-3aeb4ef2-3900>

Attached is the source for the data on conflicts with grizzlies in the GYE recovery zone

Thank you for your time.

Correspondence ID: 1261Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Flagstaff, AZ 86004
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 12:27:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am somewhat conflicted, as I know that these beautiful creatures once roamed here before human intervention. My input however, is that many humans who are using our national recreation areas are not equipped/able to handle the intense responsibility that comes with maintaining distance between bears and humans. I worry that either the humans will be at risk without intense oversight, or the bears will be at risk, if they become food aggressive or territorial. I believe that the environment no longer serves their needs, and if it did, there would be a natural migration from areas they are already found.

Correspondence ID: 1262Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Shoreline, WA 98133
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 12:45:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a resident of Washington and backcountry recreationalist, I support Alternative A (No Action). I disagree with the dismissal of environmental justice from the analysis because it does not meet the Justice40 requirements or because low income communities are not the focus areas for reintroduction. There is no data or analysis to backup the dismissal. These animals have a range and will undoubtedly disproportionately affect lower income communities.

As a backcountry recreationalist, given the recent fatal attacks in Banff British Columbia, I am not reassured that the use of management will protect my safety or the safety of workers. Bears are not managed until after a human-bear incident occurs. An incident with a large grizzly, while rare, can result in the loss of human life. I do not agree with taking on this risk given that these bears have had the opportunity to be in the North Cascades for decades - there is nothing stopping them - and there is no evidence that they have crossed the border in need of habitat.

As a Washington resident and taxpayer, I do not support any alternatives other than Alternative A (No Action).

Correspondence ID: 1263Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 12:46:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is a terrible idea! If these bears are brought back to the area there will be more bear maulings and deaths which causes a serious danger to public safety. This means that when people hike they will have to carry a serious

weapon, whereas now there is generally no concern about being preyed upon while in the wilderness. Why would someone create a problem where there is none?

Correspondence ID: 1264Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 12:48:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Does this mean that we get to bring a lawsuit against the National Park Service when one of their introduced grizzly Bears attacks and kills people and livestock? I think it does.

Correspondence ID: 1265Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Challis, ID 83226
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 12:51:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I would like to see grizzlies reintroduced onto North Cascades National Park. It's their historical area and would be a great top predator to bring back to an environment where it thrived in the past. Please go ahead and add the 25 grizzlies to the area as discussed in previous documents.

Correspondence ID: 1266Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Darrington, WA 98241
United States of America
Outside Organization: Sauk Suiattle Indian Tribe Tribal Government(Official Rep.)
Received: Oct,03 2023 12:53:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The Sauk-Suiattle Indian Tribe is fully and adamantly opposed to the reintroduction of Brown bears (Grizzly's) into the North Cascades. This is a poor idea introducing a know apex predator into a high use recreation area, where it will pose an immediate threat to human life. Further, if reintroduced, their presence will further deplete populations of deer, elk, and fish, that are a guarantied right to the Point Elliott Treaty Tribes under the Point Elliott Treaty of 1855. However if introduced the brown bear would fall under the hunting rights of the tribes as outlined in the 1855 treaty. We would highly encourage the halting of this process. It is ill conceived and will cost lives, resources, and money to ultimately remove them from the area again.

Correspondence ID: 1267Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Clinton, WA 98236
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 13:02:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I've spent time hiking in the wilderness in grizzly country, and time hiking in the north Cascades, and I would prefer not to have grizzlies reintroduced in the North Cascades. Brown bears are terrifying predators, and reintroducing them is likely to lead to death and injury of humans by the bears, and while education and other mitigation can reduce the amount of catastrophic bear encounters, it cannot eliminate them. Education and mitigation efforts require resources, of course, and the upshot will be that the forest service budgets will be stretched thinner than they already are, in order to provide an incomplete solution to a problem which is already solved by not having grizzly bears in the North Cascades.

Excluding the cases of death or serious injury, it is worth noting that *any* encounter with a grizzly bear in the back county is going to be terrifying and is likely to ruin the day of both the hiker and the bear. I've been hit by bear spray splashback, and

even that mild dose caused painful burning for days, I can only imagine what the bear must feel. Beyond that, reintroduction of grizzlies will lead to more people carrying bear spray and firearms into the back country, which means more bear spray and firearms accidents, all of which could have been prevented by not reintroducing bears.

Please do not add grizzly bears to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 1268Project:112008Document:132104

Address: chelan, WA 98816
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 13:09:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: October 3, 2023

To Whom It May Concern:

I feel quite strongly that grizzly bears should not be introduced into the North Cascades, but be allowed to repopulate naturally.

1)There are resident grizzlies just north of the North Cascades Complex in Canada. Even more are found farther to the east in the Rockies.

2)There are documented "visits" of grizzlies into the North Cascades.

3)Grizzlies are known to range widely in search of new areas to inhabit.

4)If there isn't a population already in the area by this point in time, maybe it's because of other naturally occurring conditions that preclude their staying/maintaining in the area.

5)With the amount of tourism and hiking done in this area, including the Pacific Crest Trail, I really don't feel these animals should be introduced to the area. If they expand their range from Canada, so be it - but let it occur naturally.

Thank you for taking these points into consideration.

A Concerned Chelan County Resident

Correspondence ID: 1269Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Redmond, WA 98052
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 13:32:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am a member of Audubon and am a long time believer in the importance of carnivores in various environments. I am very supportive of their reintroduction.

Correspondence ID: 1270Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bainbridge Island, WA 98110
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 13:36:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Having lost a good friend (who was not doing anything unwarranted) to a grizzly bear attack I am NOT in favor or reintroducing them to the North Cascades.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kind regards, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 1271Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 14:06:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We do NOT want Grizzly Bears, thank you for asking...

Correspondence ID: 1272Project:112008Document:132104
Address: EVERETT, WA 98203
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 14:08:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Today's headline. "Grizzly bear kills 2 in Canada's Banff National Park", As a family of overnight backpackers please reconsider this! Thank you

Correspondence ID: 1273Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Pendleton, OR 97801
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 14:17:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do not agree that we should be introducing Grizzly Bears into Washington State. They are predators! Just two days ago, 2 people were killed by Grizzly Bears in Canada. They would be devastate local farms and wildlife. Introducing Grizzly Bears would also negatively affect tourism and discourage those who love and appreciate the great outdoors. It is time we put people and people's ability to earn a living and enjoy a great quality of life above animals.

Correspondence ID: 1274Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bonney Lake, WA 98381
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 14:19:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I believe grizzlies should be reintroduced to the North Cascades. While they can be dangerous, we can't continue to let our fears disrupt and shape ecosystems.

Correspondence ID: 1275Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Republic, WA 99166
United States of America
Outside Organization: Home owner Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 14:20:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do not wish to see grizzly bears introduced anywhere in Washington. OK if they find their way here from Canada or Idaho in a natural way. My reasons for objecting are: Senator Morton passed a law years ago that grizzlies were NOT to be introduced to Washington from other places. I still agree with this law. An apex predator and hikers, farmers, and ranchers in the area of introduction is a very poor and dangerous situation. Introduced wolves have been extremely bad neighbors for the farmers and ranchers and make hiking dangerous as well. Bears make it worse by far. Neither predator will stay in the high mountains, as wolves have proved, and soon find easy prey on farms and then in towns, eating livestock, pets, garbage, and the constant worry that children will be next. I live in the mountains and do not want to share my land with grizzly bears. Black bears are enough of a worry. Please listen to the people who live in the mountains, not the city folk or those from out of state. They have no "skin in the game" and WE DO! Thank you for the comment period and the meetings.

Sincerely,

Correspondence ID: 1276Project:112008Document:132104

Address: HILLSBORO, OR 97123-8717
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 14:22:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: There are already grizzlies in the north cascades. Additionally, there is NOTHING preventing even more natural grizzly migration from states with existing populations. ON TOP OF THAT, states w/ growing grizzly populations are experiencing increased human-grizzly conflict and fatal encounters. Any discussion of grizzly re-introduction MUST BE coupled with a grizzly bear hunt. These animals MUST maintain a healthy fear of humans to keep conflict at minimum. All that said, it would be best NOT to re-introduce grizzlies at all.

Correspondence ID: 1277Project:112008Document:132104

Address: RAINIER, WA 98576
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 14:35:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No, to Grizzly Bear

Correspondence ID: 1278Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98105
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 14:43:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Option C, which involves designating grizzly bears in the US portion of the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE) as a nonessential experimental population (NEP) under section 10(j) of the Endangered Species Act (ESA), offers a comprehensive approach to grizzly bear restoration and management. This alternative allows for the careful management of a geographically separate population of grizzly bears distinct from other non-experimental populations. By labelling the population as "nonessential," the focus can remain on the survival of the species while taking into account the effects of establishing an experimental population.

Additionally, under Option C, special regulations govern the management of this experimental population, providing authorized agencies with greater flexibility to address conflict situations, promote social tolerance, and ensure human safety. This flexibility includes management actions, including deterrence, incidental take, research and recovery actions, relocation of grizzly bears, preemptive relocation to prevent conflicts, and even conditioned lethal "take" when necessary.

By delineating three management zones and considering the specific circumstances in which "take" may occur, Option C outlines a well structured approach to managing grizzly bears in the NEP area. This approach is not only essential for addressing human-bear conflicts effectively but also for advancing the recovery and reestablishment of a self-sustaining grizzly bear population in the NCE. The description of management tools and approvals in each management zone, as detailed in the FWS's proposed 10(j) rule, ensures a balanced approach that prioritizes both conservation and human safety.

Correspondence ID: 1279Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ellensburg, WA 98926
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 14:54:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm against Grizzly Bears being planted in the North Cascades for the following reasons:

This action may have significant impacts on the local community closest to the area where the bears would be introduced. One of those factors may include discouraging potential employees from entering the job market in certain commodities due to increased risks, which could reduce the available labor force for employers.

It may also affect a result in increased investment in fencing, deterrents, and hazing, which can negatively impact farmers and ranchers who are already working on thin margins. The introduction of grizzly bears may increase stress on herds and flocks, leading to reduced fertility and other immeasurable impacts on agriculture and our food supply.

These actions will pose a danger to public and private citizen safety during work and recreation activities, which can also further increase economic burdens on farmers, making it harder for them to diversify, reducing viability and leading to further consolidation.

The Endangered Species Act (ESA) restrictions can be particularly harsh for farmers and ranchers since they may prevent them from making productive use of their primary business assets. Furthermore, the actions of the federal government make it clear that impacts caused by species on the ESA are to be borne entirely by the landowner unless state governments are willing to step in and help compensate for losses.

It is essential to note that Section 10(j) specifically violates Washington State law, as RCW 77.12.035 states that "Grizzly bears shall not be transplanted or introduced into the State."

Correspondence ID: 1280Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Corpus Christi, TX 78418
United States of America

Outside Organization: NA Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 15:02:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear WA State,

Your organization has made a shambles of wildlife management over the years. Please stop introducing or reintroducing animals to our ecosystems (mountain goats in the Olympics... epic disaster... turkeys everywhere... mostly just annoying...).

Grizzly bears already exist here in natural sustainable numbers. Do not introduce more. There have been several grizzly attacks this years across the west, and we don't need to invite attacks here with introduced animals that exist beyond the means of the ecosystem. Their population will continue to grow naturally in the state. Focus your efforts (and our money) on creating recreational opportunities, not meddling with an already intact ecosystem.

No extra grizzlies in WA!

Respectfully, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 1281Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Oak Harbor, WA 98277
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 15:08:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please no more Grizzlies,

I hike, fish, camp, and hunt here. I don't want to end up like the several folks in ID/WY/MT who have been mauled by grizzly bears this year. By the way, the bears are already here, they don't need "restoration". Please spend my

money on creating wilderness for the animals, that's all they need to thrive in sustainable numbers in this state.

Sincerely, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 1282Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Annacortes, WA 98221
United States of America
Outside Organization: Licensed Hunter Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 15:23:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: NPS,

Please don't waste money on this. I'm a hunter, and I'd love to see Spring Black bear season restored instead of spending money on this project. That money would be better spent on preserving the ecosystem that already sustains a healthy grizzly bear population.

If you really want to spend money on something, expand the wilderness areas surrounding the park, and work on wild fire prevention.

Sincerely

Correspondence ID: 1283Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Lancaster, PA 17602
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 15:41:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Reintroducing the Great Bear to the greater NC Park area is essential to redress the historic harm to the bear and to its former environment. After the wolves were returned to YNP in the mid-90's, the grizzly made a natural comeback there. Today, the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem (GYE) is home to over a 1000 grizzlies with very little adverse consequences to humans. Any problems have been mitigated due to constant oversight by the State and Federal agencies.

There's no significant reason the same cannot be accomplished in the NC ecosystem which contains over 600,000 acres of the Stephen Mater Wilderness, an excellent place to plant the seed of grizzly reintroduction. If the GYE is as successful as it is with the growing grizzly bear population without any designated wilderness area, there's zero reason the NC cannot be as successful with its large expanse of wilderness. Thank You.

Correspondence ID: 1284Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Vancouver, UN V5T 4L3
Canada
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 15:51:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Restoring grizzly bears to the north cascades is important ecologically and culturally to our ecosystems and communities. The North Cascades is incomplete without grizzly bears.

Correspondence ID: 1285Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Concrete, WA 98237
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 15:58:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: <https://www.npr.org/2023/10/02/1203036630/bear-attack-couple-dies-canada-banff> This is one example of a Grizzly attack that killed a couple and their dog while camping in Alberta Canada just yesterday.

I am FIRMLY against the re-introduction of Grizzly bears to our region.

My reasons include that I and my family do go camping and that there are no means to protect ourselves from these apex predators. Having a complete understanding of the nature of these omnivorous creatures and the history of attacks which highly outnumbers those of mountain lions and wolves respectively. Also seeing the effects of re-introduction of another species of ELK into our region which are on the protected species list and the negative effect upon life and agriculture in my own life as a negative experience. There have been numerous deaths caused by ELK from a herd named Pinelli Herd and their presence is protected meaning they can not be culled or hunted. My wife having been involved directly with a destructive attack on her halted vehicle which our insurance company had to total in Sedro Woolley, Washington. They eat the farmers crops and create a threat directly to myself in my daily life. I have met them crossing the highway as a herd of hundreds entirely at night while going 50 MPH as well after turning down my street and they have been in my yard as an entire herd before. The impact of re-introduction of a species that wasn't even from this region has been detrimental to our ecosystem and has caused the loss of human life and continues to do so. There is NO reason to bring foreign Grizzly bears to our area, if they need to migrate back they will as do all species in this world. They do not need our help as there are thriving populations in other areas and regions of our continent. There has been an ongoing argument between local farmers and the Upper Skagit Indian tribe about fishing rights and elk conservation already that is currently unresolved. This idea proposal further initiates conflict in our region. Nothing good will come from putting Grizzly Bears in our forests. The other species will migrate away from where the relocated foreign species settle and create problems for not only themselves but humans. Regardless of tracking and population control efforts, these auxiliary problems which will only be tracked and studied as problems and addressed after which may cost the lives of human beings and then numerous tax payer dollars to study and resolve problems that currently do not exist and would be created due to the enactment of such proposal. Logic dictates that, "If it isn't broken, don't fix it.". There is no need for relocating Grizzly Bears to Washington state. Furthermore State and Federal rules and treaties with Tribal communities have been preferential toward the tribes hunting rights and restrictive to non-tribal hunters which needs to be addressed as it applies to our waterways. As well the ELK population should be relocated to the North Cascades with precedence to any proposed Grizzly bear re-location or re-population instead . Thank you for reading my comment and taking it into consideration.

I vote when I am allowed and I respectfully vote "NO" on this proposal.

Furthermore as a current F.C.C. Licensed General Class Amateur Radio Operator and G.M.R.S. licensee, I must introduce my concerns as a radio operator. In our society of licensed amateurs we are active in many forms of furthering communication as part of what some call a hobby and others a scientific endeavor. We have radio operators that consistently do what are called P.O.T.A. activations at National Parks as well S.O.T.A. activations which are usually done by hiking through sometimes already dangerous areas to reach a mountain peak where radio operations are done in a contesting manner. I may wish to engage in this activity with my son in the future and the proposal at hand significantly endangers our safety while engaging in hiking to a mountain top. This is my own personal opinion as one multi-licensed radio operator and I make no official representation of the many clubs which I am affiliated.

Thank you for your time,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID:	1286Project:112008Document:132104
Address:	Portland, OR 97206 United States of America
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual
Received:	Oct,03 2023 16:16:30
Correspondence Type:	Web Form

Correspondence: Apex predators benefit ecosystems. I strongly support the reintroduction of grizzly bears into the North Cascades. I respect the National Park Service staff and will accept their recommendation for the method of introduction.

Sincerely,

Correspondence ID: 1287Project:112008Document:132104

Address: East WENATCHEE, WA 98801
United States of America

Outside Organization: N/A Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 16:18:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am opposed to reintroducing new grizzlies into the North Cascades. The area allows for remote access for recreation and conflict with bears far from services or support would be a significant deterrent to some and would likely encourage others to take overly aggressive measures. After experiencing bears in Alaska there is no good current solution to human and bear coexistence. The bears need to be away from humans no matter how beautiful they are it poses a direct and unnecessary conflict that has been shown over and over again. These animals are beautiful and wonderful when given free reign. The idea of releasing them and then recapturing when they inevitably wander into conflict is cruel and stressful to both humans and the bears.

Bad idea! Best for bears and humans alike to have separate spaces!

Correspondence ID: 1288Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 16:25:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is a terrible idea/plan. It is a plan that has failed before even begun. The idea of placing bears and then tracking them until they need to be relocated? Please do not waste resources on this ill conceived idea. Whomever keeps pushing this agenda is not listening to our communities. We do not want bears brought in, period. PLEASE stop pushing this down on us and trying to dress it up each time as something it isn't. This doesn't help anything and causes a hardship on farmers and residents. The end result is having to kill more bears in the future. WHY?!

Correspondence ID: 1289Project:112008Document:132104

Address: VALLEYFORD, WA 99036
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 16:38:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As of right now this state doesn't need more apex predators in it. The miss management of predators now, is hurting the game populations in the region they are looking to put these into. With what they are wanting by adding more Grizzly's too there will not be the amount of food to keep balance of the game over predator balance. When I mean add they are not reintroducing them to the area. There are Grizzly's there now, not in abundance but if it had the holding capacity of these animals there would be more now. I grew up in this area and saw two grizzlies with my own eyes years ago (in two completely separate areas), which tells me if the habitat was able to support them then they would already be a growing population. So, until the state can halfway mange the wildlife that is already here, we do not need another APEX predator in this ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 1290Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ephrata, WA 98823
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 16:44:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I have been a wilderness ranger in the Pasayten on and off since 1972 for the U S forest service. My comment points are:
1. Money would better be spent on trails, bridges, and visitor improvements in the North Cascades National Oark.
2. Grizzly bear in the US are not endangered.
3. "Wouldn't it be nice" is not a reason to reintroduce grizzlies.
4. Washington State deserves to be the state who does not have grizzlies to worry about for our residents,
5. No grizzly bears remain in our state when they show up. Habitat may be part of the reason.
6. Washington states growing population and large number of people using the North Cascades is such that a bear human contact is unavoidable!
7. I humbly request no action be taken for the best interest of families and hikers of Washington State!

Correspondence ID: 1291Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Darrington, WA 98241
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 17:03:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Humans have done incalculable damage to the ecosystem by removing established species. So-called predators are a critical part of the ecosystem. It is only right that we mitigate the damage humans have caused by reintroducing native species and creating an environment where they can flourish. Humans should practice adaptation over eradication. Full support for reintroducing a native species back to its natural habitat.

Correspondence ID: 1292Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Medford, OR 97501
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 17:07:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am certainly against reintroduction of grizzly bears anywhere in the lower 48 states. We are certainly seeing a large increase in dangerous and now more deadly encounters in all areas where they exist. Why would we put hikers on the Pacific Crest Trail at risk of being torn apart like the elk calves they munch on in the spring. Ask Timothy Treadwell if grizzlies play nice. Oh that's right he and his girlfriend were torn apart by a friendly bearhug. We have plenty of grizzly bears in Montana Idaho and Wyoming if you also would like a nice bear hug be my guest. Make the intelligent choice. No hike on the PCT in Washington for me if this happens.

Correspondence ID: 1293Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Anacortes, WA 98221
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 17:18:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support Alternative A. I do not support introduction of more grizzlies into the NCE.

- 1) The historical population is irrelevant to modern day, we have over 8 million people in this state and thousands of miles of highways.
- 2) We don't have the prey populations for the current predators, never mind adding a new apex predator.
- 3) BC is full of grizzly and they can no longer be hunted, they'll move in slowly and naturally should the habitat and prey

ever be healthy enough to sustain a population.

4) The people of Washington have already resoundingly rejected this proposal, trying to force it down our throats every year is truly pathetic.

Correspondence ID: 1294Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Port Angeles, WA 98363
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 17:21:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzlies should NOT be re-introduced.

Correspondence ID: 1295Project:112008Document:132104

Address: WOODINVILLE, WA 98072
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 17:29:03

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I go to nature to find peace, beauty, not to be eaten alive. It doesn't matter how rare bear attack accidents may be, just 1 accident is too much, it's a catastrophe for the family. Please don't reintroduce bears.

Correspondence ID: 1296Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Malaga, WA 98828
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 17:29:41

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This would be a great opportunity to add a species that we extirpated back into the wild! Just look at how great the wolves have been for Yellowstone! Always exciting to see them. Thank you for pursuing this!

Correspondence ID: 1297Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Cape Girardeau, MO 63701
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 17:38:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I don't understand what the point is. Why do we need more dangerous apex predators in the wild. Hunters manage game just fine while stimulating the economy at the same time.

Correspondence ID: 1298Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 17:41:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The park should not introduce grizzly bears. The likely negative impacts are strong enough reason not to. Resources should be directed to higher value initiatives. Rural communities would be negatively impacted and they voted strongly against this when it was brought up the last 5 years. No to grizzly bears in the North Cascades National Park.

Correspondence ID: 1299Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mazama, WA 98833
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 17:56:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We own a cabin in Mazama and we enthusiastically support returning grizzly bears to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 1300Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Cashmere, WA 98815
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 17:58:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I'll keep it simple. Just like the introduction of the Canadian gray wolf, it will decimate elk, deer, and livestock populations as well as increase risk to residents and outdoor enthusiasts.

Correspondence ID: 1301Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98109
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 18:01:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: While the idea of restoring grizzly bears to North Cascades National Park may seem appealing from a conservation perspective, there are legitimate concerns and potential harm that should be considered:

Human Safety: Grizzly bears are apex predators and can pose a significant risk to human safety. Their presence in areas frequented by visitors and park staff could lead to dangerous encounters. This may necessitate increased safety measures, such as bear-proof food storage, which can be inconvenient for park-goers.

Impact on Local Communities: The reintroduction of grizzly bears could affect the livelihoods and safety of local communities surrounding the park. Ranchers, farmers, and residents in the vicinity might experience conflicts with bears damaging property or livestock, leading to potential economic losses.

Disruption of Ecosystem Balance: Grizzly bears are known to have substantial impacts on ecosystems due to their predatory role. The reintroduction could disrupt the existing balance of species within the park, potentially affecting prey populations and vegetation, and even leading to changes in the behavior of other wildlife.

Limited Habitat and Resources: The North Cascades National Park might not have enough suitable habitat and natural food resources to support a healthy grizzly bear population. Insufficient food could lead bears to seek alternative food sources, potentially increasing conflicts with humans.

Costs and Resources: The process of reintroducing grizzly bears is expensive and resource-intensive. It involves monitoring, research, and ongoing management efforts, which could divert resources away from other conservation projects and park maintenance.

Ethical Concerns: Some argue that it may be ethically problematic to reintroduce a species into an environment that has changed significantly since their absence. The original ecological context may no longer exist, and the reintroduction might not be in the best interest of the bears themselves.

Public Opposition: The idea of introducing a large predator into a park may face significant opposition from local communities, park visitors, and interest groups. Public opposition can create challenges in implementation and ongoing management.

Correspondence ID: 1302Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98274
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 18:04:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a Washington resident I do not support reintroducing grizzly bear.

Correspondence ID: 1303Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98274
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 18:49:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Regarding grizzly bears:
I'm against the plan to introduce the grizzly into the North Cascades. I love the area and like to hike on the parks many trails, but people already have to avoid black bear and cougars. While those species are dangerous they come nowhere near the danger posed by grizzlies.
Thank you

Correspondence ID: 1304Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Buckley, WA 98321
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 18:50:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Yes reintroduce grizzlies to the north Cascades. Having all former species is important. People will just have to adapt.

Correspondence ID: 1305Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Shoreline, WA 98156
United States of America
Outside Organization: None Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 18:52:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I have been climbing and Backpacking in the Cascaded for over 40 years and have always hoped that one day the powers that be would reintroduce the Grizzlies back to their Natural Home. Please bring them Home

Correspondence ID: 1306Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Vancouver, WA 98687
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 18:54:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To: National Park Service
RE: Reintroducing grizzly bears in the North Cascades
From: [REDACTED]

Thank you for allowing comments from the public. What is the purpose of the National Park System? If it is to provide enjoyment, education, and inspiration for American citizens and future generations, why would we want to introduce

predatory animals who would endanger citizens and future generations? Grizzlies are dangerous. Is the National Park System trying to go against its purpose and force people to stay away from our national park lands?

This has some similarities to the idea of bringing in more mosquitoes to areas so they can bite humans and other animals to infect them with deadly viruses. Mosquitoes kill more people each year than any other animal. Just because we have been able to remove them from an area to make it safer for people and other animals, does not mean we should now reintroduce them to an area where they are no longer a threat. This seems like a crazy, warped political and/or environmental idea.

Wolves used to be a dominant predator in what is now the Portland metro area. Should we reintroduce wild wolves in neighborhoods throughout Portland because they once lived there?

Reintroducing grizzly bears has far more downsides than up. That is unless the purpose of reintroducing this dominant predator is to reduce the population of other wild animals and keep humans off the public lands that we pay for and which were set aside for us to enjoy.

I think this is a horrible idea and hope you do not reintroduce grizzly bears.

Correspondence ID: 1307Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Concrete, WA 98237
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 18:55:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I personally do not support bringing grizzly bears into the north cascades. Grizzly bears rarely wonder down into this area but it has been known to happen and if their population naturally grew into the north cascades I and everyone I know would be in favor of it. In my opinion bringing endangered predators into an area proves to be unsupported by the community and with Washington states terrible politics the grizzly bear population would get out of control. A prime example of this is in Montana where grizzly bears are becoming a problem yet we can't get them off the endangered species list although there is a plenty sustainable population. Allow nature to run its course and the grizzlies will be in the north cascades in a much more acceptable timeline and with a much better public acceptance.

Correspondence ID: 1308Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Zillah, WA 98953
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 18:56:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Real wild like science shows that grizzly bears are already in Washington state. Coming from Canada and Washington. This state can't manage the mountains lions in the state with the 2nd highest present of attacks by cougars in the lower 48 states. The wildlife governing body of the wildlife commission manages by political favor not sciences. You are asking for another failed experiment. Favoring popular democrats that want to drive into a park take a picture. They live in a fantasy world that the state hides the truth from. They believe the government takes problem animals and moves them some where else. Where the truth is the animal is destroyed through in to a land fill. This removal is not behind the backs of the clueless. The state is destroying the deer and elk herds in this state with the management of the predator that are already here. The cougar and wolf problem are out of control.

States that truly run a wildlife program with conservation in mind like Alaska and Wyoming that truly have the welfare of the animal in mind work with the hunting community to control over grazing and the control of predators. There have been 5 grizzly attacks this year in the western reagents of the us and Canada.

Put people in charge of the Washington game commission that understands the balance of nature not people that fall under a political agenda. This state can't afford the lawsuits that will come form there miss management of a grizzly populations

Correspondence ID: 1309Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Woodinville, WA 98072
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 18:57:08

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am a biologist, a science educator and a hiker. Grizzly bears are an important part of the Cascade Mountains and Pacific Northwest ecosystem. Grizzly bears were extirpated from the Cascades and most of Washington State due to hunting and ranching. There are concerns, of course, for grazing animals, hikers and others who may encounter grizzlies. Dangerous outcomes are fairly rare when examining encounters in other northern states. This should not be a reason for banning the return of grizzlies to the Northern Cascades. There are far more dangers in the urban world of crime and cars. People who live near or choose adventures into wild areas need to respect animals in nature and act accordingly. I live five minutes from downtown Bothell and downtown Woodinville. I have coyotes, bobcats and an occasional bear visit my property. We need to learn to live with wildlife, not ban them from their natural habitats. The longer we disrupt the natural ecosystems the more problems we will encounter. Education is key. Bring back grizzlies to their natural habitat.

Correspondence ID: 1311Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98503
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 19:01:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: How are you going to protect campers and hikers from the grizzlies? Stupid idea to mix them with recreational users. Remember the "Night of the Grizzlies," in Glacier National Park in August 1967.

Correspondence ID: 1312Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98506
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 19:01:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am strongly for introducing Grizzly bears into the North Cascades. There have been very few deadly encounters with them in their current locations and I feel public awareness that they are in the area is key to reducing unpleasant contacts.

Correspondence ID: 1313Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sedro-Woolley, WA 98284
United States of America

Outside Organization: Skagit County Farm Bureau Business

Received: Oct,03 2023 19:01:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I live in Skagit County, Washington State, and it appears that we have fallen back on an old childhood adage: If mother says no, ask grandmother. Time and again, the citizens of East Skagit County who are most affected by Grizzlies and elk have said no and hell no.

Now we are presented with a new and different twist in the 10 (j) rule ensuring East Skagitonians that this is a better alternative to the original plan and fewer bears would be turned loose on us. The elk were also transported here in fewer numbers and look at us now! Then, of course, there are the wolves to add to our mixed bag of ecological bliss. This unpleasant state of affairs is hailed by those who do not live in the county or at least, anywhere near where these bears are to be transplanted.

If the Canadian First Nations turn their Grizzlies loose above us, then ultimately, we can expect the 10 (j) rule to turn into the original plan.

[Per wdfw.wa.gov

Most Grizzly populations require huge areas of habitat remote from most human activity.

Grizzly bears are common only where food is abundant and concentrated (salmon runs, caribou calving grounds, etc.)]

[Males roam the most, using areas from 600 to 1,000 square miles. Females use areas up to and beyond 100 square miles. Grizzlies may travel 20 to 40 miles a day.]

Since there is no guarantee that these bears will stay in their safe space and no guarantee that food sources will always be plentiful, the next stop logically would be closer to civilization. Like the elk that have become close to domesticated, why work for food in the wild when you can enjoy the spoils of Skagitonians' habitat by government sanction.

Moreover, using deductive reasoning, one can only conclude that WDFW and supporters of their agenda have no regard for human life as we have seen with the out of control elk population in Skagit County.

Share The Bear Program: An Equal and Impartial Opportunity

In the spirit of social justice and fair and equitable treatment, let's have a Share The Bear program whereby every proponent of this ludicrous plan gets to have a sleepover and host a bear in their backyard for the weekend. We would not want to deprive any bear-watcher of their basic human right for the same opportunity shared by East Skagitonians. Our Food Bank could partner this endeavor and enlist Meals On Wheels to deliver leftover food to backyards for the bear to snack on all weekend.

In conclusion, enthusiasts who don't live here, have no concept of rural living, and make no economic or social contributions to our way of life in Skagit County are bent on forcing their ecological imaginings upon us free of all consequences. Moreover, we have a long history of paying these ecological consequences with little relief from government. Our citizens, their children, and their children's children deserve to live in Skagit County with peace of mind and safety within their own communities. We do not desire Grizzlies in Skagit.

Show less

Correspondence ID: 1314Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Edmonds, WA 98026
United States of America
Outside Organization: Retired dentist Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 19:02:47
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I was born and raised in Montana. I am an avid hiker and have my share of grizzly experiences. I realize attacks few, but if

It was your child of grandchild that is too many. We do NOT need to increase the grizzly population. Hiking should be fun and not worry constantly looking over your shoulder. I have had lots of encounters and know what to do. If a bear want you, you are out of luck.

NO GRIZZLIES NO GRIZZLIES NO GRIZZLIES

Correspondence ID: 1315Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Arlington, WA 98223
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 19:07:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No. Just No. Do not release grizzly bears into a habitat that Parks hasn't even proven can feed them.

Correspondence ID: 1316Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 19:10:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think bringing Grizzly bears to the North Cascades would be considerably unwise. Washingtonians are not use to grizzly bear mannerisms and it won't be long until humans will encounter bear attacks. Washington has enjoyed its preserved recreational spaces. The population around the North Cascades is much closer to the wild, and much larger than communities In Idaho and Montana. I don't think Washington State should allow any Grizzlies in the area, not with the Pacific Coast Trail, the frequented National Parks and popular state parks within and next to the National Forests. Grizzly Bears are extremely dangerous compared to black bear, our large town of Wenatchee borders the North Cascade Range, the safety of our children hiking and camping is more important than grizzly re-entry. Let's not forget WHY Grizzlies are no longer in Washington. Farmer and agricultural worker safety, crop preservation for the millions and millions our state provides food for (more potatoes than idaho, 95% of all pears the nation has in grocery stores) AND recreational safety... We already deal with Cougars, and they are more recluse than these aggressive glorious creatures!! I love wildlife and want to preserve it, BUT in more remote areas!! Washington, especially the communities most impacted (who love the land and the preservation of it) VOTE NO TO GRIZZLY RE-ENTRY.

Correspondence ID: 1317Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Friday harbor, WA 98250
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 19:34:52

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As an avid backpacker for over 60 years, and having encountered grizzlies at times, I absolutely believe that introducing these bears to the north cascades is absolutely FUCK'N STUPID!! You must be out of your minds even considering this! THEY KILL PEOPLE!

Think of the legal liability when one of your bears attacks - maybe a child!!

Before doing this have a backpacking field trip to glacier np and meet a few of these bears in the wild - that will sober everyone up !,

Hope you see the light

██████████

Correspondence ID: 1318Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ellensburg, WA 98926
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 19:51:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I just look at this as another way for the federal government to hurt our ranchers. I'm against it unless they are reimbursed for livestock loss. Another thing is wild animals don't stay within the borders you've given them. If the people in charge are transparent unlike how they were with the wolves it might be more tolerable. Thanks

Correspondence ID: 1319Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spokane, WA 99218
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 20:02:41

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not support this initiative. I assess there is currently insignificant research and planning to promote a project with significant impact to the environment and public safety.

Correspondence ID: 1320Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 20:21:15

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I love the North Cascades and would love to know that it has been restored with all of it's former wildlife (including grizzlies). I vote YES for grizzly reintroduction

Correspondence ID: 1321Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Poulsbo, WA 98370
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 20:34:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: They were here first. Please reintroduce them. We need to protect our species before they are all gone.

Correspondence ID: 1322Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98133
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 20:36:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears are already migrating here. Reintroduction is a terrible idea. As a life long Elk hunter in this state I've watched our populations continue to fall in huntable areas. This state has already begun wolf reintroduction, another terrible idea. If we continue on this path we will no longer have deer and elk to hunt. These large predators will then move to cattle, domesticated animals and finally people.

There is a reason these bears are no longer here, they kill...

This state has far to many left minded anti hunting people as it is, what will control populations of these reintroduced animals, NOTHING.

Correspondence ID: 1323Project:112008Document:132104

Address: seattle, WA 98112
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 20:38:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The more huge and the more dangerous and the more numerous the huge dangerous predators the better. The thought that you and your family could be disemboweled in your sleep or be ripped apart limb to limb at any moment while hiking a wilderness trail is what makes camping and enjoying wilderness areas fun and exciting. Grizzly bears by the hundreds would be a great start!

Additionally, threatened species the world over need habit. A fantastic and suitable addition to the North Cascades would be at least a small breeding population of Siberian Tigers. They love snow and eat deer. They would fit right in. Now let me tell you,... turn those things loose and by golly you would amp up the excitement factor right off the scale in no time.

Those are my thoughts. Hopefully you will get right on it.

Sincerely, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 1324Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Burbank, WA 99323
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 20:54:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: NO- do no re-introduce grizzly bears.

They are an apex predator with ch will cause havoc with people, farmers and other animals.

They serve no purpose in the management of the N Cascades.

There are plenty of black bears, cougars, bobcats as apex predators to take care of the balance in the eco system.

The answer is NO.

Correspondence ID: 1325Project:112008Document:132104
Address: East Wenatchee, WA 98802
United States of America
Outside Organization: [REDACTED] Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 21:31:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am very opposed to this plan. Grizzly Bears are not needed in the North Cascades. Hunter's, campers, hikers and fishermen don't need any additional hazards in the great outdoors. Cougars and wolves are bad enough. Please do not adopt the plan to release Grizzlies.

Thank you,

Correspondence ID: 1326Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Chelan, WA 98816
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 21:32:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: This is a bad idea, bad idea, bad idea! As a public entity your first and top priority should be public safety, period. This will create inevitable conflicts with the probability of deadly consequences. I use these lands almost every weekend in the summer months. I trail run, hike and bike, all solo, on many of the trail systems in the North Cascades and the Okanogan-Wenatchee national forest. The reintroduction of grizzlies will make it impossible for me to SAFELY use the public lands where I live.
I am appalled that we are having this conversation let alone that it is being pushed by your department.
Public lands are set aside so that all its citizens can safely recreate and enjoy them, not so that fish and game can experiment at the cost of human life.
Perhaps you should reintroduce T-Rex, I understand that they used to roam this area as well.....might be safer.

Correspondence ID: 1327Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Corpus Christi, TX 78419
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 21:34:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hi,

My husband and I spend a lot of time in this area, and we do not need any extra dangerous predators in the area. Certainly you can find something more productive to do other than releasing grizzly bears into an area that has enough already. Seriously, plant a tree.... fix some potholes in the road... restore the woodland caribou!

Correspondence ID: 1328Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 21:40:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Support any plan to reintroduce grizzlies

Correspondence ID: 1329Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 21:43:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am strongly against the introduction of grizzlies into the Cascade mountains. It opposes a safety and hazard risk to the nearby towns, live stock and outdoorsman.

Correspondence ID: 1330Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kettle Falls, WA 99141
United States of America

Outside Organization: Self Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 21:52:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think this is a really bad idea, being a hunter the predator population is out of hand in our state. The amount of game for hunting is down considerably because the game department has done such a horrible job of regulating the wolves, cougars, bears and coyotes, to introduce another predator just doesn't make since. Also, more people than ever are using the national forest and wilderness areas for recreation and we all know this will lead to more conflicts and humans being attacked and killed. With the past history of the game departments failure to do their job right when it comes to predator regulation I cannot support the introduction of grizzlies in the state of Washington.

Thank You
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 1331Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Eugene, OR 97405
United States of America

Outside Organization: None Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,03 2023 21:59:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do NOT support the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades. It is dangerous & unnecessary. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 1332Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98112
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 22:07:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am strongly against the reintroduction of grizzly bears to north Cascades National Park.

Just the other day, a 73 year old woman was mauled by a bear and her husband deployed bear spray in montana.

Within the same week, a couple was killed by a grizzly bear in Banff National Park and the couple were experienced in the Backcountry.

Just weeks prior, a hunter was mauled by a grizzly bear in Montana.

These stories are only the recent events of grizzly bear attacks on humans. The number of attacks is rising and reintroducing the bears risks the lives of Washington hikers and backpackers.

Correspondence ID: 1333Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Clinton, WA 98236
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 22:10:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I agree with brown bears being moved to Washington. Americas wildlife has been devastated from its once abundant biodiversity. Bear hunting should be banned trophy hunting is immoral. Animals don't exist to be hunted. Alot of Americans want to see the biome thriving and brown bears have always had a cultural significance to the native Americans. Anyone hiking in the wilderness can and should have some type of weapon for self defense however. Finally I don't think bears eating ranchers property should be put down.

Correspondence ID: 1334Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Riversside, WA 98849
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 22:21:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support option A - NO ACTION. This is not the first time public comments have been sought on this issue of reintroducing grizzly bears into the NCE region. Each time, the resounding comments from people who live, work and recreate in that region has been that we do not want the reintroduction of grizzlies in this area. Whenever grizzly bears are introduced the population of deer and elk and salmon is reduced as the bears have to eat. When adequate amounts of the above feed is not available, the bears are apt to seek sustenance by feeding on domestic animals, pets and perhaps even a human. The law requires that the forest system be managed for multiple uses which include ranching/grazing, hunting, fishing, recreation of all kinds, etc. Grizzly bears have the potential to greatly disrupt those activities. Please drop the idea of reintroducing the grizzly to the NCE.

Correspondence ID: 1335Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 22:27:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: While I can appreciate the efforts to restore and protect the Grizzly Bear population - the North Cascades are now vulnerable to wild fires and the impacts of climate change. This is a vulnerable environment and I would much

prefer that the National Park Service focus on saving the forest. We are in a critical juncture and without forests the bears cannot survive any more than humans can. We need to prioritize issues of climate change and the risks to forest lands. Returning Grizzlies is not the highest priority for the Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 1336Project:112008Document:132104
Address: East Wenatchee, WA 98802
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 22:30:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: This is a dangerous plan which puts the lives of those recreating in the north cascades at risk. I do not support this plan.

Correspondence ID: 1337Project:112008Document:132104
Address: East Wenatchee, WA 98802
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 22:41:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am strongly against reintroduction of grizzly bears into the North Cascades. There will be a natural introduction of these animals as populations expand in our surrounding areas. Having moved to WA from states with grizzly bear populations and spending time in grizzly bear country as well as many friends; there are plenty of close calls and numerous fatalities caused by these animals. The ability to spend time in these places without a prominent predator, introduced by humans, is a privilege. We need not to interfere with the carrying capacity of a thriving ecosystem to drive tourism to remote areas.

There needs to be a plan to control population if this introduction goes through. Look at wolf introduction in Yellowstone and the effects it had on the ecosystem as well as the business of ranchers, farmers, and hunters.

Correspondence ID: 1338Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Battleground, WA 98604
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 23:15:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do not agree with the plan to reintroduce grizzly bears here in Washington. I feel that they would have a negative impact on our ungulate population which is suffering due to mismanagement of the predators already present. As a lifelong sportsman I feel we need a healthy balance of both and the mule deer are already suffering. The grizzlies would not help us in our efforts to preserve our mule deer population. Let's see more effort in managing what's dying before we add another nail to the coffin
Thanks

Correspondence ID: 1339Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Sammamish, WA 98074
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 23:32:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I would vote for Option A, No action

Correspondence ID: 1340Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 23:32:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: While public comment will never sway a decision. I do not support the reintroduction of Grizzly Bears into the Cascades. This bear has no natural predators and there has been little evaluation of the impacts to livestock and humans 10 to 20 years down the road.

Alternate A no action is the only thing that should be considered

Correspondence ID: 1341Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Chelan, WA 98816
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 23:39:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We do not want any more grizzly bears in the Northern Cascades!

Correspondence ID: 1342Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Chelan, WA 98816
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 23:39:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We do not want any more grizzly bears in the Northern Cascades!

Correspondence ID: 1343Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Federalway, WA 98001
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023 23:52:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I would love to see grizzly bears back into the woods. They will add a bit more excitement to a hike in true wilderness. In all the hiking that I did when I was younger I never encountered any dangerous engagements with critter's. Now I have a cabin in the woods and have seen bears and cougars but they tend to steer clear of me. Besides getting injured by a bear is so much more interesting than your car accident.

.

Correspondence ID: 1344Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,04 2023
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am in favor of grizzly restoration plan. Grizzlies belong in the north cascades and I look forward to them getting back there.

Correspondence ID: 1345Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Farmington, ME 04938
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,04 2023
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: They should start in Seattle

Correspondence ID: 1346Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98101
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,04 2023
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Thank you for welcoming our input. We worry about public safety in a national park which is more remote (and hence less likely to be able to get support to easily) compared to other national park spaces in the country co-existing with grizzly bears.

Correspondence ID: 1347Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Shoreline, WA 98155
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,04 2023 01:33:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not bring grizzly bears to our state. We have a lot of families hiking and encounters with grizzly bears are much more dangerous than anything we have here. Introducing this apex predator would increase possibilities for people to be seriously injured or killed. If that happens no "sorry" or "higher environmental goals" would mean anything to grieving families.
Please leave bears where they are and do not bring them here.

Correspondence ID: 1348Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,04 2023 01:46:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not support relocation of grizzly bears to the north cascades national park. I believe there will be user bear conflicts in the park similar to what we have seen in Montana and recently Coleville, WA. In the short period of time they have been introduced into Yellowstone there has been a dramatic increase in bear conflicts with users. This will also happen in the north cascades if they are reintroduced.

Correspondence ID: 1349Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Woodinville, WA 98072
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,04 2023 02:07:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hard no. Would like to visit the Cascades without worrying about being killed by a deadly bear. Let's just stick to black bears, please.

Correspondence ID: 1350Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,04 2023 04:02:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not believe introducing grizzly bears into Washington state is a good idea. I enjoy hiking and recreation within the Wenatchee national forest with my children. Given the recent deaths of two adults while camping by grizzly bear in Canada, and the nine other deadly attacks within the last three years this is a threat to public safety. Grizzly bears can be territorial, protective, and predatory. Park attendance will fall along with revenue from Discover Passes. Please do not reintroduce grizzly bears as proposed.

Correspondence ID: 1351Project:112008Document:132104

Address: CASHMERE, WA 98815
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,04 2023 06:26:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The historical population is irrelevant to modern day, we have over 8 million people in this state and thousands of miles of highways.

We don't have the prey populations for the current predators, never mind adding a new apex predator.

BC is full of grizzly and they can no longer be hunted, they'll move in slowly and naturally should the habitat and prey ever be healthy enough to sustain a population.

The people of Washington have already resoundingly rejected this proposal, trying to force it down our throats every year is truly pathetic.

Correspondence ID: 1352Project:112008Document:132104

Address: CASHMERE, WA 98815
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,04 2023 06:28:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The historical population is irrelevant to modern day, we have over 8 million people in this state and thousands of miles of highways.

We don't have the prey populations for the current predators, never mind adding a new apex predator.

BC is full of grizzly and they can no longer be hunted, they'll move in slowly and naturally should the habitat and prey ever be healthy enough to sustain a population.

The people of Washington have already resoundingly rejected this proposal, trying to force it down our throats every year is truly pathetic.

Correspondence ID: 1353Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Waterville, WA 98856
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,04 2023 07:03:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The reintroduction of grizzlies to the North Cascades is a stupid, foolhardy plan seemingly designed to please the smug, self-satisfied employees of the Interior as they sit in their air-conditioned offices in Washington DC.

Meanwhile, those of us who have spent our lives recreating in and living near the North Cascades will be saddled with the threat of potentially hundreds of extraordinarily dangerous apex predators. I personally do not look forward to having to carry a 45/70 rifle with me everywhere I go while backpacking on the Crest.

The proposed rules casually dismiss the threat these animals pose. Given how few people actually spend any significant

amount of time in deep wilderness, the threat to the human population at large will certainly be small. But that is little comfort to we few who actually do spend extended periods of time in these mountains.

While the NPS can glibly dismissing any dangers, even a casual observer of news would note that just last week a couple and their dog were killed and partially consumed by a grizzly in Canada while camped in the wilderness. Perhaps instead of the North Cascades we could instead introduce the grizzly to Rock Creek Park in DC and see how the interactions go there?

If one wishes to experience grizzlies up close and in-person, go to Alaska. Leave us be in Washington.

Correspondence ID: 1354Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Moses Lake, WA 98837
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,04 2023 07:21:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As an avid user of the North Cascades, who's witnessed small black bears eating deer alive, I ask that the much larger grizzly bear not be reintroduced to the area.

Correspondence ID: 1355Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Pacific, WA 98047
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,04 2023 07:44:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: NO, NO, NO. Do not bring grizzly bears to the north cascades.

Correspondence ID: 1356Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Centralia, WA 98531
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,04 2023 07:58:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: NO MORE PREDATORS!!

We know that Grizzlies already exist in the North Cascades of Washington. Adding to that population just increases competition for an already dwindling ungulate population. Our state has already seen a huge increase of black bear, cougar, and an out of control spread of wolves. Adding another apex predator to the mix will increase danger to humans and increase the amount of money spent to euthanize "problem animals". Our state's WDFW commission has already mismanaged the predator population and this mismanagement is getting worse.

Correspondence ID: 1357Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Alberton, MT 59820
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,04 2023 08:32:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Bears are incredibly adaptable, there is no need for grizzly bear reintroduction. Natural population increase and expansion is occurring at an astounding rate. We are already seeing many hiker/bear conflicts across Idaho, Montana and Wyoming. Adding more bears to this area is unnecessary and potentially dangerous. We need to manage bears, not reintroduce. thank you.

Correspondence ID: 1358Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Snohomish, WA 98290
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,04 2023 08:50:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: While I wouldn't advocate the removal of grizzly bears from Washington I also do not think we need to bring them back.

Correspondence ID: 1359Project:112008Document:132104
Address: East Wenatchee, WA 98802
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,04 2023 09:15:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I vote for the no action taken option. Keep studying the reintroduction but conduct a parallel study looking at potential social and economic impact to communities neighboring the reintroduction areas. Wildlife incursions into ever expanding residential neighborhoods seem to be on the news more often than in the past. Selfishly as an avid hiker I would prefer to not have to open carry a high powered weapon and bear spray.

Correspondence ID: 1360Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98105
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,04 2023 09:17:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am in favor of restoring grizzly bears to the North Cascades. We must correct the missteps of previous generations that attempted to and did wipe out these magnificent creatures in order to restore the ecological balance of the wilderness. Just as the wolves in Yellowstone had a great positive impact on the environment, so can the grizzlies in the North Cascades. In addition, the grizzly is an iconic figure for Native Americans.I believe any depredation of grazing stock can be controlled, such that the reintroduction of the grizzly will greatly outweigh any such losses.

Correspondence ID: 1361Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,04 2023 09:26:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I ask that we do not reintroduce grizzlies to North Cascades National Park. I live in Washington State and hike/backpack several times a year in the park. The scenery there is simply breathtaking. While I've enjoyed watching black bears from the trail a number of times on hikes through North Cascades, I really do not want to worry about encountering a grizzly on the trail. I encountered a family of grizzlies once in Glacier National Park, and it was a terrifying experience. They came right out of the woods as we had stopped to eat lunch and somehow ended up with my group in between the mom and the cubs. I really want to keep enjoying the North Cascades without having to worry about a threatening situation like that happening again.

Correspondence ID: 1362Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,04 2023 09:29:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: There has been confirmed sitings of grizzly bears in North Cascade for the last 10 years and my family has been in this county for 97 years bringing in more bears without a management plan not to mention the population growth of almost 5 million people moving here in the last 30 years is going to create a major problem. I am not sure how many people will need to die before your wdfw will wake up!! The bears have been coming down from Canada for many years and adding to the population will only cause more deaths not only bears but probably a few tourists and newbies too our state welcome too Californication

Correspondence ID: 1363Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Concrete, WA 98237
United States of America
Outside Organization: Farmer Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,04 2023 09:45:19
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a resident near to the Cascade National Forest, I beg you to consider our safety for ourselves, livestock, and pets. Please also take into consideration the hikers, fishermen and campers that use this area for recreation. We already have mountain lions, black bear, and coyotes to contend with. Recent administrations, both Republican and Democrat, have not been kind to the farmers in America. Please consider how hard it is to keep going when government doesnt consider you and your costs in the loss of livestock as important.

Correspondence ID: 1364Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Yelm, WA 98597
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,04 2023 09:49:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Fully support grizzly bear reintroduction efforts into the NCE, specially using Alternative C action plan. I am an avid hunter, and understand returning the grizzly bear could have adverse impact on populations of game species that I hunt, or create barriers to accessing game in areas of the NCE where grizzlies are reestablished (if exclusion/buffer zones are implemented). I have lived in Washington state my entire life. I advocate for Alternative C to allow for greatest flexibility in managing conflict between bears and people. I hope to see grizzly bears in the NCE in my lifetime. I hope to see Woodland Caribou return to the Selkirk mountains. I hope to see California Condors returning to Washington skies in my lifetime (perhaps in Olympic National Park). My wife and I visited North Cascades National Park for the first time last month, and I was so inspired at the prospect of an apex predator returning to those lands.

Correspondence ID: 1365Project:112008Document:132104
Address: OAK HARBOR, WA 98277-9029
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,04 2023 09:52:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am not in support of introducing Grizzlies into the Cascades for multiple reasons. I love hiking and hunting in our National Forests and the reintroduction of grizzlies would pretty much destroy what's left of deer and elk populations that the wolves have already desimated.

Correspondence ID: 1366Project:112008Document:132104
Address: SEQUIM, WA 98382
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,04 2023 10:14:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: YES! By all means, restore the Grizzlies, along with appropriate protections, to the North Cascades. And, while you're at it, please consider the reintroduction of Gray Wolves. These actions would be a small step in the right direction to correcting the depredations of humans.

Correspondence ID: 1367Project:112008Document:132104

Address: la conner, WA 98257
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,04 2023 10:17:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The North Cascades is a natural for grizzly reintroduction. I saw a griz and her cub near Watson Lakes about 50 years ago and, although I'm now 77 and probably won't get that lucky again, I think there is great value in knowing that sons and daughters might have that chance and that old brains can rest assured that the N. Cascades are closer to a point of repose with regard to fauna habitation.

More heavily used areas might turn into zoos or fire public outrage or become traps for the effort if included in the plan.

I think, although the biology and history is of great interest, more summarized narrative always gets people more involved than extensive rafts of detail,

I salute this long awaited effort.

Correspondence ID: 1368Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Colville, WA 99114
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,04 2023 10:24:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I live in the area of restoration. I for one is strictly NOT in favor. We're already dealing with wolves! So NO MORE PREDITORES!

We already have a population problem with elk moose and not to mention the great restoration of antelope what happen there.

Correspondence ID: 1369Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lenore, ID 83541
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,04 2023 10:26:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Bring the bears back and throw away the 10(j). They belong here, the fucking 10(j) does not.

get this right for a change.

Correspondence ID: 1371Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Redmond, WA 98053
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,04 2023 10:31:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I believe Grizzlies should be re-introduced to their native range in Washington State. I support the natural balance of predators and prey.

Correspondence ID: 1372Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Darrington, WA 98204
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,04 2023 10:38:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I live on [REDACTED] and spend a lot of time in the Baker/Snoqualmie. I have already seen a black bear and it crossed the river but we left and did not have an interaction. Grizzly bears have no right to be introduced to the ecosystem because it would make the area unsafe for hikers and campers such as myself. I will never feel safe camping outside now. Thank you for your time.

Correspondence ID: 1373Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spokane Valley, WA 99212
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,04 2023 10:47:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I cannot think of a positive reason to do this. There are three main points to make. First of all, hunting opportunities for deer and elk have greatly diminished thanks to the reintroduction of predatory carnivorous wolves and omnivorous grizzlies in other parts of the state. Mountain lion populations also continue to increase further intensifying the competition for food with other predators. Couple this with human expanding human presence, and humans become the next alternative. This reckless and unsafe idea lacks foresight and consideration on who it will impact the most negatively, namely the human population. This leads to my second point.

We no longer live in the year 1492 when these creatures inhabited the land and had near sole reign over the ecosystem. Humans are not an invasive species and should the Dept. of Interior needs to stop treating us this way. When humans arrived, we altered the environment, true, but this is a natural process since humans are part the natural world. Any notions to REVERSE THE CLOCK are foolish and lack forethought. The romantic notion that we can somehow expand the grizzly bear population to "balance" ecosystem is not a scientific idea. Rather, it is an emotional romantic dream that antisocial people with a chip on their shoulder against white European settlers. Environmentalists have conjured up this retribution as a way to OVERCOMPENSATE for past human practices of hunting wolves and bears. Reintroducing these predators WILL NOT reset the clock back to 1492.

Third, we already have areas where grizzlies and wolves have been reintroduced and are being monitored. This is sufficient in itself already. Wilderness areas and the National Wildlife Refuge system are set up for this purpose and it has already been started. There is no good reason to continue the RECKLESS expansion.

Correspondence ID: 1374Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Cashmere, WA 98815
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,04 2023 11:12:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I agree fully with comments submitted by the Chelan County Board of Commissioners. Times have changed a lot around here since grizzly bears once roamed the North Cascades. These days, the mountains are crowded with hikers, almost all of whom are unarmed, and the number of people living in mountain residences has grown exponentially. Grizzly bears are apex predators, and kill people.

There is a population of grizzlies in the North Cascades now, in British Columbia. Nothing is stopping them from expanding their range southward, which they'll do if it appears to them to be good habitat. Please don't meddle.

Correspondence ID: 1375Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,04 2023 11:13:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I commented during the previous period before that restoration plan was halted. Now that the current administration has reopened the comment period, I'd like to say that I sincerely hope that this time the process can be brought to fruition and a limited number (at first) of grizzly bears can be reintroduced into their former home range. The same landscape is still there--mostly within the North Cascades National Park and is wilderness, as wild as one will find in the Lower 48. Return of the bears would only add to the improvement of the landscape, being a keystone species, and grizzlies will have a positive ripple effect on the whole ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 1376Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225-7215
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,04 2023 11:14:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support bringing grizzly bears back to the North Cascades Ecosystem. We need that top level predator again. I support both Alternatives B and C.

Correspondence ID: 1377Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lake Stevens, WA 98258
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,04 2023 11:20:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing these comments as a public citizen even though I am a fishery manager for a resource organization. I am probably bias with my views as would have loved to be a bear biologist if I did not chose aquatics.

I have had positive experiences with Grizzlies throughout my life from Alaska, Canadian, and Montana. I have educated myself on these animals too and I find them curious opportunistic animals.

I am for a limited reintroduction where habitat can support forging opportunities that include tubers and berries.

These introductions should all be collared and monitored. I know this type of monitoring already goes on near ski resorts in Canada where there is close contact with human infrastructure. Presently, we have a very health black bear population in the North Cascade with very little conflict.

Correspondence ID: 1378Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,04 2023 11:28:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in full support of reintroducing Grizzly Bears back into their native habitat in the North Cascades. They need a place in this world and the North Cascades is one of their native habitats, and will provide a start to providing them with a home again.

The only concern I have is that when humans go into the Grizzly Bears habitat, which they most definitely will, that a bad encounter because of domestic dogs and bad human behavior will cause those bears to be killed. So I believe there needs to be required education on bear safety to anyone entering the bears habitat, and maybe warnings and disclosures to inform all humans that if they get eaten or mauled by a bear, the bear WILL NOT be killed in repercussion. It seems that every time a

human or livestock gets attacked or killed by any animal the poor animal gets hunted down and killed. Something needs to be put in place to protect the Grizzly Bears that are reintroduced and populate so that the program is successful and not a waste of time, effort, and taxpayer dollars.

Correspondence ID: 1379Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Blaine, WA 98230
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,04 2023 11:30:15

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have no hesitation on the reintroduction of grizzly bears. I understand the environmental importance to the ecosystems

My fear is humans (ignorant) education is vital for the bear's survival

Thank you for caring

██████████

Correspondence ID: 1380Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Chelan, WA 98816
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,04 2023 11:42:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Introducing Grizzly bears into the North Cascades National park would be a poor decision that would do harm to the ecosystem, hikers, and communities such as Stehekin. The public that enjoy these areas have spoken up in the past and continue to speak up that they do not want this apex predator introduced into these areas. The thoughtful and respectful action is to listen to these communities that would have their lives placed in danger by this reintroduction. Grizzly bears have no place in North Cascades National park.

Correspondence ID: 1381Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Portland, OR 97213
United States of America

Outside Organization: ██████████ Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,04 2023 11:43:10

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Good morning,

I am a proponent of the reintroduction of grizzly bears into North Cascades national park. This was their original home range and a return would be fantastic for the ecosystem and also for tourism, much like how people come from all over to enjoy the wildlife wonders of Yellowstone, which has benefitted from the reintroduction of apex predators.

Beyond that, a reintroduction would also benefit the residents who already live in the Pacific Northwest, such as myself. It is unfortunate that due to our human presence and expansion that we have reduced the natural range of the grizzly bear. To have them return would be a step to returning the location to what it once was.

I also would like to point out as many people probably have, that this reintroduction would not negatively affect farming or ranching as apex predators appear to create balance instead of imbalance. They would not be hunting the cattle or livestock of animals as long as they have ample resources within the park complex ecosystem, which is one of the largest in the parks system. Beyond that they would also help keep the deer and elk populations in check, which would in turn reduce accidents in the road from collisions and also allow areas to recover from overgrazing - which is actually something livestock are guilty of.

One caveat to my positive comments is that since grizzly bears left the range I hope the parks have a plan to provide them what they need to keep them happy, healthy, and able to live in the area with all the human pressures. Otherwise, they will either die or leave again.

Thank you,

██████████
██████████
████████████████████

Correspondence ID: 1382Project:112008Document:132104

Address: EAST WENATCHEE, WA 98802
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,04 2023 11:57:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in favor of reintroduction of grizzly bears. We have been without this magnificent animal for too long. The human population and our development has expanded exponentially, crowding out much of nature in the past 200 years. It is good to try to reestablish a complete ecosystem including top carnivores and native species for the maintenance of the Earth's life support systems. In turn humans benefit from these ecosystem services and enjoy wild places. Canada, Montana and Wyoming have grizzly bears and get along quite well. As a hunter and avid outdoorsman I hope to see a wild grizzly bear. The dangers from bears are highly overrated and pale in comparison to the dangers involved in driving a car or many lifestyle choices people make everyday..

Correspondence ID: 1383Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lacey, WA 98516
United States of America

Outside Organization: Retired Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,04 2023 12:07:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We are in a mass extinction of life on earth due to fossil fuel global warming and oligarch corruption. Action must be taken now to save life on earth!

Correspondence ID: 1384Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Renton, WA 98058
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,04 2023 12:20:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly Bears are a natural part of the NW environment. While they are feared because of some unfortunate contacts with humans, they generally avoid such encounters. I grew up in the Rocky Mountains of Canada in an area where grizzlies were abundant. The message was to watch out that an encounter did not force the grizzly to attack because you blocked its escape route. The same is true of all bears, especially a mother with cubs. We can live together!

Correspondence ID: 1385Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Puyallup, WA 98374
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,04 2023 12:23:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly reintroduction is a bad idea and not supported by the majority of populace affected by this plan. For one, there are already many grizzlies in the north cascade region of this state. This includes with sitings from north

cascade E/W border all down to conconully, Winthrop, Omak, republic etc all with sitings. They are here naturally already moved down from Canada including Moose and the habitat is supporting it's natural carrying capacity. These regions already have a reduced and critical mule deer population due to expanding human settlement and car impacts and further introducing more Apex predators will continue to pressure this herd. Grizzly are already here and introducing more is going to have a very negative impact instead of letting natural settlement take place as it has. WA state is bad with predator management and balancing populations and many predator attacks to livestock and humans have already occurred. Please refrain from any further human interference and let's focus on safe mule deer migration routes if anything.

Correspondence ID: 1386Project:112008Document:132104

Address: King, WA 98040
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,04 2023 12:43:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not reintroduce grizzly bears into the North Cascades. Since there are so many people in the Pacific NW who love to hike and camp outdoors, this will likely lead to more human deaths. Grizzlies have been gone from that area for decades without any apparent large negative consequences. Why invite more human-bear confrontations? Keep the grizzlies where they currently are and not in the North Cascades. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 1387Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Renton, WA 98056
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,04 2023 12:45:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Reintroduction of grizzlies bears into the North Cascades will not be managed in conjunction with conservation of other big game. Washington fish and game commission has failed to prioritize the management of predators populations and ungulate populations. The commission is not prepared for the reintroduction of a new predator while maintaining the health of other big game species. The commission does not follow the advice of biologists and continues to vote based of subjectively rather than objective data.

Correspondence ID: 1388Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Yakima, WA 98902
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,04 2023 16:05:55

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Typical WA DC Bureaucrats deciding what's best for a location more than 2,000 miles away...
"Grizzly bears shall not be transplanted or introduced into the state. Only grizzly bears that are native to Washington state may be utilized by the department for management programs." Seem fairly plan to me that the citizens of the state clearly do not want grizzlies transplanted or relocated into the state.. The few that are here already seem to be fine and so far we haven't had deadly encounters that Wyoming and Montana have had.

10 years ago there were more than enough grizzly bears in Wyoming yet they remain unmanaged.

After crossing paths with a grizzly at less than 25 yards and not being one of the tragic stories is miraculous..

Luck, and a little bit of grace are the only things that saved the three of us from disaster. These 800 fur covered wrecking balls should not be in every possible location. They are already protected and the population is maintaining or growing at a pace quicker than they should be... Leave WA alone and let the bears that are already here do what bears do.. WA does not need your help. Listen to the local voices not Seattle.

Correspondence ID: 1389Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Yakima, WA 98902
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,04 2023 16:06:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Typical WA DC Bureaucrats deciding what's best for a location more than 2,000 miles away...
"Grizzly bears shall not be transplanted or introduced into the state. Only grizzly bears that are native to Washington state may be utilized by the department for management programs." Seem fairly plan to me that the citizens of the state clearly do not want grizzlies transplanted or relocated into the state.. The few that are here already seem to be fine and so far we haven't had deadly encounters that Wyoming and Montana have had.

10 years ago there were more than enough grizzly bears in Wyoming yet they remain unmanaged.
After crossing paths with a grizzly at less than 25 yards and not being one of the tragic stories is miraculous..
Luck, and a little bit of grace are the only things that saved the three of us from disaster. These 800 fur covered wrecking balls should not be in every possible location. They are already protected and the population is maintaining or growing at a pace quicker than they should be... Leave WA alone and let the bears that are already here do what bears do.. WA does not need your help. Listen to the local voices not Seattle.

Correspondence ID: 1390Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Yakima, WA 98902
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,04 2023 16:07:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Typical WA DC Bureaucrats deciding what's best for a location more than 2,000 miles away...
"Grizzly bears shall not be transplanted or introduced into the state. Only grizzly bears that are native to Washington state may be utilized by the department for management programs." Seem fairly plan to me that the citizens of the state clearly do not want grizzlies transplanted or relocated into the state.. The few that are here already seem to be fine and so far we haven't had deadly encounters that Wyoming and Montana have had.

10 years ago there were more than enough grizzly bears in Wyoming yet they remain unmanaged.
After crossing paths with a grizzly at less than 25 yards and not being one of the tragic stories is miraculous..
Luck, and a little bit of grace are the only things that saved the three of us from disaster. These 800 fur covered wrecking balls should not be in every possible location. They are already protected and the population is maintaining or growing at a pace quicker than they should be... Leave WA alone and let the bears that are already here do what bears do.. WA does not need your help. Listen to the local voices not Seattle.

Correspondence ID: 1391Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Yakima, WA 98902
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,04 2023 16:07:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Typical WA DC Bureaucrats deciding what's best for a location more than 2,000 miles away...
"Grizzly bears shall not be transplanted or introduced into the state. Only grizzly bears that are native to Washington state may be utilized by the department for management programs." Seem fairly plan to me that the citizens of the state clearly do not want grizzlies transplanted or relocated into the state.. The few that are here already seem to be fine and so far we haven't had deadly encounters that Wyoming and Montana have had.

10 years ago there were more than enough grizzly bears in Wyoming yet they remain unmanaged.
After crossing paths with a grizzly at less than 25 yards and not being one of the tragic stories is miraculous..

Luck, and a little bit of grace are the only things that saved the three of us from disaster. These 800 fur covered wrecking balls should not be in every possible location. They are already protected and the population is maintaining or growing at a pace quicker than they should be... Leave WA alone and let the bears that are already here do what bears do.. WA does not need your help. Listen to the local voices not Seattle.

Correspondence ID: 1392Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Yakima, WA 98902
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,04 2023 16:08:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Typical WA DC Bureaucrats deciding what's best for a location more than 2,000 miles away...
"Grizzly bears shall not be transplanted or introduced into the state. Only grizzly bears that are native to Washington state may be utilized by the department for management programs." Seem fairly plan to me that the citizens of the state clearly do not want grizzlies transplanted or relocated into the state.. The few that are here already seem to be fine and so far we haven't had deadly encounters that Wyoming and Montana have had.

10 years ago there were more than enough grizzly bears in Wyoming yet they remain unmanaged.

After crossing paths with a grizzly at less than 25 yards and not being one of the tragic stories is miraculous..

Luck, and a little bit of grace are the only things that saved the three of us from disaster. These 800 fur covered wrecking balls should not be in every possible location. They are already protected and the population is maintaining or growing at a pace quicker than they should be... Leave WA alone and let the bears that are already here do what bears do.. WA does not need your help. Listen to the local voices not Seattle.

Correspondence ID: 1393Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Coupeville, WA 98239
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,05 2023 07:01:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hi,

There's really no need, and no good reason to place more grizzly bears in the cascades. If the habitat remains protected, the grizzly population will continue to grow, and natural growth is far better than introduction efforts. Introduction efforts are expensive, and the bears will not all survive, and those bears are far more likely to cause human conflict in their unfamiliar habitat... please do not do this!

Correspondence ID: 1394Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Annacortes, WA 9822q
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,05 2023 07:10:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: You've got to be kidding!

All the grizzly problems in Montana, Idaho, and Wyoming, and you want to have those problems here!

So far, let's evaluate the facts. There are already a few grizzlies in the park, they're happy, they don't cause problems... and you all want to possibly create a problem in the area that i love to camp. Please do not do this! Spend our tax dollars on solving problems, not creating problems.

Correspondence ID: 1395Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Cincinnati, OH 45244
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,05 2023 07:27:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello ,

Regarding the plan to reintroduce Grizzly bears to the North Cascades, it seems like a foolhardy and irresponsible action at this time. Grizzly, like many other predators, are naturally expanding their territories. We have seen this with wolves, cougars, and a variety of smaller carnivores. In fact, in the absence of serious trapping and due to carefully managed damage control and hunting opportunities, large predators populations are in a better place overall than they may have been for over a century. If the habitat will support them, Grizzly bears are either already present or will be present shortly as they move in from surrounding states or Canada. The time, money, and resources needed for a Grizzly reintroduction effort could surely be used somewhere else where there is a more dire need. I certainly love the ide of Grizzly bears on the landscape but I also love the reality of healthy predator and ungulate populations and a balanced ecosystem.

Furthermore, Washington state has clearly proven they are unable to objectively follow scientific data in managing large predator populations. The cancellation of the Spring Black bear season is a looming red flag primarily driven by uniformed or biased public opinion. I admit, as a non-resident, have limited voice and input. My concern is the kind of precedence we set state by state as these wildlife trends certainly seem to cross state lines.

There is no doubt that bears and people can coexist as they do in many other states. But why force the issue- it only creates huge divisions in a state where there is already a growing divide between rural and urban/suburban populations. It is clear that some of the folks attempting to force this issue will never need to worry about livestock depredation, wild game depredation or their own personal safety while in the backcountry. Please, at the very least, listen very carefully to the people that will be forced to deal with either naturally occurring or reintroduced Grizzlies. Their opinions must carry a certain weight that should not be ignored.

Correspondence ID: 1396Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Lake Worth, FL 33461
United States of America
Outside Organization: Please Select Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,05 2023 07:45:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: It is my understanding that the Biden administration and the National Park Service are taking significant steps in bringing grizzly bears back to a productive and wild ecosystem spanning Washington and British Columbia. As a proponent of Northwest Conservation, I have read their reports on the restoration proposal and have taken much of their comments in favor of the proposal into my comments.

The grizzly bear has always been and is still the North American wildlife icon. The grizzly has immeasurable ecological and cultural value for our ecosystems and communities. We have a unique opportunity and obligation in the PNW to co-author a significant conservation success story - to restore the grizzly to a small but important part of its traditional home, as has been stated by the Director of Northwest Conservation.

I understand also, as indicated by Northwest Conservation, that the National Park Service has identified the North Cascades as one of North America's premier intact ecosystems. But the North Cascades is incomplete without grizzly bears. As I understand it, this is the second attempt by the agencies to restore grizzlies to the North Cascades after a 2015 process was halted by the Trump administration in 2020. At the time, more than 159,000 people wrote comments supporting the reintroduction of grizzlies. Thankfully that administration that was a threat to all ecosystem re-establishment attempts has ended and the Biden administration which is more friendly to ecological restoration projects is supporting the proposal for the return of the grizzly.

The NCE is one of two grizzly recovery areas without an established population of bears - and natural bear migration is unlikely to repopulate it. Instead, wildlife biologists, based on decades of thorough research, suggest safely relocating existing bears into the North Cascades. Biologists have not been able to find evidence of a reproducing population in the North Cascades in more than 30 years and chances are near zero that grizzlies will reestablish themselves without human

assistance. That is why this restoration effort is so necessary.

Restoring grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem is a crucial step in preserving the region's ecological and cultural heritage. We must ensure the successful reintroduction of these iconic animals.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment and I want to thank the US National Park Service and US Fish & Wildlife Service for all their efforts to bring this proposal for grizzly bear recovery and for listening to the public's interest in bringing this plan to fruition.

Correspondence ID: 1398Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Toledo, WA 98591
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,05 2023 09:09:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am requesting that this plan for grizzly bear restoration not go forward. My family and I spend a lot of time in the back county and have had to deal with black bears. We don't need to add a more dangerous element to the outdoors. Please abandon this plan.

Respectfully Submitted

████████████████████

Correspondence ID: 1399Project:112008Document:132104

Address: College Place, WA 99324
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,05 2023 09:10:03

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: After reading the article, "Should grizzly's return to Washington's North Cascade's? The feds want your input.", found in my local paper, I am writing to say I support the reintroduction of the Grizzly Bear to the North Cascades of WA State.

Thank you for this work.

Sincerely,

████████████████████
████████████████████

Correspondence ID: 1400Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Blaine, WA 98230
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,05 2023 09:10:24

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I fully support bringing the grizzlies back. I think it will greatly benefit the ecosystem and I think the plans to manage the area are well thought out.

Correspondence ID: 1401Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Moses Lake, WA 98837
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,05 2023 09:47:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I like Grizzly bears. I like them in Yellowstone and I like them in Montana. There are plenty of grizzly bears in British Columbia. I like them in British Columbia. If northern Washington was perfect habitat for them they would already be here. They aren't, and they aren't for a reason.

Stop fiddling. Humans don't make things better they just screw them up.I don't want grizzly bears in Washington. We have enough Federally created animal problems in Washington without adding another. Leave them where they are.

Correspondence ID: 1402Project:112008Document:132104
Address: East Wenatchee, WA 98802
United States of America
Outside Organization: Washington State Farm bureau Non-Governmental
Received: Oct,05 2023 10:03:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To put grizzly bears into the woody would counter productive to all parties. Ranchers an farmers trying produce food would be pushed off land to make way for grizzly bears. It is a very bad idea. Someone will be mauled or killed then the bear will be shot the end. Thank you

Correspondence ID: 1403Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Sutton, UN SM3 9AQ
United Kingdom
Outside Organization: Bear Conservation Conservation/Preservation(Official Rep.)
Received: Oct,05 2023 10:07:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We strongly support the planned release of 3 to 7 grizzly bears into the NCE (North Cascades Ecosystem) over roughly 5 to 10 years with a goal of establishing an initial population of 25 grizzly bears before switching to adaptive management.

Our preferred alternative is Alternative B as we would wish to see the reintroduced animals receive full protection as a threatened species with the existing special rule (50 CFR 17.40(b)) under section 4(d) of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) governing the regulation of grizzly bears in the lower 48 states.

In particular we have concerns that the more "relaxed" approach to the use of lethal force against individual bears perceived as being a problem would, given the low numbers of animals being released, be very likely to compromise the effectiveness of the plan.

It should be added that while Alternative B is our preferred option we would support Alternative C against Alternative A.

Kind regards,


Executive Director,
Bear Conservation

Correspondence ID: 1404Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America
Outside Organization: private Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,05 2023 10:23:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: If you put grizzly bears into our national forest, how many people does the bear have to kill before you start killing the bears again? There are so many people that use the forest for hiking and camping with their families, they would just be tempting bear bait. Please do not put bears back into the North Cascades. Let them hang out in Yellowstone where the tourist do dumb things. Not here please!

Correspondence ID: 1405Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98273
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,05 2023 10:35:31

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We hope the magnificent Grizzly Bear is restored to the Northern Cascades of Washington State, including North Cascades National Park. We have enjoyed them for years when living near and visiting Yellowstone and Grand Teton National Parks. As far as we know, they contribute in many ways to the environmental health and public enjoyment of the areas where the bear resides. They are incredible animals and we are in awe of their beauty and behavioral traits. They were a natural part historically of our area. When they were lost, a valuable part of that area was missing. The Grizzly Bear brings grandeur to the areas they reside. I have read that the North Cascades ecosystem is one of the largest areas of uninhabited wild areas in the lower United States, which is wonderful and of which we are blessed. One of the values of the North Cascades, is that there is one main road, Highway 20, running through this region, until you get to Highway 2, Stevens Pass. This is basically, a very large, wild region of country, where the Grizzly Bear could live, and not impact human development much. I could be wrong about my evaluation of this. I don't know much about minor roads, forest service and logging roads. The Grizzly Bear has expanded its range in the last few years into Jackson Hole, and the Northern Wind River Range of Wyoming. I haven't heard that this has cause much problems. Yellowstone National Park has wonderfully managed the Grizzly Bear, since the 1970's, when the Park changed its strategy of trying to manage the bears more naturally, stopping the bear feeding along the Park's roads and responsibly handling the garbage of the Park to avoid bears depending on getting food from the garbage. Now, I have had the incredible privilege and enjoyment of watching Grizzlies in Hayden Valley from a distance, doing incredible things. I have watched them interacting with wolf packs, hunting, and playing in one of the tributaries of the Yellowstone River. It was like watching a child splashing and running its arms through the water creating waves. The bear was just delighting, playing in the water. We have enjoyed the Grizzly Bear Discovery Center in West Yellowstone, Montana. We traveled there, not only to enjoy Yellowstone National Park, but also just to enjoy the Grizzlies and wolves at this public attraction in West Yellowstone. In closing, I would like to say again, the Grizzly Bear is an incredible and valuable part of an ecosystem, and brings so much value to where it is allowed to reside. We would love to have it back to the wild North Cascades and bring more glory to this wild and wonderful area. Sincerely, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 1406Project:112008Document:132104

Address: East Wenatchee, WA 98802
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,05 2023 11:22:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am a avid outdoorsmen who loves nature and I stand strongly AGAINST bringing the majestic grizzly bear back to the North Cascades. I spend a lot of time hiking in the North Cascades and when doing so I enjoy the area much more knowing that I will not encounter grizzlies. When a I visit Yellowstone, Grand Tetons and Glacier I avoid hiking in areas where there are grizzlies. The death of the 2 experienced backpackers carrying bear spray at the teeth of a grizzly on 9/29/23 in Banff illustrates why we should not bring this danger back to the North Cascades. I urge you, for the safety of your fellow citizens, to end this attempt to bring grizzlies to North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 1407Project:112008Document:132104

Address: YAKIMA, WA 98902-5118
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,05 2023 11:23:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The reintroduction of grizzlies in the North Cascades and Washington state is not needed. Grizzlies already are present from time to time and also from time to time have conflicts with humans and livestock. There is no reason to add more grizzly bears to Washington State.

Correspondence ID: 1408Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Grand Coulee, WA 99133
United States of America
Outside Organization: NA Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,05 2023 11:30:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: If you think they should be introduced, why not do it where it the people calling for it can enjoy it? Seattle, WA. and Washington DC would be a good place to start. Turn them loose in the cities and sit back and enjoy the benefits of your decisions!

Correspondence ID: 1409Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Chelan, WA 98816
United States of America
Outside Organization: [REDACTED] Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,05 2023 11:35:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hello. I want to state my opposition to bringing these predators back to Washington State. There is no good reason to do this. If someone wants to see a grizzly bear they should go to Montana or Wyoming. Plenty of people are killed by the desire to go where these Apex Predators live. We don't need that opportunity here in north central Washington. How many of our fore fathers and there family members were killed getting rid of these monsters? We also don't need to be spending our tax dollars supporting these type of ideas. Sent them to Canada not Washington State!

Correspondence ID: 1410Project:112008Document:132104
Address: East Wenatchee, WA 98802
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,05 2023 11:50:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My friend was mauled by a Grizzly hunting in Montana. Lost all use of his arm. A couple was just killed at a National Park in Canada. One of the nice things about hunting/camping/hiking in Washington state is not having to worry about that same thing happening here. We have property in northern Okanogan county, and I take my kids up into the North Cascades. I can't see any good coming of this proposal to the people who actually live and spend time near these areas. Its only people far away sitting on a computer thinking how nice it would be. This had already been settled. Knock it off.

Correspondence ID: 1411Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,05 2023 12:04:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: NO. Please do not re-introduce Grizzly Bears here. There are already some around the area, we don't need more.

Correspondence ID: 1412Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mt Vernon, WA 98273
United States of America

Outside Organization: self/WCA Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,05 2023 12:06:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: If the bears attempt to relocate themselves so be it . In the meantime "man" needs to keep his nose out of their business and leave well enough alone. I am sick and tired of humans thinking they know what is best . In the meantime the humans need to take care of their own problems and leave the animals alone.

Correspondence ID: 1413Project:112008Document:132104
Address: East Wenatchee, WA 98802
United States of America
Outside Organization: NA Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,05 2023 12:09:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: After reading the article in The Wenatchee World by reporter Oscar Rodriguze, I would like to leave a comment.
It seems like we care more about the farmers, ranchers, builders, and real estate developers than we do about the grizzlies. After all, that is probably why there are so few of them left in the North Cascades.

I admire the U.S. Fish&Wildlife Service and the National Park Service employees for wanting to help restore these animals to their natural environment. It seems like they will have to jump through hoops to to accomplish this. Keeping the people with money and power happy is what it amounts to. I think the saddest part is when the article says famers, ranchers can "hazer and kill the bears" when needed,

Why would we do this to this animals? We took their land.

Long comment short, I admire these agencies for what they want to do, I hope it will be successful for all---including the Grizzly bears.

Correspondence ID: 1414Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Everett, WA 98201
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,05 2023 12:23:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am a Native American and I 100% disagree with reintroducing the Grizzly Bears. Not only is it dangerous for us as human beings but also costly to live stock raised to feed us. All you have to do is look at what a disaster it became when you decided to reintroduce wolves.

Thank You,
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 1415Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Hoquiam, WA 98550
United States of America
Outside Organization: Agriculture Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,05 2023 12:32:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hello, my name is [REDACTED] I am contacting you regarding the desire to bring grizzly bears into Washington. Currently there is no boarder fence between the USA and Canada and there are grizzly bears in several other states which boarder Washington. If the bears want to come in there is nothing stopping them. The grizzly bear is an omnivore and at the top of the food chain, no other predator without a weapon is able to survive a grizzly bear attack. There are many people who enjoy the Federal Lands that tax payer money purchased, those people will be at great risk of loosing

their lives because of re-introduction of grizzly bears. In 2023 alone there have been several attacks by grizzly bears in the USA and Canada, resulting in death of people as well as grizzly bears. Grizzly bears are intelligent animals who learn that humans usually have food with them or near them, the bears want the food and they take it, usually at the cost of someone's life. A sow may have cubs that she is protecting or feeding and that may be her reason for being aggressive, or it could be a boar who is establishing his territory. All of these are reasons for the grizzly bear to attack. I do not believe that tax payers, whose money was used to establish these parks, voted to have their lives put at risk to enjoy the parks. In Alaska there are parks where people go with a guide to view the grizzly bears feeding along the rivers. These guides have a high powered rifle just in case a grizzly should charge. Is it the plan for the National Park Service to have guided tours through their National Parks with an armed guide to protect the people? Bear spray works at very close range, if a bear is charging you and you spray it in the face it does not stop the charge it only blinds the bear and makes it angrier. You still get run over by 500 to 1000 pounds with claws and teeth. Most humans do not survive that experience, please do not re-introduce grizzly bears to Washington Federal Lands.

Correspondence ID: 1416Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Woodburn, OR 97071
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,05 2023 12:47:56

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We have enough grizzly bears and they are not endangered. We also don't need more news reports like this, "A grizzly bear attacked and killed a couple and their dog in Canada's Banff National Park on Friday, September 29, government officials said.

Parks Canada, the agency that manages Canada's 48 national parks, said in a statement that officials received a message at 8 P.M. Friday night from a Garmin inReach device alerting rescuers of a bear attack. The message came from a GPS device located in the Red Deer River Valley, a scenic area located on the eastern side of the park."

Correspondence ID: 1417Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Northport, wa., WA 99157
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,05 2023 12:56:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No introduction needed in wa state

Correspondence ID: 1418Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ocean Park, WA 98640
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,05 2023 13:18:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We already have black bears. I'm afraid of grizzlies attacking and killing runners.. I still run and I'm 73. Also I hike and camp a lot.. I pick wild huckleberry, which all bears love to eat. Grizzlies just make it more dangerous. Black bears usually just walk off or I can talk to them and slowly back away. They haven't circled around to come back and get me yet!

Correspondence ID: 1419Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Chelan, WA 98816
United States of America

Outside Organization: Citizen Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,05 2023 13:31:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing these comments in opposition Grizzly Bear Reintroduction into the North Cascades Ecosystem. As a resident that lives with a sixty mile radius of the reintroduction zone, I know that I won't be affected by the bears right off bat. But as the population increases over time and through the natural process of moving into their own individual territories these bears will eventually find their way into populated areas. And as with almost every interaction between wildlife and humans. The wildlife would come out on the short end. Furthermore, since these bears prefer to solitary animals outside of the breeding season. Mother bears would move farther away from the boar's range and would lead to more interactions with recreationists and with landowners.

The Methow Valley is not that far as the crow flies from the reintroduction zone and cattle operations in that part of world would be impacted by bears when they come in contact with the cattle on summer pasture which even if depredation of livestock didn't occur. Just large predators in close contact with cattle affects their productivity because of the stress placed on them from hypervigilant behavior brought on by the predators. This has been proven in studies involving wolves in the Wallowa Region of Eastern Oregon conducted by extension and BLM personnel. Along the same lines the distance to where sheep are grazed in the forest around Lake Wenatchee is not out of the migratory patterns of the Grizzly Bear and depredation of sheep by bears is well documented in sheep producing states that have Grizzly Bear populations.

The North Cascades National Park and Stehekin provide unequaled recreational opportunities and they are lifeblood of the both the park and the community. Bears especially as the population increases would negatively impact that industry and community itself. I encourage the agencies and individuals involved in this decision to weigh very carefully the adverse economical impacts of this plan against the perceived ecological benefits.

Thank you for your time and consideration of these comments.

Correspondence ID: 1420Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,05 2023 13:33:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a voter, resident, land owner and avid back country user in one of the affected counties(Chelan) I would like to say that I am very much in favor of reintroducing grizzly bear back into Washington state. Ownership of federal lands is shared by all citizens, bear can be an issue for some use cases but that alone doesn't mean they should not be part of the environment, please take into account all points of view on the matter. Washington is part of their historic range and they should be allowed to exist and protected within that range to create a more full and robust ecosystem. Humans should learn to live with the environment not conquer it simply because it makes life easy, I think we have seen the ramifications of blindly following that thought process too many times now.

Correspondence ID: 1421Project:112008Document:132104
Address: tonasket, WA 98855
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,05 2023 13:39:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly Bears are not native Central Washington and introducing them will be dangerous to the people, livestock and animals, native wildlife of the area. There are already native black bears and other apex predators and it will create havoc for the ecosystem;

<https://www.yahoo.com/lifestyle/wild-day-watch-happens-biker-082618000.html>

"Like most wildlife, bears tend to avoid humans, but grizzly bears are known to charge and attack humans, and just this week two hikers and their dog were killed by a grizzly in Banff National Park."

Correspondence ID: 1422Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellevue, WA 98008
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,05 2023 14:24:49
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears are dangerous animals. I think that if you are going to intentionally place the Cascade hikers in harm's way, it's fair to hold you responsible for the harm the bears do. At the very least, you should be civilly liable, and I think you could make the argument that you are criminally liable since you intentionally introduced the bears here.

If grizzlies make their way here on their own, that's different, but what you're suggesting is no different that harboring a dangerous dog and turning it loose. Be careful here.

Correspondence ID: 1423Project:112008Document:132104

Address: PALO CEDRO, CA 96073-0800
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,05 2023 14:50:47
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: OPPOSED. The question that needs to be asked in regards to reintroducing the Grizzly Bear to the Cascade Mountains is "WHY"? The grizzly as the apex predator that not had an impact on this environment for decades. Life and the environment in this area has moved on. There are few areas, with the exception of northern Idaho, parts of Montana and Wyoming, in the west that are now wild and wilderness. All the rest are populated by man. Historically, man's coexistence with the grizzly bear, whether we like it or not, has not been a peaceful one. The bear, just like the wolf, is not going to recognize boundaries. So why and what is going to be accomplished and for who?

It's time to move forward and protect the grizzly habitat that exists. To create more habitat for this large aggressive animal is, in my opinion, a waste of effort, taxpayer money and government resources. Putting a collar on each animal is no different that creating a large zoo. And a bandaid for a bad idea.

Correspondence ID: 1424Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Chehalis, WA 98532
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,05 2023 14:51:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Reintroducing Grizzlies into a state with a proven track record of ecological mismanagement is a bad idea, both for the grizzlies themselves, and also for the safety of the people that engage in outdoor activities.

Correspondence ID: 1425Project:112008Document:132104

Address: FORD, WA 99013
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,05 2023 14:56:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: With Washington State's poor track record of managing predator populations within the state I think this would be an unwise decision. Grizzly bears already exist in the state and are coming here naturally. I am all for the natural migration and feel these bears have a right to be in the state however, re-introduction is neither natural or wise at this point.

Correspondence ID: 1426Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98274
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,05 2023 15:13:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Regarding the reinstatement of grizzlies in the North Cascades National Park my vote would be a resounding no.
My husband and I are frequent recreational hikers in this area. We have read several news reports lately of grizzlies becoming aggressive for no apparent reason and attacking and killing hikers and pets. Please, leave the grizzlies up in Alaska or wherever.

Correspondence ID: 1427Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Tonasket, WA 98855
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,05 2023 15:14:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am all for wildlife in their natural habitat however I do see a problem with reintroducing them into the North Cascades. Mainly, if the habitat and prey populations were ideal grizzly bears would come down naturally due to the connectivity in habitat just like the Canadian lynx. So, if this is an option then have there been surveys of deer and other prey species in the range. Is it enough to sustain them? I think we should let grizzly bears come to the North Cascades naturally.

Correspondence ID: 1428Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Hunters, WA 99137
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,05 2023 15:37:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The State of Wa Fish & Game need to demonstrate the ability to manage such an initiative with competency and professionalism! These are two categories that do not exist at this time! They are going the opposite direction in managing game for the future and for the sportsman! Fish & Game needs to focus on effectively managing instead of complying to politicians who simply have zero education in effective game management and are simply complying to activists that might make them popular. Continuing to eliminate hunting rights is a perfect example of how incapable they truly are! Without the sportsman it is impossible to maintain any effective management and the people suffer as well as the specie!

Correspondence ID: 1429Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Ridgefield, WA 98642
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,05 2023 16:39:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am concerned for the and Livestock, campers, and hikers having a high risk of being attacked by a Grizzly Bear.

Correspondence ID: 1430Project:112008Document:132104
Address: ridgefield, WA 98642
United States of America
Outside Organization: Self Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,05 2023 16:40:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: PLEASE do NOT do this!

I love the wilderness. I pack my horses into the Gifford Pincot National forest every year and camp overnight. I bring a pistol but am not very comfortable with guns. I would need to buy a larger gun for my safety if there were grizzly bears in the area.

I also own cattle and miniature horses and am concerned for their welfare.

Correspondence ID: 1431Project:112008Document:132104

Address: New York, NY 10128
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,05 2023 16:56:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the bears and their beautiful journey!

Correspondence ID: 1432Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,05 2023 17:21:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As an outdoor enthusiast who loves to hike, climb and boat in the North Cascades National Park, I love the idea of bringing an apex predator back into the wilderness. Those bears are natural to the ecosystem, and we have damaged the ecosystem when we removed them.

Some argue that the bears would reduce tourism activity, I don't think that would be a problem as there is no problem with tourism to other national parks with much more dense populations of brown bears. There are also concerns about bears encroaching on agricultural lands, that seems to be resolved with collars and tracking.

Correspondence ID: 1433Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,05 2023 17:32:21

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No on re-introducing Grizzly Bears in the Northern Cascades..

Correspondence ID: 1434Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lynnwood, WA 98046
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,05 2023 17:48:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: 🙅 NO

Correspondence ID: 1435Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98118
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,05 2023 17:48:24

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: A healthy ecosystem needs all its native species! Please help grizzlies thrive in their natural environment, so the North Cascades remains a whole, healthy ecosystem for us and our children.

Correspondence ID: 1436Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lynnwood, WA 98046
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,05 2023 17:49:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: 🐻👎

Correspondence ID: 1437Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mukilteo, WA 98275
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,05 2023 18:03:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As an avid recreational visitor of the north cascades, I wholeheartedly oppose the reintroduction of grizzly bears. Recent grizzly bear attacks, including the tragic deaths of Doug Inglis and Jenny Gusse in Canada, and Amie Adamson in Montana, point to the reality that the safety of citizens is not guaranteed in environments where Grizzly bears reside.

Washington is home to thousands of trails that are frequented regularly by both the experienced, and those new to the outdoors. To add an additional risk of harm to these people unethical.

Correspondence ID: 1438Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kirkland, WA 98034
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,05 2023 18:12:49
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I oppose the potential reintroduction of grizzlies in the north cascades. Doing so would have significant negative ramifications to those wanting to enjoy recreation in the area. There is no guarantee of safety for those living or visiting near this predator. No matter the efforts taken to reduce the negative results, it will never be enough.

Correspondence ID: 1439Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98133
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,05 2023 18:39:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Bring back the grizzly bears. The ecosystem will benefit and they belong in the park. I think its a smart decision and North Cascades is a good place for them. I think its high time we stopped fighting the natural ecology of the forest and learn to live with large predators like bears. People can benefit from bear education programs at the park, as well as the scientific value of such a project of reintroduction of bears into an ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 1440Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Edmonds, WA 98020
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,05 2023 18:49:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I oppose this dangerous plan to move more grizzly bears into Washington State. Crazy and dangerous. I don't want to have to carry a gun when out in the woods. Pepper spray is not effective against this extremely dangerous wild predator.

In Alaska people typically don't go into the woods without firearms. Construction sites near bears have to have armed guards loaded for bear. It is inherently dangerous, kind of like hiking in lion or tiger habitat with only a can of pepper spray. No one

would do that. The urban greeny liberals driving this dangerous grizzly policy need to get their head out of their ass.

This is so stupid and so unnecessary. Just stop.

Try reintroducing wolves and bears into the urban parks in Seattle instead. See what happens if you the feel the need for a project to study.

Correspondence ID: 1441Project:112008Document:132104

Address: West Linn, OR 97068
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,05 2023 19:15:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not support bringing grizzly bears to the North Cascades. I lived in Yellowstone for five years and during that time, at least four people were killed, some of those partially eaten, and my neighbor was severely mauled by grizzly bears. Another neighbor had had hundreds of stitches from an earlier incident. These were people who had the misfortune of encountering these bears while hiking, they weren't taunting the bears or approaching them intentionally. One was sleeping in a tent. These are just the incidents I noticed most, there were other maulings near the park and more deaths since that time in grizzly country.

Little attention was paid to these incidents at the time they occurred.

We were warned not to hike in groups smaller than four people. Do citizens really want to give up solitary hikes in the North Cascades? We also don't know what effects a warming, drier climate will have on bear behavior. Will their hibernation periods be shortened? This may very well lead to desperately hungry bears looking for food wherever they can find it and most likely increased grizzly-human encounters.

Correspondence ID: 1442Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Clinton, WA 98236
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,05 2023 19:18:41

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am almost 80 years old and have enjoyed hiking, camping, skiing and other recreational activities in the Cascade Mountains all my life. One of the joys is the freedom from huge predators. I know of no sightings of grizzly bears. To "reintroduce" this vicious predator to our beautiful Cascades is not a good idea as was shown just last week with 2 very bear aware campers and their dog brutally killed by a grizzly in Banff National Park. A park which has only 60 grizzlies in all 2564 square miles. Please do not do this to those of us who enjoy these beautiful mountains.

Correspondence ID: 1443Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Poulsbo, WA 98370
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,05 2023 20:25:12

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am absolutely opposed to bringing back the brown bears! There is no place in our "human populated" state environment for bears that threaten humans. Nature is doing just fine without them. I was smart of our predecessors to hunt them out of Washington. The animal activists and biologists behind this need to wise up and walk away from this idea. Shame on you!

Correspondence ID: 1444Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tonasket, WA 98855
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,05 2023 20:37:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: You cannot place a higher value on the lives of animals than those of human beings. If the possibility exists for even one person to be hurt or killed by one of these animals, then reintroduction should be off the table. Grizzly bears are one of the only large predators in North America known to actively hunt humans, and if the federal government wants to introduce them in an area that is frequented by humans in spite of the risks (however small from a statistical standpoint) that they pose, then they bear the sole responsibility for any harm to humans that may result from such action. I am not advocating for grizzly bear extermination, but they need to be left in the areas they currently habitate, rather than being transplanted into new areas that lack the necessary controls to protect people.

Correspondence ID: 1445Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Maple Falls, WA 98266
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,05 2023 20:42:37

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My husband [REDACTED] and I have lived in the Kendall area for 24 years. We believe that the idea of introducing grizzly bears into our county and possibly our area is unbelievably stupid and completely unnecessary. Children play on the streets all the time, and household animals are prevalent. We fervently hope that this idea will quickly die. Thank you for considering our concerns.

Correspondence ID: 1446Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Shoreline, WA 98133
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,05 2023 20:45:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly favor Alternative A, No Action. Reintroducing grizzly bears into the NCE is irresponsible and ill-advised. The region's population is growing, and increasing numbers of people are living and recreating in the mountains. Reintroducing grizzly bears will risk (a) more human-wildlife conflicts, resulting in injuries and fatalities; (b) greater recreation pressure on nearby areas without a grizzly population; or both. These risks far outweigh the limited ecological benefits of restoration.

When humans come into conflict with existing wildlife or other natural characteristics, responsible management to encourage coexistence makes sense. Adding back a hazardous animal to a well-used area where it does not currently exist does not make sense.

Correspondence ID: 1447Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Roy, WA 98580
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,05 2023 21:11:31

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I don't believe that reintroducing grizzly bears is in anyone's best interests especially We the people. Grizzly Bears haven't

Been here in Western WA for a really long time. Our predator population is already out of control with big game animals slowly declining. My family and I depend upon big game meat to feed our families as we have always done. By introducing more grizzly bears on this side would be devastating to the game animals, as well as putting hikers, hunters, fishing and other outdoor enthusiasts at risk. They game animals already have to compete for survival as it is. Thank you for considering my input in this matter. Im gonna ask that the wdfw maximize hunting opportunities for the public by not bringing in more grizzlies in this state.

Thank you

Correspondence ID: 1448Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98125
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,05 2023 21:32:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Firstly, this has to be the worst use of government funds to take bears out of their already naturally habitat and bring them to another location. Secondly, these animals are extremely dangerous- why would you purposely be opening the possibility of hikers being mauled and/or killed.

As a state we have voted against this in the past and will do it again. I'm against this.

Correspondence ID: 1449Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ashland, OR 97520
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,05 2023 22:10:03

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm in favor of grizzly bear reintroduction in the North Cascades. I'm an avid backpacker who has hiked a couple trails (PCT and PNT) thru the area and would love to have grizzly in the area. I understand there is always a risk with grizzly bears but such is life and they deserve to have as much of their historical space back for their lives. So just wanted to comment that I fully support reintroducing grizzlies to the North Cascades area. Thanks!

Correspondence ID: 1450Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kennewick, WA 99338
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,05 2023 22:14:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Good Evening,

I am writing this to voice my opposition to plans to reintroduce grizzly bears to Washington state. My biggest concern with reintroducing bears is their negative impact on wildlife and people that live in areas they will live. We've seen the states inability and or reluctance to control predators (wolves, cougars) at the cost of livestock and other wildlife and releasing grizzlies will on add to this issue. Please do not reintroduce grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 1451Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America

Outside Organization: individual Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,05 2023 22:19:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to express my support for Option C for the North Cascades ecosystem grizzly bear recovery program. As personal background, I am 74 years old, a retired geologist. For the last 57 years, I have enjoyed traveling on foot in the backcountry of the North Cascades, mountain climbing for several decades, and backpacking and hiking in later years. I have lived in Bellingham since 1964, and most of my outdoor travels have been in the North Cascades. However, I have also made trips to areas that have grizzly bear populations (e.g., The Selkirk and Purcell Ranges in Canada, the Canadian Rockies, and the Yellowstone ecosystem). I am aware that large predators have a potential for risks, but public awareness can mitigate most of these issues, providing safety for both humans and bears.

I support all steps that can be taken to preserve and restore the natural character of the North Cascades ecosystem.

Reintroducing grizzly bears in a region that was once their native habitat is an important step toward that goal. Given that their extinction was caused by humans, I believe that restoration of these magnificent animals to the North Cascades is a matter of environmental justice. It saddens me to know that there are people regard animals like bears and cougars as enemies, instead of creatures who play important roles in the natural cycle of wilderness life. This is a situation where a key element for successful grizzly bear reintroduction is an increase in public awareness; I believe that Option C is a step in that direction. The plan is detailed, carefully constructed, and based on many years of study. I hope that it can be implemented.

Correspondence ID: 1452Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Toutle, WA 98649
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,05 2023 23:09:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To whom it may concern,

I am writing to comment on the grizzly reintroduction plan, again. As a former Park Service and Forest Service employee, as well as a lifetime resident of rural Washington state with experience living, working and playing in the North Cascades, I strongly believe that grizzly bears should not be introduced into the Cascades. I urge the agencies involved to choose the "no changes" alternative.

I have reviewed the EIS and am quite concerned that reintroduction is a large experiment with one of the world's most dangerous land predators. Nowhere can I find that grizzlies have been inserted into a habitat without any existing bears. The EIS references some augmentation in the Cabinet Mountains, but there is no experience with dropping grizzlies into an area without any. The National Park Service has an infamous history of "experimenting" with grizzly policy with devastating results. Agencies rush to change policies, sometimes to match the politics of the day. They strive to make things more "natural" often fails to take into account the effects on individual animals, and the people that encounter them. The book Engineering Eden details how the zeal of the Park Service and push close the Yellowstone's garbage dumps did not adequately consider the effect on individual bears. This abrupt policy change contributed two separate grizzly attacks that killed two people. Four grizzlies were ultimately killed by rangers.

I am concerned that something similar could happen if bears are taken from their familiar habitat and surroundings, captured, traumatized, then dropped into a brand-new setting. All of this is to happen to these young animals in the late summer and fall, when they must find massive amounts of food just before hibernation. As any Yellowstone documentary describes, young bears learn all the tricks of survival from their mothers. Famously, bears in Yellowstone climb high into the mountains to search for moths in talus slopes. They also know when to head to the lower areas around Yellowstone Lake to catch spawning trout. These unique food sources, their locations, and the timing to forage for them, is all taught to cubs by their mothers. A translocated animal dropped into a new area could not know where special regional foods are located. This EIS doesn't consider factors, like this, that effect translocated bears.

The problems inherent in transporting any bears to the North Cascades, would be especially severe if bears were brought in from Yellowstone. Bears should never be transported from the greater Yellowstone area to the North Cascades. Yellowstone has vastly more protein-rich food sources, especially elk calves and deer fawns. The North Cascades has very few elk and a declining deer population. These areas are just too different to take a bear from the abundance of Yellowstone and drop it into the less productive North Cascades. The elk in the North Cascades are largely in the Skagit Valley near the towns of Concrete, Birdsvie and Sedro-Woolley. Bear predation on elk here sets up a ready-made conflict with people. The same is true for salmon, which are most available in the populated areas along the Skagit River. The EIS mentions "berries" as a main food source, but some years there are no huckleberries. In these years, even black bears are known to be more aggressive and seek out human food. Taking a bear from Yellowstone and dropping them into the North Cascades would be like forcing a carnivore to be a vegan overnight. This confused, hungry, lost and disoriented bear is likely to also become a dangerous bear very quickly.

The EIS contends over and over that one of the main environmental impacts that must tolerated is the disturbance from

helicopter flights. Seriously? Nobody cares about a helicopter!. The main environmental impact of moving grizzly bears around the country isn't the helicopter sound. The big problem is the on-the-ground presence of confused, lost, homesick and hungry grizzly bears in prime hiking, hunting, camping, ranching, farming and horseback riding areas.

The Park Service and other agencies should have a little humility, and go back to some of their earlier studies of similar translocations of large predators. In college, I helped with a paper on the effects of wolf reintroduction. The paper compared what was predicted in the wolf reintroduction EIS and what actually happened on the ground. The difference between prediction and reality was shocking. The wolf population exploded and the impact on elk herds was catastrophic when compared with the predictions of the EIS. For example, that EIS predicted that 100 wolves in the two release areas would be reached in 2002. In Yellowstone ALONE the population by 2004 was 174. In 2021 the wolf population in Idaho reached 1500, all with hunting, trapping and state management! Because the government essentially dropped a wolf bomb on Idaho, the local communities have not embraced the return of this prime predator, and a deep resentment of wolves exists in the rural communities that must deal with them. Perhaps, if wolves had been allowed to recover more slowly, on their own time, this animosity might not be as pronounced. Of course, grizzly bears will not expand so quickly, but the point is that EIS predictions are just that--predictions--and the agency doesn't have a very accurate crystal ball. The agencies really do not know what these bears will do, how far they will travel, how their behavior will be effected after being dumped into an unfamiliar area, how they will tolerate human interactions, and various other factors.

The EIS fails to really understand the human use in the relocation area, especially on Forest Service land. In the summer and fall the Pacific Crest Trail becomes a superhighway of thru-hikers, who start in the spring in California and end up at the Canadian border. As a local, I have recreated alongside this moving pulse of humanity. These hikers would be completely unprepared and unaware that they are heading into grizzly country. They all travel very light, move quickly, and cover 25-35 miles per day. They don't have extra weight like bear spray and bear canisters. There are no designated Forest Service campsites, like there are in the National Park. Many of these thru-hikers are really outdoor novices, many foreigners from Europe. They are not prepared to be hiking pell-mell through a grizzly reintroduction area. The Pacific Northwest Trail, while less used, is quickly becoming popular as well.

The "no action" or "no change" alternative does not mean there will not be grizzlies in the North Cascades. Grizzly sign is quite common in Horseshoe Basin area already. Keep up the monitoring for bears. A grizzly was just caught killing chickens in Colville, Wa. There is really no reason the bears cannot migrate into the area on their own, just like the wolves have. In fact, if the habitat was so productive, the bears should be there already. But with this marginal habitat, bear numbers will stay low, just like in the similar area north of the border. Let the bears return on their own. Do not transplant grizzly bears into the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 1453Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kirkland, WA 98034
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,06 2023

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I fully support and encourage the draft grizzly bear restoration plan and recovery plan in the North Cascades Ecosystem. The current status and 'do nothing' option is unacceptable. I want my children and future generations to know that these grizzly bears are still here. Previous generations have destroyed so much and removed forever the ecosystems and wildlife that I miss. Gone are the passenger pigeons, nearly wiped out are buffalo, birds numbers have dropped precipitously for the last 50 years. Billions of birds are lost. Without our active care and involvement, the grizzly in their native habitat will be gone too. Please help them recover and rebound as soon as possible.

Correspondence ID: 1454Project:112008Document:132104

Address: San Diego, CA 92108
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,06 2023

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: These are such awesome animals, they are so important to the Eco system, they keep getting pushed out of their environment by people, it is sad.

Correspondence ID: 1455Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Portland, OR 97266
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,06 2023

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a life-long hiker and camper in the Pacific Northwest, I feel we have a duty to restore wildlife like grizzly bears to their historic range as often as possible. Our society as a whole will improve so much when we start a healthy co-existence with wildlife.

Correspondence ID: 1456Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spanaway, WA 98387
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,06 2023 02:38:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Humans were responsible for removing grizzlies from the North Cascades and it's our responsibility to bring them back home.

If we don't take action now, we risk losing grizzly bears from the North Cascades forever.

Thank you for your time!!

Correspondence ID: 1457Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Snohomish, WA 98290
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,06 2023 06:27:48

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not bring back grizzly bears. They are incredibly dangerous to hike around and they will kill to many deer. I'm worried about getting attacked by one.

Correspondence ID: 1458Project:112008Document:132104

Address: East Wenatchee, WA 98802
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,06 2023 06:37:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I love nature, and I love all the animals in it. When I am enjoying the outdoors here in central Washington I carry bear spray and am confident in its effectiveness to deter an attack should I startle a bear or get a little too close to a family unit. I am not so concerned with my safety if grizzly bears are re-introduced to this area. What I am concerned with is the thousands of uneducated and unprepared hikers that visit our area each year to voyage to our beautiful lakes and peaks with their families. Our trails are extremely overcrowded with urban travellers from Seattle who saw Colchuck on Instagram and come here to take a selfie with the lake and Dragontail in the background. They usually know very little about hiking, have very little gear, and aren't even physically prepared for what they just drove two and a half hours to accomplish. Black bears are skittish in my experience, and in the experience of many outdoor enthusiasts I have spoken with. If they are far enough away when they become aware of the presence of a human they will quickly exit the scene. Dangerous encounters

are rare in our area. I have not even heard of one in the fifteen years I have lived here.

My knowledge of grizzly bears is limited, as I have not lived anywhere where they do, but the way they have been portrayed in the media leads me to believe they are not as skittish as the black bear and that they could pose a serious danger to these inexperienced citizens who have become accustomed to the inviting nature of our mountains here in Central Washington.

Correspondence ID: 1459Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Renton, WA 98059
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,06 2023 06:54:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears originally inhabited land all the way to California. Now that land is heavily populated. I feel that encouraging their return and bringing them in contact with more humans is not in the best interest of the bears or humans. They belong in remote areas that are not frequented by man. Washington state is too populated and has a very strong outdoor recreation industry that would certainly cause conflict with reintroducing these bears to the environment.

Correspondence ID: 1460Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98116
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,06 2023 07:54:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Given the choice between endangered animals and endangering children, President Biden is unbelievably siding with the grizzly bears. The President's plan to introduce 200 brown bears into Washington state is unconscionable madness. We only need to look to Alaska, Montana and Canada to see the inevitable human injuries and deaths he is actively pursuing. Additionally, one wonders why Biden is handing gun rights advocates a new reason to need a gun. I'd love to continue to camp, hike and trail run without one. I'm urging my fellow Washington residents to join me in opposing this idiotic proposal from the opposite coast before cougars become the least of our worries.

Correspondence ID: 1461Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Portland, OR 97217
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,06 2023 09:18:45

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Thank you for moving forward with the planning process for the critical restoration of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem. I appreciate the hard work of the Service and all the stakeholders who had persisted in the advancement of this project over so many years.

I would voice my support for Alternative B. I recognize the desire of some interests to maximize "flexibility" and have "more tools in the toolbox" when it comes to re-establishing grizzlies across this landscape. Unfortunately, as I have seen many times across the West, "flexibility" and "tools" are considered by those opposed to recovering species and preserving wild landscapes as mere euphemisms for killing. Under Alternative C, I am concerned that frontline Service staff managing this project will be under constant pressure to utilize flexibility and move to bear killing at the first sign of conflict.

Some local landholders and politicians have found little reason to temper violent, insurrectionist rhetoric and spread misinformation about endangered species like grizzly bears and wolves. A plan that does not place strict sideboards around bear management could target frontline Service staff with threats and intimidation, not only to manipulate species management but to advance their own broader political agendas.

Grizzlies belong in the North Cascades Ecosystem, but the dedicated staff members of the Service also deserve strong

sideboards to insulate them from the aspirations of parochial interests. I believe Alternative B offers the best support for grizzlies and Service staff.

Correspondence ID: 1462Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Brewster, WA 98812
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,06 2023 09:50:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a local, who would be directly impacted by this decision, I am asking you to stop with this idea that grizzlies need to be brought into the North Cascades area. The negative impacts on ecosystems, farming, and recreation would severely disrupt the local communities. With the non-native wolves that have been brought in, our prey population has been decimated. The grizzlies would not have an adequate food source as is. This would immediately bring them into local towns and orchards. Cattle ranchers in the area have already been hit with loss with wolves killing their calves. Wolves as you know, teach their pups to kill, taking out mass amounts of animals for fun. Grizzlies would already be here if there was an adequate food source. They are obviously smarter than the government officials and extremist who do not understand the situation, rather than just look at majestic pictures of animals on a computer screen. Imagine the number of hikers, pets, and cattlemen being attacked by being out in nature. Or what about the orchard worker coming across a sow with two cubs in an orchard row? Please stop with these absurd money wasting ideas and do something that will promote our food supply in America. These people you are trying to affect are the ones working every day to make sure the whole country/world is fed.

Correspondence ID: 1463Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Everett, WA 98203
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,06 2023 09:56:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Humans were responsible for removing grizzlies from the North Cascades and it's our responsibility to bring them back home. Focused efforts on conservation and restoration are vital to the survival of our ecology.

Correspondence ID: 1464Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,06 2023 10:18:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am very much in favor of the reintroduction of grizzly bears into the North Cascades. These bears were an essential part of the natural ecosystem for thousands of years. The native peoples shared this region with these bears for many, many generations. Even though there is a much larger human population now, we should still be able to allow grizzly bears to live in the North Cascades wilderness. I frequently hike and lead field trips for the Washington Native Plant Society in the Mount Baker Wilderness, and I am aware of the danger to humans posed by these bears. Even so, the bears belong there and it is up to us to give them space to live.

Thank you for considering my input.

Correspondence ID: 1465Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,06 2023 10:29:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades National Park.

Correspondence ID: 1466Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Federal Way, WA 98023
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,06 2023 10:37:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Why spend all the time effort and money when it is obvious that the grizzly bear population will eventually restore it self in our state. Examine the bear population in the state adjacent to WA ., both Idaho & Montana's grizzly bear population is growing. The over population in these states will eventually & naturally repopulate Washington. Maybe not in our life time but neither will your program. Put your time, efforts and money to better use.
Thank you

Correspondence ID: 1467Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,06 2023 11:11:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello,

I strongly oppose any re introduction efforts of grizzly bears into the North Cascades. There are no guarantees of the outcome of this plan. Grizzlies should be allowed to naturally work there way back to the areas they used to inhabit. Past practices that have contributed to a declining grizzly population have been curtailed greatly allowing for grizzlies to migrate like they once did. We should not be playing God thinking we know what's best. I fear any sort of butterfly effect that could stem from this plan. Thanks for listening.

Correspondence ID: 1468Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,06 2023 11:36:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm an avid hiker and backpacker. Encountering black bears is routine, and they're predictably non-aggressive. Grizzly bears are much less predictable; it is a disservice to recreational users to introduce these bears to popular hiking areas. Better to use the money for habitat preservation.

Correspondence ID: 1469Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98126
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,06 2023 11:51:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I fully support the Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan - as a conservationist, I know grizzly bears provide important ecological services, like distributing seeds and aerating alpine meadows, and it's important that they are reincorporated into the North Cascades ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 1470Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,06 2023 11:58:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Millions of people safely hike and coexist with grizzly bears every year in the Rocky Mountains and Alaska. There is more than enough room in the North Cascades for humans and grizzlies to safely coexist, and people can recreate safely in grizzly bear country. Even in Yellowstone National Park, which is much smaller than the North Cascades Ecosystem, hosts millions of visitors each year, and is home to at least 150 grizzlies, bear encounters and especially attacks are exceedingly rare.

Culturally and spiritually, grizzly bears are important to many of the Indigenous peoples in the Pacific Northwest, who have coexisted with grizzlies for thousands of years. We are grateful for the knowledge and deep respect these peoples hold on behalf of grizzly bears, who are often seen as teachers, guides, and symbols of strength and wisdom. Last, we have a moral obligation to restore grizzlies as a wilderness icon and a key part of our natural heritage.

Washingtonians have recognized grizzlies as a vital part of our natural heritage and have overwhelmingly supported this once-in-a-lifetime chance to restore them to the North Cascades. Humans were responsible for killing off grizzlies in the last century, and now we have the moral imperative to bring them back. Washingtonians want to coexist with grizzly bears in the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 1471Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98144
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,06 2023 12:24:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades. Human bear conflict can be managed and mitigated.

Correspondence ID: 1472Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lake Forest Park, WA 98155
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,06 2023 12:29:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please choose Alternative A: No Action. This will keep the North Cascades free from grizzlies. The North Cascade Mountains are within easy driving distance of several large cities, so there will always be large numbers of people walking there. To keep people from being killed by bears, grizzly bear restoration should be accomplished only in areas far removed from large human populations. Please limit grizzly bear restoration to areas that are not a 2-hour drive from large cities, and thus not the Cascade Mountains.

I was charged by a grizzly bear in Glacier National Park. She ran full speed at me from 200-yards away, and stopped 12-feet from me, seemingly without ever having decelerated. It was profoundly frightening. No one should need to endure that type of fright just because they want to stroll on inviting mountain paths. Grizzlies are unpredictable, so although many encounters will not result in human death, some will. We will be causing needless human death if we deliberately restore grizzlies to areas where lots of people can choose to stroll for an afternoon outing near home.

I say "needless" because the ecosystem of the North Cascades has adapted to the lack of grizzly bears for a hundred years, and it is functioning well enough to remain a beautiful place to visit, and well enough for other wildlife populations to thrive. Grizzly bears are not necessary in that area in order to keep the ecosystem functioning adequately. We should not make it a dangerous place for its many human neighbors to visit by reintroducing grizzly bears.

Correspondence ID: 1473Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellevue, WA 98004
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,06 2023 12:51:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Out of the three options, I would prefer to see alternative C implemented. From the standpoint of someone who loves the outdoors, and especially the North Cascades, I think that reintroducing grizzly bears there is incredible. I think that alternative C is a better option compared to B because classifying the bears as an experimental population seems to give the FWS more jurisdiction in controlling and intervening with the grizzly bears when needed.

Correspondence ID: 1474Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sedro Woolley, WA 98284
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,06 2023 12:57:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not support the reintroduction of grizzlies into the north cascades.

My reason for not supporting this proposal is simple. The federal government has not had a robust plan for delisting these animals. Grizzlies and wolves in the American west have been slowly advancing in numbers and territory. NGO/animal rights groups coming in as willing partners for reintroduction and then continuously litigate to keep these animals listed under federal protection even though the populations of animals and territory are justified in removing federal protections. Until the federal bureaucracies can stem the litigation and provide solid bench points for delisting and state management. I am admittedly apposed to any reintroduction of grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 1475Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,06 2023 13:07:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears should definitely be reintroduced the the areas they once roamed.

Correspondence ID: 1476Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Issaquah, WA 98027
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,06 2023 13:46:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: In my opinion, grizzly bears SHOULD NOT be introduced into the North Cascades.

Look at all of the recent incidents where people have died in an encounter. Just last week a couple and their dog were killed in Banff.

The argument that they are part of the ecosystem is poor. The number that would be introduced and future numbers are not enough to have an impact on the ecosystem.

Grizzly bears are DEADLY. Introducing them is akin to saying "Let's plant land mines in the wilderness so people have to always worry about unexpectedly stepping on them every time they go out";

Please don't do this. It's insanity.

Correspondence ID: 1477Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Friday Harbor, WA 98250
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,06 2023 14:07:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Conservation Northwest and our coalition partners at Friends of the North Cascades Grizzly Bear praise the resumption of the draft plan and environmental impact statement, which takes a major step in bringing grizzly bears back to a suitable ecosystem spanning from Washington into British Columbia.

Joe Scott, International Programs Director for Conservation Northwest, said, "The grizzly bear is still the consummate North American wildlife icon. The grizzly has immeasurable ecological and cultural value for our ecosystems and communities. We have a unique opportunity and obligation in the PNW to co-author a significant conservation success story - to restore the grizzly to a small but important part of its traditional home."

The North Cascades is one of North America's premier intact ecosystems, but it is incomplete without grizzly bears.

This is the second attempt by the agencies to restore grizzlies to the NCE after a 2015 process was halted by the Trump administration in 2020. At the time, more than 159,000 members of the public wrote comments supporting the reintroduction of grizzlies.

"The time has come for the grizzly bear to return to its habitat to take its place in the indigenous ecosystem," said Scott Schuyler, policy representative for the Upper Skagit Tribe, whose territory lies within the recovery zone. "The Upper Skagit successfully coexisted with grizzly bears for thousands of years, and we should once more."

The NCE is one of two federal grizzly recovery areas without an established population of bears, and natural bear migration is unlikely to repopulate it. Instead, based on decades of thorough research, wildlife biologists suggest safely relocating existing bears into the North Cascades.

"Grizzlies and humans coexist elsewhere in the West," said Skagit County local Jack Oelfke, an avid hiker and former National Park Service manager. "We need to muster the courage and humility to bring them back as a critical part of our shared wild landscape here in the North Cascades."

"Many rural residents living in the North Cascades recognize that they are in grizzly bear habitat," said Jasmine Minbashian, executive director of the Methow Valley Citizens Council. "They recognize that as a native species, grizzlies were here before them and we should make room for them to return."

Correspondence ID: 1478Project:112008Document:132104

Address: mt vernon, WA 98274
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,06 2023 14:33:08

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Look to Bampf incident.

Experienced hikers and outdoors people tent camping in grizzly country

Tragic outcome two dead campers and their dog dead too.

With the increasing numbers of inexperience outdoors people wandering through Grizzly bear country is inviting more tragic consequence.

Not to mention the threat to Farmersand Cattle ranchers

Correspondence ID: 1479Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Portland, OR 97217
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,06 2023 15:02:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: More bears will die, more humans will die.

Are those deaths worth your conservation goals? I do not dispute that in a pure, natural ecosystem, the bears are a vital part and have every right, more rights in fact than we to exist here. Human population and encroachment into habitat is out of control. It would be a lovely change if we could stop polluting, stop expanding, reverse climate change, etc. Maybe one day that will happen, but for now, it is sadly a fantasy. Reality is that we have modified the natural world so far, it is naïve and irresponsible to think that we can start moving apex predators like the grizzly around as if they are pawns on a chessboard.

Have you researched the rate of grizzly attacks in Idaho and Montana in the last decade?

Best regards,,

--

Hikers killed by a bear in Banff sent one last message: 'Bear attack bad' -

<https://www.npr.org/2023/10/06/1203928437/couple-grizzly-bear-attack-banff-sent-message>

<https://www.cnn.com/2023/09/07/us/grizzly-bear-attack-yellowstone-idaho-killed/index.html>

<https://www.nytimes.com/2021/04/19/us/grizzly-bear-attack-yellowstone.html>

<https://www.foxnews.com/us/idaho-elk-hunter-shoots-kills-charging-grizzly-bear-surprise-encounter-officials>

<https://apnews.com/article/montana-grizzly-attack-lower-jaw-bit-off-e044003043566d886965721d0cc71905>

<https://nbcmontana.com/news/local/hunter-kills-grizzly-bear-in-self-defense-north-of-gardiner>

<https://www.fieldandstream.com/survival/hunter-shoots-and-kills-charging-grizzly-bear-in-yet-another-self-defense-encounter-in-idaho/>

Correspondence ID: 1480Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Kelowna, UN V1V 2C5
Canada
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,06 2023 16:08:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To whom it may concern,

Please reintroduce the Grizzly back it is home and native land. They are an important part of our ecosystem and our Indigenous peoples.

Thank you

Correspondence ID: 1481Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America

Outside Organization: Whatcom County Snowmobile club member Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,06 2023 16:48:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The restoration attempt is misguided. People do not inter-act well with Grizzlies. The only way to restore the Grizzly population is to remove the human aspect. To do that we would have to close the lands that many of us like to explore, camp, hike, hunt on. I often think that is why these projects emerge. I have witnessed over the last 20 years first hand of how hard it is to keep the National Forest open for access. As a past president of the Whatcom County Snowmobile club our members have spent hundreds of hours ditching, brushing and working with the Forest Service on preventing road damage and closures. It's a shame on how much of their funding has been cut over the years, a huge loss from lack of Logging in our area. I know many who would prefer to shut down access and restoring the Grizzly population would accomplish this. Their habitat has changed we changed it. It is impossible to go back in time when this interaction did not take place. The facts are The Grizzly Bear is not human friendly. Yes a human may surprise the Bear and be attacked and killed. Not the Bear's fault but that person is dead forever. I for one do not want to see our tax money wasted on a project that is designed to remove people from the very land we work so hard to enjoy. As an avid outdoorsman I see these pipe dreams all the time. Many people from the large metro area's see a tv show and think this would be great. They look so friendly. Look how many think its ok to pet the wild Bison in Yellowstone Park. People aren't aware and the majority of people do not understand the dangers. They have a large voice and are very powerful in there numbers, but they don't have a clue. Most have never spent anytime in the wilds. I think its a wonderful idea but an impossible dream. My voice for this project of reintroducing the Grizzly is a NO. Please keep me informed on the process.

Correspondence ID: 1482Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Vancouver, WA 98682
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,06 2023 16:54:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a washington resident I am flabbergasted as to why we need to even consider introducing grizzly bears on the landscape in the North Cascades when there are grizzly bears already on the landscape in the state. Why does the park service need to waste money trying to implement something that will happen naturally over the coming decades. I urge the park service to use their funds for more important wild life....because there are numerous that are more critical than this topic

We are currently seeing the effects of unmanaged grizzly bears in Montana, Wyoming, and Idaho over the past 5 years. Dozens of individuals have been mauled or killed due to the inability to effectively manage a population that has more than reached carrying capacity on the landscape. This will soon happen in washington state if grizzly's are introduced without a management plan that can be executed and not tied up by the court systems.

Do the smart thing and use park service funds elsewhere

Correspondence ID: 1483Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Harrington, WA 99134
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,06 2023 17:14:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to voice my opposition to any grizzly bear reintroduction efforts. My family has camped, hiked, and backpacked in the Twisp area for over 25 years, and my husband's family has enjoyed the region since the 1970's. The ability to enjoy the wildlife and beautiful scenery has created family memories that we hope to now continue with our grandchildren. Introducing grizzlies into the region is an appalling and wreckless idea.

Why would anyone purposefully choose to do such a dangerous act? Not only would this be putting human lives at risk, but also endangering the livestock that provides a livelihood for the citizens of the region. The misguided notion that an aggressive, predatory animal that was once in an area 200+ years ago should now be placed into the same region with the

new human occupants is absolutely incomprehensible. Are the politicians who are promoting and supporting this idea considering what other predators they will be reintroducing to the Seattle area next, or will the humans in the North Cascades be the only sacrifice? Please consider the potentially lethal consequences to hikers, bikers, and other outdoor enthusiasts if you exercise your political authority from the safety of your offices in Olympia and Washington, DC?

I urge you to please keep the North Cascades grizzly-free. I assume you don't want to purposefully endanger the citizens who call that region home or who enjoy the beauty it has to offer. At least, I hope wanting to protect humans is a safe assumption. Please prove me right and end any discussion about grizzly reintroduction. Thank you!

Correspondence ID: 1484Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98058
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,06 2023 17:21:55

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think Alternative C is the best. It's almost the same as Alternative B, but it protects the grizzly bears significantly. This is what all animals need that are especially getting transported from another part of the world. If we can slowly reintroduce grizzly bears into NCE and manage them, then I believe that is the right thing to do. We would have to move slowly because this isn't the time to rush anything. Everything has to be precise and on point, one mistake could cost us. We haven't had grizzly bears in over 30 years and if we have an opportunity to bring them back, we should definitely do it with lots of rules and regulations protecting them.

Correspondence ID: 1485Project:112008Document:132104

Address: North Bend, WA 98045
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,06 2023 17:29:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do NOT reintroduce grizzly bears to the Cascade Mtns out of concern for aggression towards human hikers and campers.

Correspondence ID: 1486Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lyman, WA 98284
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,06 2023 18:00:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Can't even control elk population the last thing we need to worry about is grizzly bear when living or recreating in the north cascades!

Correspondence ID: 1487Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Carnation, WA 98014
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,06 2023 18:12:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the no action on the introduction of Grizzlies to NCNP. As an outdoors person who backpacks in the area considered I feel that the danger it would pose to humans is to great.

Correspondence ID: 1488Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kenmore, WA 98028
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,06 2023 18:21:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I don't believe reintroducing grizzlies into Washington is a good idea. Many current wild animals are being push out of their natural habitats by humans. What would happen to our current black bear population? What affects would the grizzlies have on the current limited resources for other wildlife How would encounters between humans and grizzlies playout

Correspondence ID: 1489Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Tacoma, WA 98444
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,06 2023 19:05:19
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzlies should absolutely be reintroduced into the north Cascades. They were a part of a healthy ecosystem and have therefore demonstrated instrumental value in addition to their intrinsic value, which is to say, "they deserve to be simply because they are." People can still recreate in these wild areas just as they do in the rest of the world where there are brown bears, they simply must learn how. The burden of responsibility is on us to enjoy wild spaces safely, not sanitize and tame the wilderness of all that is natural and potentially dangerous. Plus, a presence of grizzlies means agencies can eventually generate revenue from permits for rednecks who desperately want to shoot stuff.

Correspondence ID: 1490Project:112008Document:132104
Address: West Richland, WA 99353
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,06 2023 19:20:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Putting grizzly bears in the Cascades is a bad idea at best. Unlike black bears, they don't run away from humans. They attack. Way more lethal than any other north American predator, the will be soon associated with death of hikers and back packers. Very recently, a very capable hiking couple just north of Montana in Canada were both killed by a sow grizzly along with their dog. Where bear spray is effective against black bears, grizzly not so much. Two spent cans of spray were found near the couple. The campsite met all of the safety precautions against predators to no avail. Male grizzly bears are even bigger and I'll tempered. This is not a good plan as this is not very remote. Please back away frome this plan if you value human life

Correspondence ID: 1491Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Yakima, WA 98908
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,06 2023 19:23:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Man is part of our ecosystem. Man caused there to be no grizzly bears in the Washington Cascades decades ago. They should not be re-introduced. The Cascade ecosystem has changed, and for the better, without these apex predators.

Why ask for trouble? Are we that stupid?

Correspondence ID: 1492Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Pasco, WA 99301
United States of America
Outside Organization: [REDACTED] (Official Rep.)
Received: Oct,06 2023 19:31:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This may be one of the dumbest ideas yet to come from the current administration. Grizzley Bears are an apex predator, that means they eat people. People and bears do not co-exist, bears are not good neighbors. They do not lean in the window and try to sell you honey flavored cough syrup like you see on the tv. They rip your car/house/barn doors off and eat everything inside, including you and your spouse/children/pets/livestock, etc.

The cascade are not heavy populated, but they are populated and growing in residents and there are to many people living and visiting there today to mix bears back into that environment. Nothing good will come of this.

If you are in doubt, I'm a no.

Correspondence ID: 1493Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sedro Woolley, WA 98284
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,06 2023 19:54:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a citizen of Washington State I do not wish to have the Grizzly Bear or wolves roaming in our highly populated areas. This area is growing extremely fast and I see nothing but trouble in the future for farmers and outdoor enthusiasts of all ages if they come into contact with these wild animals. Many people who live in rural areas are already finding many predatory animals where they live. Where I live we have cougars, bobcats, bear, etc. I worry about young children who just want to play outside. It is very concerning.

Correspondence ID: 1494Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kelso, WA 98626
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,06 2023 20:32:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Washington does not need grizzly bears introduced. As it is we already have a predator issue and our predator managements options are basically nonexistent. The only thing introducing grizzlies would do is severely Damage the deer and elk population.

Correspondence ID: 1495Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tacoma, WA 98408
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,06 2023 20:38:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I stand fully behind reintroducing grizzlies into the north cascades. It was their home before and should be again. I lived around grizzlies in Montana, and they definitely have their place in the echo system. My only concern is there isn't a great deal of ungulates in the north cascades, and I wonder if they will have enough food source in that area.

Correspondence ID: 1496Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,06 2023 20:54:21

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: North Cascades are a traditional habitat for grizzly bears. I fully support reintroduction of grizzlies in the North Cascades. This will have many benefits for the future.

Correspondence ID: 1497Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Silverdale, WA 98383
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,06 2023 20:58:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Washington State Fish and Wildlife (WSFW) has failed at the reintroduction of wolves the State.....Washington State Fish and Wildlife along with the federal agencies that would partner with Washington, have been unable to protect wolves from poachers (ranchers, hunters, angry citizens who do not want these animals in their neighborhood and just dig a hole, kill the animal and bury it, etc.) and those claiming justification for the "taking" of these animals. Therefore, based on this huge failure, they would be incapable of protecting the grizzlies from this same population. Washington Fish and Wildlife is an agency that needs to be reorganized....and refocused.....Alternate A is the only option at this time. Ranchers and hunters run Washington State Fish and Wildlife and would use this reintroduction to hunt these majestic animals for trophies.....

Correspondence ID: 1498Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Yakima, WA 98908
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,06 2023 21:46:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: You should not introduce Grizzly bears into Washington.
Just leave things alone.

Look at what happened in Montana when the forest service introduced wolves and completely wiped out the deer for the most part. The comedy was that all the out of state hunting licences and the in state licences were no longer sold as there was nothing left to hunt so they had a massive layoff in the forest service as they had way less money.

The less the do good folks in the government gets involved the less problems the create for the average person.

Do not introduce Grizzly bears in WA.

Correspondence ID: 1499Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wilbur, WA 99185
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,06 2023 21:52:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: There is no need to transplant grizzlies, our state has too big of a human population and would cause too many conflicts. If the habitat was suitable they would have already repopulated from Canada. This idea keeps being kicked around and the people of Washington spoke clearly the last time that they didn't want grizzlies re introduced.

Correspondence ID: 1500Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Yakima, WA 98908
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,06 2023 22:24:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am opposed to introducing grizzly bears into the North Cascades of Washington. There is no good reason to do it. Grizzlies will make the mountains less safe for all the hikers and campers that enjoy the outdoors and the natural beauty of the Cascades. It's only a matter of time before someone will be attacked and killed. We've seen it in Idaho,

Montana and Canada already this year. As there are few natural predators of grizzlies, it is even more dangerous for people. They disappeared from this region for a reason. To reintroduce the grizzly is to repeat what has already happened. I say NO on grizzlies being brought to Washington.

Correspondence ID: 1501Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Issaquah, WA 98029
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,06 2023 22:30:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm against transplanting more grizzlies into the North Cascades. There are already grizzlies there (in remote areas) and we should let their populations increase naturally. Adding more grizzlies from different regions will put the native population in jeopardy. Just because they aren't roaming about like they do in Yellowstone doesn't mean they aren't there. They are secretive and avoid people, which is their best means of survival. A grizzly that has a healthy fear of humans is a good thing for both the bear and the public.

Correspondence ID: 1502Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,06 2023 22:30:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a Washington resident, frequent user of state and national forest trails, and PCT thru hiker, I feel that reintroducing these bears into land that is frequently used for various recreation will be a mutual danger for interaction. The thousands of visitors and users of the north cascades trails already frequently interact with black bears due to negligent human behavior. Introducing an apex predator to these lands with no way to enforce or control human behavior will result in increased chance of negative interactions. I personally would be less inclined to use or visit the north cascades given this additional precaution

Correspondence ID: 1503Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sedro Woolley, WA 98284
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,06 2023 22:33:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: There are good reasons why Grizzly bears were driven out of this area, they are not compatible with human establishment and are a serious threat to life and liberty.

Correspondence ID: 1504Project:112008Document:132104

Address: weaverville, CA 96093
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,07 2023 06:59:12

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Although I support re-introducing grizzlies to the North Cascades. I realize I do not live there, and thus the action would have no impact on my personal well being, and my comment probably should not have as much weight as comments from local/regional folks. However, if the project challenge is whether the proposed action will have a negative impact on cattle, re-introducing grizzlies is another reason we need to segue into producing more vegetal proteins.

Correspondence ID: 1505Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Weaverville, CA 96093
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,07 2023 07:01:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Although I support re-introducing grizzlies to the North Cascades, I realize I do not live there, and thus the action would have no impact on my personal well being. Perhaps my comment should not have as much weight as comments from local/regional folks. However, if the project challenge is whether the proposed action will have a negative impact on cattle, re-introducing grizzlies is another reason we need to segue into producing more vegetal proteins.

Correspondence ID: 1506Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Okanogan, WA 98840
United States of America
Outside Organization: retired Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,07 2023 07:05:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have one question: Why are you trying to ram this down the citizen's throats? This has been tried a couple of times before and you already know how we feel about reintroducing grizzlies here, so why are you keep coming back on us to try and slip it through the cracks? I think folks are getting fed up with these agencies (you know who you are) trying to get this passed by any means necessary. Why is this so important to you?

Correspondence ID: 1507Project:112008Document:132104

Address: liberty lake, WA 99019
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,07 2023 07:12:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am strongly opposed to grizzly bear restoration in the Cascades. Historical range is a justification of semantics and unclear time boundaries - by this definition grizzlies should be reintroduced to Downtown Seattle and Olympia. The Cascade ecosystem and relationship with humans is not suitable for sudden introduction of another apex predator - insufficient prey and human conflict including depredation will make this an exceedingly costly and damaging venture.

Correspondence ID: 1508Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Aberdeen, WA 98520
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,07 2023 08:40:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: In regards to introducing Grizzlies back to the State of Washington, or for that matter anywhere outside of Yellowstone, I am 100% opposed. This is a poorly thought out idea and will lead to the death of farm animals, humans and ultimately the Grizzly, when it is killed for being an apex predator. Please do not follow through with this ill conceived idea. There weren't millions of people living in the traditional hunting areas of these bears 200 years ago. The modern reality is simply too dangerous for us humans and is unfair to the bears natural instincts.

Correspondence ID: 1509Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Moses Lake, WA 98837
United States of America
Outside Organization: NA Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,07 2023 08:48:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The salmon population is on the decline, hikers abound everywhere these days, how will this be a good idea? If this is going to be done, each bear should be tagged with a geo-location device that can be publicly accessible on an app so that ranchers and hikers can be aware of the safety of Their surroundings.

Correspondence ID: 1510Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Colville, WA 99114
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,07 2023 09:01:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I lived in this area for the previous 27 years in a rural community at the base of the North Cascades. The area being considered for reintroduction is only a short distance away. I've recreated annually in these areas at a very high level those 27 years. Based off my experience in these wild areas, there is not near enough prey in these areas to support the apex predator grizzlies. Since there is not enough prey in these areas and these areas are so small, grizzlies would for sure end up in rural communities and small towns. This puts the public and bears at risk. Every time a grizzly attacks a human, it is seeked out for euthanization. This is a lose lose situation for both the bears and the public. This will be a waste of tax payer dollars that are already stretched thin. If the grizzlies wanted to be there they would already be there. Their is no physical boundaries keeping them from migrating down from BC. The fact that they're not already thier or limited numbers is because of the lack of prey in these areas. This reintroduction plan is a terrible idea and should be dismissed immediately!

Respectfully

Law abiding, registered voter, tax paying, Washington citizen

Correspondence ID: 1511Project:112008Document:132104

Address: TOPPENISH, WA 98948
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,07 2023 09:29:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears do well in habitats where human encounters are rare, such as the Rocky Mountain Range and the Alaskan Wilderness. Washington state does not have the area to keep deadly Grizzly Bear- Human encounters from happening. You will be forcing outdoor recreationists and those who live near these areas to arm themselves for protection as they do in Montana and Alaska. This is an extremely BAD idea.

Correspondence ID: 1512Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98273
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,07 2023 09:32:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To whom it may concern:

It is this heavily taxed paying citizen's opinion that reintroduction of grizzlies into the North Cascades is misguided. As someone who lived in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem for +5 years, I feel somewhat well-acquainted with the government's often well intentioned but short sighted goals with managing wildlife and reintroducing of species into an area where they were previously eradicated.

The difference between the North Cascades and GYE is the sheer population density of humans in this area. Unlike in the GYE where I could hike, hunt, and recreate without often seeing another soul for multiple days, there does not seem to be one piece of untouched earth in the North Cascades where humans don't go. The hiking trails are packed, backcountry permits for overnight camping sold out, and even camping spots completely booked months and months in advance.

Do we have an unhealthy, disruptive over-population of deer or elk? Or is the reintroduction of grizzlies in the North Cascades simply justified under the oft used but unclear, murky justification of "climate change".

It seems to me there has been a shift in grizzly behavior in the last decade. Whether that be because of climate change, over harvesting of grizzly's natural food resources, or simply that human population are more dense than ever, it is undeniable that grizzly/human encounters have become more frequent and more deadly. While I love and respect the grizzly bear, my love for my fellow human is greater. If grizzlies are reintroduced to the North Cascades, the resultant loss of human life will fall squarely on your shoulders. The grizzlies who are euthanized for livestock/human encounters will fall squarely on your shoulders.

Correspondence ID: 1513Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Colville, WA 99114
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,07 2023 10:07:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: NO!

That's the short answer. There was a time and a place for the grizzlies back long ago when human population was very small. Now not a good thing to mix. They were taken out just like wolves for a very good reason. Leave them where they're at now

Correspondence ID: 1514Project:112008Document:132104

Address: West Richland, WA 99353
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,07 2023 10:11:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Reintroducing Grizzly Bears to Eastern Washington is a danger to the lives of the people and animals who live here. Lots of people camp, fish, hike and enjoy other activities in this area. Bringing in Grizzly Bears will endanger us all. Do Not Reintroduce Grizzly Bears to our communities!

Correspondence ID: 1515Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Stabler, WA 98610
United States of America

Outside Organization: Self Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,07 2023 10:15:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Do not reintroduce the grizzlies. I have a small acreage with a few animals. Grizzlies are aggressive animals known to kill livestock and humans. I have wolves, Coyotes, cougar and well as other predators in my area. M chicken coop would be destroyed by grizzlies as well as other buildings. Having grizzlies in my neighborhood would threaten myself and my neighbors lifestyle.

I know you will do what you want, but forcing homeowners off their land and into cities is not an option. It seems that is your intent. Would grizzlies be allowed to be hunted? What options do homeowners have besides bear spray when confronted? No to grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 1516Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Chelan, WA 98816
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,07 2023 10:34:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a lifetime resident of the area I am ONE HUNDRED PERCENT against any and all relocation of Grizz into this area! I have previously had two close encounters with these bears one in MT and another in AK. I'm probably

lucky to still be here. Just look at the recent grizzly attacks - what are you thinking ??? It's not like these bears are going extinct- there are plenty of grizz in other areas. WE DON'T WANT THEM HERE!!! My guess is this is simply another tool that will be used to try and keep humans out of the park and surrounding areas- We all know what's going to happen when bears are in the area- there will be multiple attacks on humans and people will be seriously injured and/or killed. Then the park service will draw a big circle around that area and close it to human use. Pretty soon all the "circles" will overlap and guess what.....park closed. NO to GRIZZ!!!!!!

Also- we already have WAY too many apex predators in this area and our ungulate numbers are really suffering- this will make the predator pit problem even worse.

Correspondence ID: 1517Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,07 2023 10:54:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzlies are a vital, crucial part of the North Cascades ecosystem. Please restore Grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 1518Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Moses Lake, WA 98837
United States of America
Outside Organization: Golden Spade Ranch Business(Official Rep.)
Received: Oct,07 2023 10:55:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Having lived in Kenai Alaska, I will comment that the importation of Grizzly bears in the North Cascades will absolutely result in negligent harm to humans and animals. The majority of support for such an introduction will be from individuals which will never enter into the Cascade Mountain Range. I frequently spend weeks in the North, Central, and Southern Cascades via horse or back packing. Opinion from individuals who do not enter the Cascades have zero relevance due to lack of risk. Period! It is deceptive wording to say that they will be confined to the North Range. They will expand south of Lake Chelan and North into Canada. Do the Canadians want them? Have you invited the Canadian Residents into the comment period? My vote is NO.

Correspondence ID: 1519Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Port Townsend, WA 98368
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,07 2023 11:51:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I fully support the restoration of Grizzly Bears in the North Cascade ecosystem. All species need the opportunity to repopulate their home ranges. I've been back packing in the fall in Glacier National Park when grizzlies were active, and knowing I wasn't the top of the food chain made for a deeper connection with the wilderness. The only downside I see is the increased work it will create for NP employees to manage the bears and keep hikers informed of activity. They are dismally understaffed now so hopefully that will change if grizzlies come back.

Correspondence ID: 1520Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Benton City, WA 99320
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,07 2023 11:54:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I voice my opposition to relocating grizzly bears to the North Cascades. They pose a risk to humans that recreate in these mountains, to the livestock of ranchers, and to the homes and personal property of those living in this area. There are routine examples of innocent lives lost to grizzly bears. One life is too many. Not to mention the economic impact

of losing livestock, damage to homes and property, and lost revenue from visitors deterred. I stand strongly in opposition of alternatives B and C.

The fact that they are designated as nonessential experimental population underscores that this is not essential and demonstrates the issues with managing the population.

Correspondence ID: 1521Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Everett, WA 98203
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,07 2023 12:01:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the preferred alternative, restoring the North Cascades grizzly population with endangered species protection.

Correspondence ID: 1522Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Washougal, WA 98671
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,07 2023 12:12:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I think it's a great idea to reintroduce grizzlies in the north cascades.

Correspondence ID: 1523Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Oroville, WA, WA 98844
United States of America
Outside Organization: OROVILLE GUN CLUB Recreational Groups(Official Rep.)
Received: Oct,07 2023 12:31:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Oroville County has already said NO loudly and clearly in the past. Have you forgotten??

The grizzlies are moving into Okanogan County from Canada NATURALLY and without outside help. This is the natural progression of all wildlife. If the food supply and creature comforts are there they will come and multiply as they are currently doing. There is NO REASON TO MESS WITH MOTHER NATURE!! Accept that Mother Nature moves slower than you or other grizzly huggers like.

Due to the fires of the past year and loss of grizzly food supply and the constant stream of cross country hikers in the grizzly area, to add more grizzlies in this area could be detrimental to the hikers. But of more concern is the constant increase in wilderness fires and the policy to let them burn, means that this will be an increasing problems as global warming influences the wild fire problem thus making this loss of grizzly habitat more precarious. Why put more grizzlies in an area that is so vulnerable to the weather and already a delicate environment.

Correspondence ID: 1524Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Index, WA 98256
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,07 2023 12:31:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As someone who works in the North Cascades, I think that reintroducing a large predator would negatively impact outdoor recreation in the region. A large amount of the public both local and nonlocal spend time outdoors in this region and the bears would present a threat to safety and cause it to be more like Alaska whete you need a gun or bear

spray in order to go hiking or backpacking or climbing in the area. The negative impact on the communities and public and livestock would outweigh the "they belong here"; .

Correspondence ID: 1525Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Oroville, WA, WA 98844
United States of America

Outside Organization: oroville gun club Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,07 2023 12:39:15

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The last I knew the LYNX was an enviromentaly endangered species and special efforts have been made to preserve their habitat. With the summer fires due to weather changes and droughts, this environment is compromised for them. The introduction of Grizzlies into their habitat will compromise their food supply and endanger their existence.

Think about it. How many carnivores can the land hold without impacting an already endangered species.

The fires in this area have steadily gotten worse the last several years. This future habitat is a big consideration of preserving existing species without adding more species.

Correspondence ID: 1526Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Youngstown, OH 44504
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,07 2023 12:40:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Alternative C seems to the best approach among the plans for grizzly restoration in NCE because it allows the greatest flexibility for NPS in management while also affording needed protections for the species.

Correspondence ID: 1527Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Entiat, WA 98822
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,07 2023 13:50:56

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Absolutely not. The park is overrun with careless tourists who will ruin this. There will be attacks if the bears are reintroduced.

Correspondence ID: 1528Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Maple valley, WA 98038
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,07 2023 13:57:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please reconsider the idea of "introducing" more grizzlies into WA state. The bears are already here. Without them being truly regulated, more bears in this region will just cause more negative bear/human encounters. More bears are not a good use of time or money by any of the organizations involved!
Thank you for your time.

Correspondence ID: 1529Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Renton, WA 98059
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,07 2023 14:02:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzly bears were here before us and deserve to return! They are keystone species and belong there!!

Correspondence ID: 1530Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Everson, WA 98247
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,07 2023 14:21:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: They are already here. Look up hunt wa forums there's pictures of them in and around conconully. I've personally seen tracks on funk mountain off road #200 off of road #3810. I know many others who have seen them as well while hunting in that area. Saying no confirmed sightings since 96' is false and everyone knows it. Just look at pictures people post and clear as day they are grizzly (not cinnamon colored black bears we have plenty of those as well that hikers usually misidentify). Reintroduction will cause more conflict, as they are already making small numbers on there own. Wolf population is already mismanaged in our state no need to do that with another predator. I love these animals and would love to see more of them but not by human help, only by the natural way unless you plan on opening hunting seasons to help with the wolf population and same for grizzlies it should not be done. Listen to the ranchers and people who have livestock in those areas, don't listen to the city people who have no concept of wildlife, and wildlife conflict as it doesn't affect there lives it effects the rural communities.

Correspondence ID: 1531Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,07 2023 14:28:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Two dead hikers at Banff national Park last week. Dead hiker at Yellowstone a month earlier. Are you going to set up a compensation fund for the families of dead? It's not a good idea at all.

There's enough hazards and ways to die in the wilderness hiking as it is without adding the stress of having these bears around.

They were killed off for a reason.

Correspondence ID: 1532Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,07 2023 14:31:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not reintroduce grizzly bears to the North Cascades. I am a family co-owner in a ranch in Twisp. We have horses and enjoy the pleasure of riding on public lands, as well as hiking and back country camping. Besides horseback riding, many people partaking in outdoor activities have dogs with them. The population in the Methow Valley is growing, and I believe having grizzly bears living in the North Cascades will pose safety problems for citizens, animals, and even the grizzlies because of fear.

Thank you for accepting my comment on the Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/Environmental Impact Statement, North Cascades Ecosystem

Sincerely,

██████████
████████████████████

Correspondence ID: 1533Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,07 2023 14:41:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Two dead hikers at Banff national Park last week. Dead hiker at Yellowstone a month earlier. Are you going to set up a compensation fund for the families of dead? It's not a good idea at all.

There's enough hazards and ways to die in the wilderness hiking as it is without adding the stress of having these bears around.

They were killed off for a reason.

Correspondence ID: 1534Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Prosser, WA 99350
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,07 2023 14:48:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm not against grizzly's in Washington but I do believe they will spread naturally and introducing them is a huge waste of limited resources for wildlife and nature resources.

Correspondence ID: 1535Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98164
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,07 2023 14:55:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am fully in favor of the plan to bring grizzly bears back to the WA portion of the North Cascades. I'm an avid hiker and photographer and it would be an honor to see these beautiful animals in the backcountry. It appears there has been a lot of planning so I am in favor of the preferred option.

Correspondence ID: 1536Project:112008Document:132104

Address: CHESAPEAKE, VA 23322
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,07 2023 15:04:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The American Bear Foundation of Washington has always championed the well-being of bears.

However, we firmly oppose the reintroduction of grizzly bears into the North Cascades. It's evident that grizzlies are already finding their way into the region, with recent incidents like the young grizzly in Stevens County. We believe in natural migration and proper management. The existing challenges with the black bear, cougar, and wolf populations in Washington highlight the need to avoid adding more pressure on our wildlife.

As someone who frequently hikes, the thought of an increased grizzly bear population in the North Cascades is concerning. Observing the events in places like Montana and Idaho, it's clear that more bears can lead to more dangers. Grizzlies have every opportunity to migrate from BC or Idaho without human intervention. I urge you to let nature dictate its path.

The North Cascades have always been a haven for outdoor enthusiasts like me. It's come to my attention that grizzly bears already exist in this range, as noted by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. Introducing more would not only threaten the fragile mule deer population but also increase the risk for those of us who love the outdoors. I'm against any plans to reintroduce grizzlies in Washington.

The recent incident in Stevens County, where a grizzly bear was captured, is a testament to the growing predator challenges in Washington. Our state is already grappling with managing wolves, cougars, black bears, and more. Considering the strain on our ungulate populations, I cannot support the idea of reintroducing grizzlies into the state.

I felt compelled to voice my concerns about the potential reintroduction of grizzly bears in Washington. It's undeniable that grizzlies are already making their way into the state from neighboring regions. The absence of physical barriers means they can migrate naturally. Given the state's challenges in managing its existing wildlife, introducing another apex predator seems counterproductive.

The American Bear Foundation of Washington has always been at the forefront of advocating for bear welfare. Yet, we cannot support the reintroduction of the grizzly bear. The state already hosts this formidable predator. With the challenges the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife faces in managing the rising numbers of black bear, cougar, and wolves, introducing a larger and more aggressive predator seems like a step in the wrong direction.

Correspondence ID: 1537Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Prosser, WA 99350
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,07 2023 16:16:58

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzlies are already moving naturally into northern Washington from Canada and west from Idaho. I personally am aware of grizzlies in northeast Washington that WDFW isn't aware of and doesn't know they are there from conversations with locals.

Correspondence ID: 1538Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bainbridge Island, WA 98110
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,07 2023 16:19:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The Grizzly bear is part of the ecosystem of the north cascades mountains of Washington. It is imperative that we actively support their survival within this mountainous range. I am a hiker and spend a fair amount of time outdoors within the Washington ranges. Yes they are a powerful animal, and can be scary. The grizzly bears here long before our human race and help to balance the environment. I believe that they help to balance the wilderness keeping it as it was intended. It is important to introduce more grizzly bears so to keep the bears in this area strong and vibrant. Their introductions to other western states has shown that they can coexist with humans, and cattle. Educating the people who frequent the north cascades will be essential to keeping humans safe. This is a policy that is good for all. Thank you, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 1539Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Joint Base Lewis McChord, WA 98433
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,07 2023 16:19:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think this is a wonderful idea and an excellent plan. I believe all echelons of government should strive to restore nature and preserve culture wherever possible and from my understanding this plan aims to do both. I approve wholeheartedly and wish the relevant agencies luck in executing this plan.

Correspondence ID: 1540Project:112008Document:132104

Address: West Richland, WA 99353
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,07 2023 16:25:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: 1. I firmly oppose the reintroduction of grizzly bears into the North Cascades. It's evident that grizzlies are already finding their way into the region, with recent incidents like the young grizzly in Stevens County. We believe in natural migration and proper management. The existing challenges with the black bear, cougar, and wolf populations in Washington highlight the need to avoid adding more pressure on our wildlife.

2. As someone who frequently hikes, the thought of an increased grizzly bear population in the North Cascades is concerning. Observing the events in places like Montana and Idaho, it's clear that more bears can lead to more dangers. Grizzlies have every opportunity to migrate from BC or Idaho without human intervention. I urge you to let nature dictate its path.

3. The North Cascades have always been a haven for outdoor enthusiasts like me. It's come to my attention that grizzly bears already exist in this range, as noted by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. Introducing more would not only threaten the fragile mule deer population but also increase the risk for those of us who love the outdoors. I'm against any plans to reintroduce grizzlies in Washington.

4. The recent incident in Stevens County, where a grizzly bear was captured, is a testament to the growing predator challenges in Washington. Our state is already grappling with managing wolves, cougars, black bears, and more. Considering the strain on our ungulate populations, I cannot support the idea of reintroducing grizzlies into the state.

5. I felt compelled to voice my concerns about the potential reintroduction of grizzly bears in Washington. It's undeniable that grizzlies are already making their way into the state from neighboring regions. The absence of physical barriers means they can migrate naturally. Given the state's challenges in managing its existing wildlife, introducing another apex predator seems counterproductive.

6. I cannot support the reintroduction of the grizzly bear. The state already hosts this formidable predator. With the challenges the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife faces in managing the rising numbers of black bear, cougar, and wolves, introducing a larger and more aggressive predator seems like a step in the wrong direction.

7. As a regular visitor to the North Cascades, the potential increase in grizzly bear population is alarming. The incidents in states like Wyoming serve as a cautionary tale. With no barriers preventing grizzlies from migrating from places like BC, it's best to let nature take its course.

8. The beauty of the North Cascades has always drawn me in. However, the knowledge that grizzly bears are already present, as confirmed by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, makes me apprehensive. Introducing more would jeopardize not only the mule deer but also the safety of countless individuals. I'm firmly against the reintroduction proposal.

9. The recent capture of a grizzly bear in Stevens County underscores the challenges Washington faces with its predator populations. With the existing issues surrounding wolves, black bears, and cougars, it seems imprudent to consider adding grizzlies to the mix. I strongly advise against this reintroduction.

10. The presence of grizzly bears migrating into Washington from places like BC and Idaho is undeniable. Without any physical barriers, they can naturally inhabit the state. Given the difficulties in managing the current wildlife populations, I believe it's in the best interest to refrain from reintroducing more apex predators.

11. Reintroducing the grizzly bear is not in the best interest of the state. The challenges posed by the increasing numbers of black bear, cougar, and wolves are evident. Introducing a predator of the grizzly's stature would exacerbate these challenges, putting both humans and wildlife at risk.

12. I wish to express my reservations about reintroducing grizzly bears to the North Cascades. Recent events, such as the grizzly incident in Stevens County, highlight the existing challenges. We advocate for natural migration and believe that the current pressures on our wildlife, especially ungulates, make this reintroduction inadvisable.

13. As a frequent visitor to the North Cascades, the idea of more grizzly bears is concerning. The experiences of states like Montana and Idaho serve as a warning. Grizzlies can naturally migrate from neighboring regions, so I believe we should let nature take its course.

14. The North Cascades offer a unique experience for outdoor lovers. However, the presence of grizzly bears, as confirmed by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, poses a threat. Introducing more bears could harm the mule deer population and increase risks for visitors. I'm against this reintroduction.

15. The recent grizzly bear incident in Stevens County is a clear indication of the challenges we face with predators in Washington. Our state is already stretched thin managing various predators. Given the pressures on our ungulate populations, reintroducing grizzlies seems unwise.

16. I'm writing to express my concerns about reintroducing grizzly bears in Washington. Their natural migration from regions like BC and Idaho is evident. With the state's current wildlife management challenges, adding another apex predator seems ill-advised.

17. I believe that reintroducing the grizzly bear is not in the state's best interest. The challenges posed by the rising numbers of other predators are evident. Introducing grizzlies would only add to these challenges, endangering both humans and wildlife.
18. The North Cascades are a haven for many, but the potential reintroduction of grizzly bears raises safety concerns. The incidents in states like Wyoming are a testament to the risks. Grizzlies can naturally migrate from nearby regions, so human intervention seems unnecessary.
19. The North Cascades are a sanctuary for many outdoor activities. However, the existing grizzly bear population, as noted by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, is already a concern. Adding more bears could jeopardize the mule deer and increase risks for visitors. I oppose this move.
20. The grizzly bear situation in Stevens County highlights the predator challenges in Washington. With the existing predator population and the pressures on our ungulate herds, reintroducing grizzlies seems counterproductive.
21. I wish to voice my concerns about the potential reintroduction of grizzly bears in Washington. Their presence, migrating from regions like BC and Idaho, is already noticeable. Given the state's wildlife management challenges, reintroducing more apex predators is concerning.
22. Reintroducing the grizzly bear poses significant challenges. The state's current predator management issues are evident. Introducing grizzlies would exacerbate these issues, putting both humans and wildlife at risk.
23. The potential reintroduction of grizzly bears in the North Cascades is alarming for many of us who frequent the area. The experiences of states like Montana serve as a cautionary tale. Grizzlies have every opportunity to migrate naturally, so human intervention seems unwarranted.
24. The North Cascades are a favorite for many outdoor enthusiasts. However, the presence of grizzly bears, as confirmed by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, is concerning. Introducing more bears could harm the mule deer population and increase risks for visitors. I'm against this proposal.
25. The recent grizzly bear capture in Stevens County underscores the challenges we face with predators in Washington. Our state is already dealing with various predators. Given the pressures on our ungulate populations, reintroducing grizzlies seems ill-advised.
26. I'm writing to express my reservations about reintroducing grizzly bears in Washington. Their natural migration from regions like BC and Idaho is evident. With the state's current wildlife management challenges, adding another apex predator seems lindane
27. Reintroducing the grizzly bear is not in the state's best interest. The challenges posed by the rising numbers of other predators are evident. Introducing grizzlies would only add to these challenges, endangering both humans and wildlife.
28. The North Cascades are a haven for many, but the potential reintroduction of grizzly bears raises safety concerns. The incidents in states like Wyoming are a testament to the risks. Grizzlies can naturally migrate from nearby regions, so human intervention seems unnecessary.
29. The North Cascades are a sanctuary for many outdoor activities. However, the existing grizzly bear population, as noted by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, is already a concern. Adding more bears could jeopardize the mule deer and increase risks for visitors. I oppose this move.
30. The grizzly bear situation in Stevens County highlights the predator challenges in Washington. With the existing predator population and the pressures on our ungulate herds, reintroducing grizzlies seems counterproductive.
31. I wish to voice my concerns about the potential reintroduction of grizzly bears in Washington. Their presence, migrating from regions like BC and Idaho, is already noticeable. Given the state's wildlife management challenges, reintroducing more apex predators is concerning.
32. Reintroducing the grizzly bear poses significant challenges. The state's current predator management issues are evident. Introducing grizzlies would exacerbate these issues, putting both humans and wildlife at risk.
33. The potential reintroduction of grizzly bears in the North Cascades is alarming for many of us who frequent the area. The experiences of states like Montana serve as a cautionary tale. Grizzlies have every opportunity to migrate naturally, so human intervention seems unwarranted.
34. The North Cascades are a favorite for many outdoor enthusiasts. However, the presence of grizzly bears, as confirmed by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, is concerning. Introducing more bears could harm the mule deer population and increase risks for visitors. I'm against this proposal.
35. The recent grizzly bear capture in Stevens County underscores the challenges we face with predators in Washington. Our state is already dealing with various predators. Given the pressures on our ungulate populations, reintroducing grizzlies seems ill-advised.
-

Correspondence ID: 1541Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98116
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,07 2023 16:34:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Without reservation, I support this plan. Please implement it.

Correspondence ID: 1542Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Kennewick, WA 99337-3906
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,07 2023 16:40:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Do NOT introduce Grizzly bears in Washington state. They have no place here.

Correspondence ID: 1543Project:112008Document:132104
Address: SPOKANE, WA 99205
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,07 2023 16:51:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hi, I would like to add my comment as a resident and one who works and plays in the woods of Washington. I do not believe that a grizzly bear reintroduction into our state is a wise or necessary plan. They appear to be moving in naturally, so the cost is unnecessary. There is also serious conflict issues. Unfortunately, WDFW leaders have shown poor predator management and do not follow science or research in regards to population. This impacts outdoor users and heavily impacts other wildlife and increases wildlife-urban interactions. Until there is trust that the agency will be proactive about managing predators, there is absolutely no need to do an intentional reintroduction of the largest predator in the lower 48.
Things like this really have an impact on fringe voters who feel impacted or unheard. I continue to lean to the right as I feel the left gets too strong and pushy with their agenda, this is an example of that, as well as the spring black bear season, of which I don't even participate.
Please consider all reasonable facts when making this decision. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 1544Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98273
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,07 2023 16:53:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Thank you for the opportunity to express my thoughts concerning this important issue. I am strongly against the reintroducing grizzly bears in the North Cascade Mountains. The low number of ungulates, the high number of existing apex predators (i.e. black bears, mountain lions, and wolves), and the high density of humans makes this a clear choice for me. As I've read on this subject, I do not see any truly viable reason for their reintroduction, but there are plenty of reasons to not do it.

Thank you,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 1545Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98273
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,07 2023 17:13:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a family, we enjoy the North Cascades Parks. The thought of surprising a Grizzly Bear while hiking or camping is beyond comprehension. Grizzly bears are not extinct and live in other places. We do not approve "bringing them back" to our state! Please leave them alone!

Correspondence ID: 1546Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Everett, WA 98208-4080
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,07 2023 17:44:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Alternative A is the only reasonable option. The very idea of reintroducing grizzly bears into the North Cascades is absurd when the potential for negative bear/human interaction is taken into account.

Alternative B and C are also directly in conflict with existing state law RCW 77.12.035, Alternative A is also the only legal option unless federal authority is used to super cede state law.

Reintroducing Grizzly bears to Washington State exposes the public and park employees to an unacceptable risk of dangerous human/bear interactions. If there is an ecological upside of reintroducing bears to this geographical region, this is outweighed by the danger posed to PEOPLE and the resource costs of a new ongoing species management program.

Alternative A, final answer.

Correspondence ID: 1547Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Zillah, WA 98953
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,07 2023 17:45:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I fully support the reintroduction of Grizzly bears to the North Cascades. Grizzly bears have been an important part of the North Cascades Ecosystem for thousands of years. They play a vital role for the health of the environment and other wildlife species, figure prominently in regional Native American and First Nations' cultures, and contribute to the richness of our natural heritage in the Pacific Northwest. Now is the time to restore a healthy grizzly bear population in the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 1548Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Custer, WA 98240
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,07 2023 17:45:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: It would be great in restoring grizzlies to whatcom county

Correspondence ID: 1549Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98274
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,07 2023 18:20:01

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am against reintroducing the grizzly bear population to Washington State & Federal Parks. The recent grizzly bear attack and Calgary, Alberta Canada is an example of the dangers to people. Experienced hikers, who frequently hiked in the area, and had bear spray that proved ineffective. People cannot be safe and enjoy the outdoors with grizzlies living in park areas.

Correspondence ID: 1550Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Yakima, WA 98908
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,07 2023 18:36:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a Washington resident, I am not in favor of this proposed plan to reintroduce the grizzly bear into the North Cascades ecosystem for the following reasons.

- 1) Grizzly bears are already present in the northeast corner of Washington, and will continue to migrate into the state naturally. I would prefer that we allow them to do this on their timing.
 - 2) Grizzly bears are an apex predator. The north cascades see a LOT of recreation from Washington residents. Increasing the population here is a recipe for disaster - for people and bears.
 - 3) Due to the political climate of Washington, there is very little chance that management of this species will ever be turned over to the state and de-listed from the ESA. We cannot afford to have a substantial population with no tools to manage their population through hunting.
-

Correspondence ID: 1551Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,07 2023 18:43:08

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not support reintroduction of grizzlies to the North Cascades. If the habitat could support them they would already be there. There have been multiple attacks and fatalities on humans this year where grizzlies are present. With increased human population and increased human recreation in the North Cascades it is extremely irresponsible to even consider reintroduction. Human bear conflicts will happen! RCW 77.12.035 prohibits translocation/introduction of Grizzlies into Washington state. Please respect the laws of Washington State.

Correspondence ID: 1552Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98112
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,07 2023 18:49:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I want to express that I am in favor for bringing grizzly back to the North Cascades.

Grizzly are part of the ecosystem and can help keep other animals at adequate numbers. I do understand that many have concerns, but I think it is much like the wolves at Yellowstone. Each animal plays an important role.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 1553Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Renton, WA 98058
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,07 2023 19:14:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I personally do not support reintroducing grizzly bears back into Washington. As an avid hiker/camper, safety is my main concern. I am a supporter of animal conservation and maintaining habitats, but I think not having grizzlies in Washington is something that is appealing to avid outdoor people like myself.

Correspondence ID: 1554Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98133
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,07 2023 19:31:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: If there's enough room in the North Cascades to support Grizzly Bears, then they absolutely should be introduced. As long as there's room for at least a small population, and I believe there is, then it seems the best thing for both the ecosystem and the bears is to bring the bears back. Yes, Grizzlies are powerful, wild animals, but all of nature is wild, and grizzlies have a place.

Correspondence ID: 1555Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Othello, WA 99344
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,07 2023 19:37:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have severe concerns regarding the introduction of grizzly bears into the North Cascades. First, the bear is an apex predator, which means it has no natural enemies. The bears would be able to hunt and kill prey without any recourse, thus depleting the population of other species that normally thrive in the same area. One of the most important species in that part of the state is fish, particularly the trout and salmon that spawn in the rivers and streams of the North Cascades. Battles over the fish have already taken place, and just when the Native Americans and sportsmen have finally found balance, people want to introduce another challenge to the fish population..

Second, the North Cascades is an area that is very popular for recreation, with abundant hiking, camping, and water activities. Encounters with bears would be very dangerous for many people, but especially those with children. Reports already exist of bear attacks on campers and hikers. Introducing grizzly bears into the mix is simply inviting trouble.

Third, the residents of the area have already objected to the proposed introduction. Forging ahead without their approval fractures an already difficult relationship the people of the area have with state government.

Personally, I believe that if grizzly bears naturally migrate into the North Cascades, that would be preferable to a forced introduction. A natural migration would happen slowly over time and allow other people and animals to adapt to their presence. A smaller population of bears would allow fish and other prey to develop a natural environment that includes the bears, and the bears would be less of a threat to sportsmen, ranchers, and residents. Please consider alternatives to the current plan for introduction of grizzly bears. Thank you for your consideration.

Peace,


Correspondence ID: 1556Project:112008Document:132104

Address: ENTIAT, WA 98822-9728
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,07 2023 20:07:47
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am absolutely opposed to the reintroduction of grizzly bear in the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 1557Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Colbert, WA 99005
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,07 2023 20:24:15

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My family roots go back to 1870 in Washington State. In that time the population of many native species has been decimated.

I have visited and camped in wild lands that are contiguous with the North Cascades.

As a Washington resident I have legal standing in this State.

I am in support of the augmentation of the current estimates of 2 grizzly bears in this enormous forest of our state which is referred to as the North Cascades.

As the Salmo wilderness of northeast Washington also has a small population of Grizzly bears it is important that the North cascades have a stable population of grizzly bears so these populations can travel and exchange genetic variations for the health of the genetic variability of Grizzlies.

Again, my lifetime residency in Washington state insures my standing for the support of the augmentation of the current population of grizzlies in our beautiful state.

Keep Washington Green.

Correspondence ID: 1558Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Castle Rock, WA 98611
United States of America

Outside Organization: Sportsmen of Washington Recreational Groups(Official Rep.)

Received: Oct,07 2023 20:29:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a avid hunter I understand the risks that involve going into the back country. This last September I took 2 other men on a High buck hunt by the Washington Canadian boarder. I'm the 4 days we where out we seen multiple hikers and not a single one had a side arm or bear mace. Introducing grizzlies to the north cascade is going to cause deadly conflict. It's just a matter of time! As a hunter I know I may someday become the prey. But I'm not the only one using these wilderness areas. It's families, clubs, solo through hikers, and many more. Montana is a great example of the dangers of grizzlies being in the mountains.

Correspondence ID: 1559Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Langley, WA 98260
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,07 2023 20:39:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzlies should be back in their native habitat range if it's possible. The needs and welfare of the grizzly should be well considered prior to reintroduction - as you're aware they need wide open spaces and long roaming areas. There would need to be ample sources for food and water among other nourishment. Human interactions are always a possibility and that needs to be considered but not denied, wildlife should take precedence before humans in my view, they were here before us! I strongly recommend re-entry of the grizzly back to the cascades.

Correspondence ID: 1560Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Springfield, NH 03284
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,07 2023 20:45:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The North Cascades are a favorite for many outdoor enthusiasts. However, the presence of grizzly bears, as confirmed by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, is concerning. Introducing more bears could harm the mule deer population and increase risks for visitors. I'm against this proposal.

Correspondence ID: 1561Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Moses lake, WA 98837
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,07 2023 21:04:15

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: There are already enough Grizzly Bears here. We need less predators, not more. This is not something to spend money on that we do not have. Let's take care of our homeless situation, Veterans in need, corruption in DC, our South border situation and so much more before creating more expenses and problems.

Correspondence ID: 1562Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Everett, WA 98203
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,07 2023 21:20:15

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support reintroduction of Grizzly bears into the pacific northwest. They have long been an important part of the ecosystem and deserve a place back in it.

Correspondence ID: 1563Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Shoreline, WA 98155
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,07 2023 21:31:31

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Introducing grizzly bears into Washington state poses significant challenges and risks that should be carefully considered. Firstly, grizzly bears are apex predators and their presence could disrupt the existing ecosystem, impacting local wildlife populations. Secondly, human-bear conflicts may increase, leading to safety concerns for residents and visitors. Additionally, managing and monitoring these bears would require substantial resources, potentially diverting funding from other important conservation efforts. Therefore, I believe We should Not reintroduce grizzly bears to Washington state.

Correspondence ID: 1564Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Gold Bar, WA 98251
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,07 2023 22:24:41

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please don't bring more grizzly bears to Washington. There was just a couple and their dog killed by a grizzly bear in Canada. They had bear spray and had sent an SOS signal through a GPS, but that did not save them. Grizzly bears are too dangerous. People want to be able to enjoy the wilderness without constantly worrying about grizzly bear attacks. They make it unsafe to hike with dogs, which is super sad. My dogs want to be able to go on wilderness adventures but that only gets riskier with more grizzly bears. We don't want relocated bears in our state.

Correspondence ID: 1565Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Qualicum Beach, UN V9K 2L9
Canada

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,07 2023 23:46:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not support the re-introduction of grizzly bears into the North Cascades. This area has seen a massive uptick in people engaged in hiking and backpacking. The Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail has become so busy that permits to hike are now utilized.

I believe that if grizzlies were re-introduced that human / bear interactions would increase, and some of those would result in injury and/or death for recreationists.

Respectfully,
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 1566Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kirkland, WA 98034
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,08 2023

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a hiker who loves spending time in the N Cascades I am against the grizzly restoration plan. I hike with other women, none of us pack guns. The most recent grizzly deaths were this year in Banff and could have been prevented only with a gun. I have seen many bears hiking on the trail, some from afar and some too close for comfort but fortunately all were black bears who turned and left once we made eye contact, this would not be so with a grizzly!!! I honestly don't think I will feel safe enough to hike the N Cascades if grizzlies are reintroduced even though it is my all time favorite hiking grounds. Please do not move forward with this plan.

Correspondence ID: 1567Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Warren, ID 83671
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,08 2023 07:19:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Never reintroduce an apex predators to the highly used cascade range. You will cause direct loss of life and harm livelihood of ranchers and farmers.

Correspondence ID: 1568Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Coulee City, WA 99115
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,08 2023 08:01:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The introduction of grizzly bear to the North Cascades is not a better idea now than the last time it was floated a few years ago. Grizzlies are apex predators, and their introduction to the North Cascades will invariably result in a loss of human life, just as it did in Banff National Park a few days ago. Also a few days ago, a grizzly charged a hunter in northern Idaho, resulting in the death of the grizzly. And a grizzly was trapped and relocated in a separate incident after repeatedly breaking into a chicken coup in Northern Washington State. Humans and grizzly "coexist" only until the grizzly decides not to. To think otherwise is anti-human, not pro-bear.

Correspondence ID: 1569Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Emery, SD 57332
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,08 2023 08:04:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a country, we must be able to return our existing natural terrain back to what it was. The grizzly bear was slaughtered by humans. Now in northern Washington, humans must return them. Apex predators are vital piece of any ecosystem. Indigenous people coexisted with these animals. And in many areas we do now. The people of Washington are going to have to learn how. So let's reintroduce them.

Correspondence ID: 1570Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Saratoga Springs, UT 84045
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,08 2023 08:13:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am strongly opposed to reintroducing grizzly bears in Washington.

Correspondence ID: 1571Project:112008Document:132104
Address: port angeles, WA 98362
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,08 2023 08:51:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support restoration of grizzly bears in the north cascades ecosystem. This would assist in re-balancing that environmental system as grizzly bears were part of it in the past.

Correspondence ID: 1572Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Sedro Woolley, WA 98284
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,08 2023 09:15:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I strongly appose the re - induction of grizzly bears in the N. Cascades. As a 5th generation cattle farmer in east skagit county, this has the potential to be catastrophic for the community. As it stands now, there are far to many unmanaged Predators in East skagit count, and the surrounding foothills.

Correspondence ID: 1573Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Sedro wolley, WA 98284
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,08 2023 09:24:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: NO GRIZZLIES IN THE NORTH CASCADES. Wa state outlawed this in 1997 and using federal land to circumventing states laws and rights is a slippery slope that no group should support. WA state has to many predators, cougars, wolves, bobcats, coyotes, black bears etc, that are already diminishing the deer and wildlife population and creating conflict with farmers. Recently black bears have been killed because they are coming into local town and killing small farm animals and pets. Cougars are spotted near elementary schools and cause lockdowns. The predatory animals in WA are no longer able to be hunted enough to allow the fornpopulation vontrol, the black bear spring season has been canceled several s,pring seasons in a row. Introducing another species if predator to areas frequented by families campers and hikers is setting up the animals for interaction with humans that is unnecessary and cause threats to the humans who live in the areas. Bears WIL come into farms and seek out easy prey (humans in their habitat), as other predators are already doing as the urban sprawl of WA creeps into the wilderness.

We have growing reports of predators attacking farm animals, pets and even children on camping trips over the past several

yaers, adding another predator to the top of this food chaise will push these other predators farther into the urban areas as food resources dwindle.

Correspondence ID: 1574Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bend, OR 97701
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,08 2023 09:47:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am opposed to reintroduction of grizzly bears in the Cascades for safety reasons. As an avid outdoor person I do not want grizzly encounters to be a part of our camping experience. Their reintroduction is not necessary.

Correspondence ID: 1575Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,08 2023 09:57:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am not comfortable with this idea of reintroducing the Grizzlies to the North Cascades. The idea is quaint, going back to the past. In reality we have more people in the back country and more of civilization encroachment into the wilderness boundaries. People as a general rule are still poor at controlling waste and attracting black bears. I can only imagine what this looks like with grizzlies. The best behaved bear is only as good as the worst behaved human. I do a lot of wilderness activities. I've been very comfortable with Wolf reintroduction. The grizzlies I'm not comfortable with. If there is a greater good reason, I'm willing to hear it out and remeasure my consideration. Although, I will plan to learn gun safety and start to carry in the wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 1576Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Camas, WA 98607
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,08 2023 09:58:12

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am concerned about the impact this will have on hunters and hikers who like to use and enjoy this natural area. There was recently a fatal grizzly bear attack in Banff, Canada. However, I also understand that restoring habitats to a more natural state before humans impacted it is important for the health of these habitats. Please just carefully consider the impact this will have on humans.

Correspondence ID: 1577Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tacoma, WA 98402
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,08 2023 10:05:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Unless the bears are confined within a designated wilderness area with posted warning signs, the threat to humans remains high. Intentionally releasing an apex predator anywhere near population centers, grazing pastures, and salmon running rivers seems counterintuitive to other conservation measures already underway. The exception rule for killing a rogue bear may seem reasonable, but bears do what bears do and should not be killed for it. (Is it really possible for a wild animal to live by rules which they cannot comprehend?) Sane people do not eat wild bear meat due to roundworm infestations. I believe grizzly bears should continue to live where they are now, isolated and wild and the hunting of bears banned. I do not think they should be "reintroduced" anywhere they have not survived to date as it is clear their biggest enemy is people. If a wild bear attacks or kills a human, it will be because the human did not heed the danger while in the wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 1578Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Port Ludlow, WA 98365
United States of America

Outside Organization: NAR KCAR REALTOR Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,08 2023 10:18:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The comment is more aligned with the question of why do we need to bring back an apex predator to an area that can be managed by hunting and trapping? Grizzly bears are well known for wide ranging foraging along with invading residences, livestock and black bear cub kills. The grizzly predation on elk and deer calves is a majority of spring diet in other states as they awake from winter hibernation. Is the elk population so out of control in numbers that we need to populate these again? How easy would this decision be if they rambled through North Bend or Issaquah or Bellingham streets tearing up farms and livestock?

Correspondence ID: 1579Project:112008Document:132104

Address: BURBANK, WA 99323
United States of America

Outside Organization: Title Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,08 2023 10:31:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello, I just wanted to give my two cents here. Although we all enjoy watching bears and all kinds of wildlife, I think we need to have some places to take our families, ride our horses, raise our livestock and feel safe without having to worry about a grizzly bear attack. I realize this doesn't happen all the time, but it does happen. And I really don't want to have to worry, "will my bear spray work" and I definitely don't want to have to shoot one. I believe we have enough grizzly bears in and around the Yellowstone area and Glacier National Park and other areas where we can go to enjoy seeing the grizzlies there. I don't dislike grizzly bears at all, I actually really enjoy watching films or seeing them alive in their environment. I just feel that the grizzly bears have made a great comeback and we don't need to introduce them all over in the United States.

Thank You,


Correspondence ID: 1580Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Anacortes, WA 98221
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,08 2023 10:59:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: After much consideration, I feel adding grizzle bears to the North Cascades is not a good idea for the bears. I have hiked and backpacked for many years in the North Cascade Park and experienced run ins with black bears that normally shied from humans. Grizzle's reputation is they have a difficult time tolerating human interference in their area.

- * Who is going to protect the grizzlies from humans?? The National Park does not hire enough personnel to protect the bears that traditionally have a difficult time cohabitating with the ever increasing human population of day hikers and backpackers venturing into backcountry trails.
- * Most grizzlies lack common sense on how to handle an encounter with humans. To the grizzlies this is their turf and they can become angry and belligerent.
- * Is the park service going to protect the grizzle from people when it wanders into the adjacent national forest area in search of food?
- * Is the park service going to protect the grizzlies when more and more day hikers and backpackers carry side arms when hiking versus a can of bear spray?

Conclusion: the grizzle may have roamed the North Cascade area many years ago without humans around, but it doesn't make sense to subject them to a forced existence with humans that don't know how to react to them.

Correspondence ID: 1581Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Riverview, NY 12981
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,08 2023 11:01:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear USF&WS:

Yes, I would like to see Grizzly Bear's restored back into the Northern Cascades Region of Washington State and British Columbia.

Thank you for taking the time to read my email.

Correspondence ID: 1582Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98101
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,08 2023 11:13:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Recently two experienced and well-prepared hikers were mauled to death by a grizzly in an area where grizzly bears are known to inhabit. This type of consequence will now be more possible in the state of WA should this proposal go through.

Correspondence ID: 1583Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Eatonville, WA 98328
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,08 2023 11:20:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please help restore the PNW's ecosystems by reintroducing Ursus arctos to North Cascades NP.

Grizzly bears are a keystone species, they deserve free space and a return to their native habitats.

Correspondence ID: 1584Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Tacoma, WA 98409
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,08 2023 11:39:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No thank you. I moved here in 1997 because there weren't any Grizzly Bears. They will in turn kill livestock and all

The college kids including mine that like to hike those areas. Why are we forcing something? Leave them In Alaska, Montana, and Canada.

Correspondence ID: 1585Project:112008Document:132104
Address: East Wenatchee, WA 98802
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,08 2023 11:41:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Let the bears come back to the North Cascades on their own. Social tolerance will be better that way. Reintroducing bears is not necessary.

Correspondence ID: 1586Project:112008Document:132104
Address: chelan, WA 98816
United States of America
Outside Organization: human race Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,08 2023 12:00:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: one human life is worth 500 grizzly bears. It is too late for this re-introduction and there are simply too many users of the area with the very large and growing population in the Puget Sound area. To use the mortality of climbers, etc as a justification for this is inane.
Sincerely
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 1587Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Arcata, CA 95521
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,08 2023 12:23:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear. NPS

I support the re-introduction of grizzly bears into the north cascades ecosystem. It will benefit the overall function of the ecosystem there. A "trophic cascade" will benefit this area.

Regards

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 1588Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Denver, CO 80212
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,08 2023 12:58:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The proposed plan to address the current state of the grizzly bear population in the North Cascade mountains is vital to the improvements of the population. With only 60 individuals in the area, it is important that something be done (FWS, 2023). The proposed alternative A action plan is not a realistic solution to the dire state of the grizzly population in the region. While easy to do nothing, the population is only further hurt by the lack of action. The proposed preferred plan, alternative C, allows agencies the flexibility required to successfully protect and grow the grizzly population. As a hiker and camper, one of my major concerns is the potential interaction I may have with large predators like bears. While there are supplies available to discourage bear attacks, it is still a concern on my mind when I head out on a trail. Increased access to bear mace and information about bears in the area should be provided when entering the park or making

reservations. Increased trash removal from campsites may discourage human and bear interactions, as well as improve the quality of the campgrounds. If backpackers are making reservations, mace should be a requirement and could be sold at visitor centers.

Alternative C allows for the greatest amount of monitoring and human-bear interaction intervention, which is important when recreating. Bears are a vital part of the ecosystem and help manage other wildlife populations. Despite the threat they pose to people, the bear's presence is necessary in the park and intervention is strongly encouraged.

Correspondence ID: 1589Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Elma, WA 98541
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,08 2023 13:06:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I REALLY HOPE YOU DO NOT try to bring more, Grizzly bear into Washington State!! That is a VERY BAD CHOICE!!! WE also need to get rid of the DAMN WOLVES!!!!

Correspondence ID: 1590Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Vancouver, WA 98686
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,08 2023 13:09:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: What a stupid idea. Grizzlies (and wolves) were eradicated in Washington decades ago by our ancestors for a reason. If anyone is stupid enough to think thst reintroduced grizzlies won't leave the mountains and come looking for easy food sources like garabafe cans, domestic pets and livestock (and even humans to consume) are morons. I am completely against any new grizzlies introduced Washington.

Correspondence ID: 1591Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,08 2023 13:14:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I fully support reestablishment of the Grizzly bear to Washington. we need the ecological benefits of top predators and biodiversity.

Correspondence ID: 1592Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Poulsbo, WA 98370
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,08 2023 13:33:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of grizzly bears in the North Cascades. They were here before human settlers tried to trap, kill and remove then for their own economic gain. They are apex predators in the wilderness and deserve to continue to have their own habitat. The US government has supported the cattle ranching industry for the benefit of private citizens to the detriment of wildlife and the public for far too long. The National Park service and congress need to allow them to live naturally in their ancestral habitat and they need to educate the public on how to respect, understand and coexist with grizzly bears in the Wilderness. Grizzly bears terrify many people because they are large and powerful. We need to respect them and understand that the root cause of many bad interactions with them are often the result people's actions like diminishing their wild spaces, killing their natural prey, and getting between a mother bear and her cubs. The wilderness needs to be wild and we need to respect and protect it. People in our modern society have become too soft and expect that the

government should remove any hazards outside of their homes. There is a trend where people are not responsible for their actions and tend to blame others for their bad decisions. The mission of the National Park Service is to preserve unimpaired the natural and cultural resources and values of the national park system for the enjoyment, education, and inspiration of this and future generations. Allowing grizzly bears to roam their ancestral range in the North Cascades is a step in the right direction toward helping them exist for future generations.

Correspondence ID: 1593Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Puyallup, WA 98374
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,08 2023 13:46:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears in Washington is a bad idea. First of all the predators are already running rampant in our state. The black bears, cougars and now wolves are decimating elk and deer populations. Now you want to reintroduce an apex predator into an ecosystem that has no idea what grizzly bears even are. It is going to take not only the ungulates but also the black bears by complete surprise. If you look at Montana and Wyoming the grizzlies complete dominate whatever ecosystem they're in. On top of that the conflict that'll arise from people and bears will be unavoidable. Through hikers on the PCT will come into contact with an apex predator that exists nowhere else on the trail. Hunters will undoubtedly run into them as grizzlies have no fear of humans, as shown by at least one human being killed every year in Montana during hunting season. Also, knowing this state, there will be no management plan ever put into place even if grizzlies are delisted from federal protection. The deer, elk, and people will be at the whim of grizzlies, black bears, cougars, and wolves by the time this happens and the new bill to get rid of bear and cougar hunting goes through. There will be grizzlies on the landscape, "to make the wild feel more wild" but at what cost?

Correspondence ID: 1594Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98516
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,08 2023 13:50:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please don't release them into the cascades

Correspondence ID: 1595Project:112008Document:132104

Address: LACEY, WA 98503
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,08 2023 13:53:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Adding Grizzlies to the North Cascades Ecosystem will impact the Elk and deer population already being impacted by the climate and the wolf re-introduction. There will be more human to bear interaction. With most hikers unprepared on how to properly react to grizzlies there could be some dire encounters.

Correspondence ID: 1596Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olalla, WA 98359
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,08 2023 14:18:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not re-introduce grizzlies into the Cascades. It's dangerous enough as it is hiking. Currently, these animals will spread and will ultimately kill people. I say this, as in the past three weeks for different people have died in the continental US do the grizzly attacks.

Again, do not re-introduce these dangerous Apex animals

Correspondence ID: 1597Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Battle Ground, WA 98604
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,08 2023 14:23:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is not good for Washington state. We already have a very large apex predator populations. There is currently grizzlies in Washington state we don't need to transplant more here. Let alone the restrictions that will come with having them transplanted here.

Correspondence ID: 1598Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Maple Falls, WA 98266
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,08 2023 15:02:48

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Leave it as it is we do not need another apex predator this state can not properly manage the predator population it currently has no need to add grizzlies to the mix its a bad idea and everyone I know now feels the same way.

Correspondence ID: 1599Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Brian Alexander, WA 98022
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,08 2023 15:08:48

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: A family man/ hunter against the reintroduction of grizzlies in the northern cascades in Washington. The rural densities of home dwellings and recreational outdoorsmen and women will be directly impacted and put into danger, as well as the ungulate populations which are already mismanaged

Correspondence ID: 1600Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Everett, WA 98201
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,08 2023 15:40:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To whom this may concern,

I have read the EIS for the reintroduction of the Grizzly bear in the North Cascade Ecosystem and am concerned. I am concerned as an outdoorsman, backpacker and WA citizen. I am concerned that while the idea of reintroducing such a magnificent animal is admirable, the idea is lacking a realistic long term end-game and outcome. While, yes, the goals have been stated, the consequences of having an unregulated alpha predator in such a landscape have not fully been studied, discussed and realized.

As an outdoorsman, I actively hunt black bears and blacktailed deer in the northern cascades. I have spent countless nights camping and hiking the ridges and drainages of the Mt Baker wilderness and surrounding areas of the Cascades. I am "bear safe" with hanging my food, being careful about trying not to eat inside my tent. I typically carry a side-arm while bow hunting as an insurance policy but have yet to even come close to having to use it, thankfully. As an outdoorsman, I am an active participant in nature... I am no longer an observer and only there to "experience" nature. I am the alpha predator with my senses on high alert. My quarry is aware and on edge as a result of my historical presence and at the slightest chance of their demise, they leave with haste. What is to happen if an introduced grizzly bear, an

alpha predator, leaves the park, which they DEFINITELY will, and that animal has no sense of fear of humans? What if that alpha predator decides that they would like to now inhabit a new territory where hikers, hikers with dogs and backpackers who enjoy to camp without fear of being attacked, frequent? Any animal that is federally protected and has no fear of humans will certainly begin to create an unacceptable situation between itself and those that recreate in the shared territory.

As a backpacker, I live to see the incredible vistas of the high Cascades. The region is rugged, unforgiving and at times, dangerous. The absolute LAST thing a backpacker needs to worry about is becoming a member at the bottom of the food chain. A hungry Grizzly, without any fear of humans, due to its federal protections, will eventually attack a backpacker and the outcome will be grim. One argument I continually read is that "we need to let nature run its course;" True, while the Grizzly historically was a part of the North Cascades ecosystem, humans are now in much greater numbers, we seek out wild spaces to recreate and most importantly, we are a PART OF NATURE. We cannot blindly and romantically believe that having Grizzlies reintroduced into a highly frequented space will not cause major and potentially catastrophic consequences.

As a Washington state citizen I take issue with any federal protections of an alpha predator especially because historically, any transfer of management of said species to the states is almost always met with lawsuits from animal rights advocates, out of state I might add, and then injunctions which only prolong any management. The legal battles, as you are well aware, are costly, political in nature and most often they only delay a decision. Decisions need to be science based and made, not by politicians and judges, but rather, by educated, expert biologists whom understand the inner workings of not just the species in question but of how that species interacts with its environment and yes, the people in it.

To say that I am apposed to Grizzly reintroduction would be an understatement. Whether or not you take what I am writing into account is entirely up to you. I just could not sit by and "hope" that others will express their opinions and distaste for this potential decision. Thank you for taking the time to read this and I would like to hear back from you if at all possible.

Sincerely,

Correspondence ID: 1601Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Aberdeen, WA 98520
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,08 2023 16:24:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears should not be reintroduced to Washington. Washington has one of the highest human populations in the Wester United States and covers one of the smallest geographic areas. There is no room for grizzlies. Washington is not Alaska or Montana. Stop this liberal backed madness and nonsense.

Correspondence ID: 1602Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Coupeville, WA 98239
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,08 2023 16:59:55

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears were an essential part of the ecosystem of the North Cascades in the past.

My husband and I are avid hikers and have seen Black bears on the trails. We are not afraid of Grizzlies being relocated to the area.

It is about time that human beings make up for causing the extinction of many species of animals. Here is our chance!

Correspondence ID: 1603Project:112008Document:132104

Address: LEAVENWORTH, WA 98826
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,08 2023 17:36:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I realize the biology and reasons for reintroducing grizzlies into the wild are there, but they don't seem to be of enough significance to spend the time and money on it. The "no action" alternative is a better use of resources as it helps existing "management practices," which includes improved sanitation, motorized access management, outreach and educational programs and recreation enhancement for people. Reintroducing grizzlies is going to end up with problems we don't need. "No action" please.

Correspondence ID: 1604Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Puyallup, WA 98374
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,08 2023 17:41:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is a terrible idea. We are having more human/bear conflict right now and adding more grizzlies is begging for more deaths. I imagine that this will cost millions of dollars and will cost even more to eradicate each bear the attacks a human or livestock. I understand there were grizzlies in the cascades but there are more humans then ever in history and begs for human deaths in the hands of our government.

Correspondence ID: 1605Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Blaine, WA 98230
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,08 2023 17:48:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is a terrible idea. We all know bears don't stay in designated areas and we will have issues with human/bear interactions. It won't be safe for either bears or people who recreate nearby.

Correspondence ID: 1606Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kenmore, WA 98028
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,08 2023 18:23:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My wife, kids, and I hike in the North Cascades regularly. The threat of grizzlies would be overwhelming to deal with and I would hate to get pushed out of beautiful country in fear of my families safety. One single human life lost is not worth it. Please listen to the residents who will live beside these animals, and do not endanger our families. I beg you, we already have problems with black bear and cougar killing our pets, and I live 25 minutes from the city.. I don't want to be coerced out of an area my family and I love.

Correspondence ID: 1607Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America

Outside Organization: Whatcom County Snowmobile Club Recreational Groups

Received: Oct,08 2023 19:06:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I agree that the Grizzly bears could make a positive change to the ecosystem of the North Cascades, if the bears find their own way back to the area. In other words, I think it's fine if Grizzly bears NATURALLY migrate back into the ecosystem. It's inviting problems to artificially transport them back into the mountains. Humans have a bad track record messing with the natural balance that species create within ecosystems and grizzly bears have the ability to affect this delicate balance if we transport them in. Wolves brought back to British Columbia are a prime example of this. In summary, let the bears come back to the place that they once inhabited naturally, but let's not assume that we can do it artificially without messing up the balance. Oh, did anyone think of how a huge population of bears in the mountains might affect the safety of humans who enjoy hiking, camping, hunting, and recreating?

Correspondence ID: 1608Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98116
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,08 2023 19:06:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The death of a hiker west of Yellowstone National Park and the deaths of the couple camping near Lake Louise in Banff indicate that those bears were euthanized because of their behavior. Since their behavior cannot be controlled, I must say that because of the increased population moving north because of heat and need of water, the grizzly bears should not to be reintroduced into the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 1609Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sumner, WA 98390
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,08 2023 19:09:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am against the aggressive timeline if the reintroduction of grizzlies in the northern cascades.

Correspondence ID: 1610Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Maple Valley, WA 98038
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,08 2023 19:32:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As an avid outdoors person, i am on the trails biking, hiking, kayaking, orienteering, adventure racing and snow shoeing. I am not highly afraid of local wildlife though I have healthy respect for our resident black bears and cougars. I love seeing animals and respect their presence in our communities. I am not sure that reintroduction of Grizzlies in the North Cascades is the right move. Washington is full of people who are active and out trailheads, green spaces and recreation areas can't keep up. We will only have more people exploring the backcountry trails and campsites as well as housing that is encroaching on natural habitat. There will be many conflicts, some deadly if grizzlies are introduced into highly populated north cascades region. Banff has had 4 deadly bear attacks in the last decade. The north cascade range is even larger with a greater population density.

I am not in support of this reintroduction.

Correspondence ID: 1611Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Snohomish, WA 98290
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,08 2023 20:07:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This idea is absurd. Have you completely forgotten history & science?!! These bears cannot coexist with the amount of hikers, hunters, and people just enjoying nature in the northern cascades. They attack. Just look at the

latest attack in Banff and the history of attacks when they roamed the lower 48. Attacks were not rare. The blood and disfigurement will be on the NPS hands and unprovoked attacks will occur 100%. The population will creep into the central cascades they will follow the salmon and livestock. The current keystone predators are doing fine in the Northern Cascades. All I can hope for is someone to get this into litigation as fast as possible to impose an injunction and I will donate whatever I can to stop this because I will be stopping a future mauling that will absolutely happen if this proposal goes forward.

Correspondence ID: 1612Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Duvall, WA 98019
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,08 2023 20:25:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: People need to consider the fact that, over the past 3 decades, Washington lifestyle has adjusted to a "non-grizzly" environment. Reintroducing a new apex predator into what has become one of the country's "most outdoorsy" states could have disastrous consequences.

Correspondence ID: 1613Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Portland, OR 97215
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,08 2023 20:57:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am fully in support of re-introduction of grizzly bears into the North Cascades ecosystem. They are native to the area and only extirpated due to the hands of humans. As an avid outdoorsman and Northwest resident, I am excited at the prospect of having them return to their native area. They are special animals and knowing they live in the Northwest in place I recreate would make the experiences in these area more wild. They add value to the ecosystem and all our outdoor experiences.

Kindes regards,


Correspondence ID: 1614Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kirkland, WA 98011
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,08 2023 21:04:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a person who enjoys the outdoors and loves feeling safe during hikes, me and my husband strongly oppose the grizzly re-introduction to WA state.

Correspondence ID: 1615Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Burlington, WA 98233
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,08 2023 22:00:31

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am concerned about how grizzlies will impact our salmon population. Currently we are already facing devastating effects to our Orca population and behavior due to current salmon levels. Bringing in a new competitor that has not existed in this ecosystem in large numbers for almost 200 years to now eat up the salmon population before they make to our ocean could be devastating for our existing endangered animals that we love. On another note, no one in this area is educated on grizzlies or how to prevent conflict with them. No one in this area will be prepared for grizzlies coming for food in their cars, most don't know they are capable of ripping car doors off in such a pursuit. No one in this area is used to having

to secure their garbage. Most in this area are trained on how to deal with a cougar encounter, which unfortunately will likely be most people's automatic reactions to coming across a grizzly which is the exact OPPOSITE of what is needed and will endanger themselves more. People in this area are a little too used to taking their dogs off leash on the trails, as they have done this their whole life, and will not be prepared for their dogs running up to a grizzly. Everyone will start feeling the need to carry firearms whenever camping, or just living in the cities surrounding the Cascades. This increase of firearms being carried will likely lead to more gun related accidents. If the natives are sad that grizzlies are almost non existent here and they want grizzlies to coexist with humans then maybe they can start by putting them on their reservations in their backyards first. Not in the backyards for populations living in Sedro, Darrington, concrete, mount baker and more. Many of these communities have farm and pasture lands and are a large part of Skagit and whatcom county economies. When I hear the proposal of "experimental introduction" it feels like a way to tell the populations that do not want such experiments or grizzlies here to shut up and not complain because it gives the impression of temporary. So basically don't worry, it doesn't have to be forever. However, how likely is it that endangered species will be removed from this environment once introduced is very slim. We should not be forced to suddenly cohabitate with a species the general public knows nothing about and do not want. Also, children being able to go on camping and hiking trails with their families is one of the vital ways we teach future generations a love for nature. How much less comfortable the parents in this state will be to pursue such activities as a family and how much less funding our parks will receive to maintain such places.

Correspondence ID: 1616Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Port Angeles, WA 98363
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,08 2023 22:29:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I highly encourage the Park Service to reconsider the move to place Grizzly Bears in the North Cascades. While it seems like a good idea, much of the wildlife population is tenuous at the time, to say the least (for example Elk). Many of these species will be negatively affected. Grizzly/Brown Bear are apex predators. We can romanticize the days of past but it doesn't mean you'll have that end product!

Sincerely,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 1617Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Renton, WA 98058
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,09 2023

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not reintroduce grizzly bears in Washington State. This will 100% bring more deaths and disaster.

Correspondence ID: 1618Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tacoma, WA 98445
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,09 2023 01:27:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: They should absolutely be here in WA.

Correspondence ID: 1619Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bend, OR 97709
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,09 2023 03:45:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I spend alot of time in the north cascades. Heaven on earth. I believe reintroducing grizzled bears into the region is a bad idea. Around 40 years ago I first hiked the section of the pct from manning Park to stehekin. I try to do Steven's pass to high bridge yearly. My first trip 40 years ago in fall I encountered 5 people. 3 were hunters. Today if I hike this section I may encounter around 500 people.

I truly love nature and this is why I believe this is a terrible idea. The interaction with black bears keeps most of us on our toes alone. Grizzlies are the ultimate apex predator. Not only do you introduce a truly viable threat to humans back into what is a crowded quite small area but you add a level of stress to the local animal population that in my opinion is already struggling. Between climate change, human use and overall incriachment you will upend an already delicate situation. This is going to be a train wreck so to speak. Between bear attacks on humans to the impact on local wildlife this is not a fair ideal. The bears will begin to migrate to local communities creating public outcry with ranchers, black bear and deer populations will be future decimated and the ongoing political issue will be a massive financial drain.

I believe money would be better spent on supporting the local animal population , trail maintenance and overall public services to enhance people's u derstanding of the natural world without undo deadly encounters with grizzlies.

Please DO NOT DO THIS.

sincerely. [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 1620Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sultan, WA 98294
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,09 2023 07:38:48

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not reintroduce grizzlies in Washington. The amount of people that recreate in the north cascades is to high and people will get hurt or even worse the bears will kill people. Just look at the growing number grizzly encounters in Montana.

Correspondence ID: 1621Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Pasco, WA 99301
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,09 2023 07:49:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly oppose the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the cascades. They are already moving into the northern regions from Canada, they will have a negative impact on the already struggling ungulate populations, and they pose an extreme risk to those wishing to enjoy the outdoors in this state.

Correspondence ID: 1622Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Canton, OH 44708
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,09 2023 07:54:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: At what point do we prioritize nature? We are literally destroying the natural world we rely on for survival. Grizzly bears are the anchors of a healthy ecosystem. Humans need to learn how to live with these animals and all other animals if we are to ensure our own survival as a species. I am in full agreement with re-introducing these animals to Washington.

Correspondence ID: 1623Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kent, WA 98031
United States of America

Outside Organization: None Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,09 2023 08:03:19
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please. No. Deer populations in western Washington cascades continue to plummet due to many factors including wolves, habitat loss etc. Another introduction could be further crippling unless that's the end goal of the state and federal government. Why is there no thought on the ungulate populations? What's the obsession with predators? Yes they're beautiful but you cannot manage ungulates and not manage predators properly if you hope for "balance"

Correspondence ID: 1624Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Littleton, CO 80120
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,09 2023 08:05:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Natural Migration is Already Happening: Grizzly bears are already making their way into Washington. Just last week, a grizzly bear was captured and removed from Stevens County. If they're meant to be in Washington, they'll come on their own.

Safety Concerns for Recreational Users: Hikers, hunters, and outdoor enthusiasts already have to be cautious of black and grizzly bears. Introducing more grizzlies could lead to increased risks, as seen in states like Montana, Idaho, and Wyoming.

Strain on Wildlife Management: The WDFW Commission has not maximized recreational opportunities for sportsmen as directed in their mandate. With recent decisions on black bear and potential changes to mountain lion hunting, many conservationists fear the commission is failing to manage its wildlife properly. Introducing more grizzlies would exacerbate this issue. To be clear, reintroduction would not mean a grizzly bear hunting season. The point here is that the state is already under strain from mismanagement of its large population of existing predators beside grizzly bear.

Predator Balance is Essential: Washington is already home to a variety of predators including wolves, cougars, black bears, and coyotes. Washington's ungulate populations, such as elk, deer, moose, mountain goats, and the endangered woodland caribou, are under strain. Introducing more apex predators would further imbalance its delicate ecosystem. Again, much of this is a consequence of decisions made within the state to properly manage existing species.

Does Historical Presence Justify Reintroduction: While grizzlies once roamed areas like downtown San Francisco (before it was San Francisco), it doesn't mean they should be reintroduced there, or in Washington for example. There is a responsible way to do things. Is it responsible for humans to bring grizzly bear into Washington state when so much mismanagement of wildlife is taking place?

Correspondence ID: 1625Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98105
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,09 2023 08:15:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Highly supportive of returning grizzlies to North Cascades. As a hiker in the park, I am OK and will just take extra precautions.

Correspondence ID: 1626Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Renton, WA 98056
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,09 2023 08:36:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Under no circumstances should NPS be deliberately introducing grizzly bears into the North Cascades. They are a dangerous predator, and NPS should be directly held liable the first time a resident or hiker or hunter is killed by this foolish and unnecessary action. The couple in Banff that was killed by a grizzly bear despite doing all the "right things" and discharging a full can of bear spray to no effect shows that there's no way to ensure grizzlies can be reintroduced safely. NPS should follow the "no action" alternative and simply let nature decide where grizzly bears live and roam. Hopefully it will continue to be "not Washington state".

Correspondence ID: 1627Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Scottsdale, AZ 85254
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,09 2023 09:00:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Are you guys nuts ? This is the last thing we need . More bears.

Correspondence ID: 1628Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Monmouth, OR 97361
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,09 2023 09:01:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do not reintroduce Grizzlies into the Cascades. Grizzlies are thriving where they are currently and cause a lot of conflict. We certainly do not need to expand on that conflict and put more people in danger. Just please stop. This is the 3rd time we are telling you that it is a huge mistake. The Cascade range is not the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem and certainly nothing like Yellowstone Park (a very manipulated large Zoo).

Correspondence ID: 1629Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Valier, MT 59486
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,09 2023 09:11:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support grizzly bear reintroduction to the north cascades. I currently live with grizzlies and they really don't cause many issues. The problems bears cause are blown way out of proportion. Bear issues can be easily avoided with common sense precautions. I support this plan.

Correspondence ID: 1630Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,09 2023 09:23:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do not think they should be reintroduced in such a busy part of the country. With the kind of outdoors experienced folks that hike in this area there is bound to be disaster. Also as an experienced outdoorsman even I do not want to be around grizzlies. Refer to recent banff disaster for what is to come if this goes through.

Correspondence ID: 1631Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Athol, ID 83801
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,09 2023 09:45:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To whom it may concern,

This comment is AGAINST the North Olympic grizzly plan.

The claim of "If this part of our natural heritage is restored, it should be done in a way that ensures communities, property, and the animals can all coexist peacefully," Hugh Morrison, the regional FWS director, said in a statement on Sept. 28 is asinine because it proposes that the bears won't go wherever the hell they want. 'Peaceful coexistence' with a bear only happens when humans & bears are separated. Which is exactly the point - use the bears to crowd the people back out by regulations of 'free space'. This plan will also be used as precedent to repeat the process elsewhere in the Northern Rockies where i reside. Maybe you drop a few in Lake Tahoe for POTUS' next vacation?

No.

Not 'no', but Hell No ! The people of the area have spoken repeatedly - listen to your Employers, the Citizens who provide your paychecks. We're tired of your boss and his radical environmental tyranny. The bears are NOT endangered anymore & He doesn't have to deal with them at the beach or in his basement. Stop wasting our tax money infringing on our rights to live where we choose.

Correspondence ID: 1633Project:112008Document:132104

Address: cosmopolis, WA 98537
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,09 2023 09:50:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is a terrible idea. Bringing more grizzlies into this state is a hazard to everyone who exercises their right to use public land. Livestock will be put in jeopardy. Hikers lives will be at risk. Our ungulates don't need any more predators. Our black bear, cougar and wolf populations are unsustainably high. This is all around a bad idea.

Correspondence ID: 1634Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Omak, WA 98841-9396
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,09 2023 10:13:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As someone who frequently hikes, the thought of an increased grizzly bear population in the North Cascades is concerning. Observing the events in places like Montana and Idaho, it's clear that more bears can lead to more dangers. Grizzlies have every opportunity to migrate from BC or Idaho without human intervention. I urge you to let nature dictate its path.

The North Cascades have always been a haven for outdoor enthusiasts like me. It's come to my attention that grizzly bears already exist in this range, as noted by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. Introducing more would not only threaten the fragile mule deer population but also increase the risk for those of us who love the outdoors. I'm against any plans to reintroduce grizzlies in Washington.

Correspondence ID: 1635Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Vancouver, WA 98682
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,09 2023 10:38:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As someone who frequently hikes and hunts with family and small children the thought of an increased grizzly bear population in the North Cascades is concerning. Observing the events in places like Montana and Idaho, it's clear that more bears can lead to more dangers. Grizzlies have every opportunity to migrate from BC or Idaho without human intervention. I urge you to let nature dictate its path.

It's already known that grizzly bears exist in this North Cascade range, as noted by the Washington Department of Fish and

Wildlife. Introducing more would not only threaten the fragile mule deer and elk population but also increase the risk for those of us who love the outdoors. I'm against any plans to reintroduce grizzlies in Washington.

Correspondence ID: 1636Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spokane, WA 99208
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,09 2023 10:53:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The reintroduction of grizzly bears to the Cascades should not move forward. If they naturally return to this area that should be allowed as they are currently expanding their range (I.e. young grizzly relocated from Stevens County, WA).

Correspondence ID: 1637Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,09 2023 11:17:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a local resident to the North Cascades who will be directly impacted by the introduction of Grizzly Bears, I am highly opposed to the Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan. My family, friends, and community recreate daily in this region and I have not spoken with a single person who wants Grizzlies to be introduced into our backyard.

Correspondence ID: 1638Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Omak, WA 98841-9396
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,09 2023 11:19:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I felt compelled to voice my concerns about the potential reintroduction of grizzly bears in Washington. It's undeniable that grizzlies are already making their way into the state from neighboring regions. The absence of physical barriers means they can migrate naturally. Given the state's challenges in managing its existing wildlife, introducing another apex predator seems counterproductive. The recent incident in Stevens County, where a grizzly bear was captured, is a testament to the growing predator challenges in Washington. Our state is already grappling with managing wolves, cougars, black bears, and more. Considering the strain on our ungulate populations, I cannot support the idea of reintroducing grizzlies into the state.

Correspondence ID: 1639Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Edgewood, WA 98372
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,09 2023 11:57:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am currently in favor of Alternative A, as this is described as the only alternative which provides for full participation of WDFW. I believe we ought to focus on habitat and increased connectivity overall, not on how to transplant specific animals to and from specific places based off of different political or social opinions at a given time.

Additionally, I thank all involved for their work on this project, and others.

Respectfully,

██████

Correspondence ID: 1640Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,09 2023 12:10:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: This is a bad idea and I am against it. You are going to get a hiker killed.

Correspondence ID: 1641Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98227
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,09 2023 12:11:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Greetings,

I am in support of having a healthy population of grizzly bears in the north cascade ecosystem. Having backpacked in Alaska with grizzly bears present one has to respect there space and be bear smart to avoid problems of interaction.

To have a healthy ecosystem in the North Cascades we need apex predators such as the grizzly.

Regards

██████████

Correspondence ID: 1642Project:112008Document:132104
Address: OMAK, WA 98841
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,09 2023 12:27:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I want to register my disapproval with plans to reintroduce Grizzly bears in the North Cascades. I live in the forested foothills of the North Cascades outside of Tonasket Washington. I chose to live here because I enjoy the outdoors, especially the frequent encounters with deer, black bear, turkey, grouse and other wildlife. Unfortunately, wolves have recently moved into the area, and while I haven't encountered them, it is a bit unsettling to know they are there, especially when my grandchildren visit. Grizzly bears would be a dramatic escalation in our safety concerns.

While the downside to Grizzly reintroduction is obvious to those at risk, the primary advantage is to be soothe the sensibilities of urban populations that will not be exposed to the dangers that are created. The species is no longer at risk given the robust population that has recovered and spread from Montana through Idaho and into eastern Washington. The population in Canada is also robust, and if additional habitat was needed, Grizzlies could easily migrate south into the North Cascades. Why not let nature take its course rather than force an artificial introduction. While unsettling, at least the arrival of wolves near my home was natural.

With no benefit to the species, it appears that the objective of Grizzly reintroduction is to terrorize rural residents. Until Grizzly populations are restored in Olympia and Sacramento and wolves in and around Washington DC, why don't you just leave us alone.

Correspondence ID: 1643Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Washougal, WA 98671
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,09 2023 12:41:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Yes, restoration is how we turn around the destruction caused over the last 100-200 years. Reduce, restore, relearn how to live with what we have.

Correspondence ID: 1644Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,09 2023 12:46:47
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do not support this plan. In our area there are already many predators including black bears and cougars. However, introducing much more aggressive grizzly bears into the area does not seem like a wise decision. It would only be a matter of time before someone's life is affected by a grizzly bear attack.

Thank you for your consideration.

■

Correspondence ID: 1645Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Malaga, WA 98828
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,09 2023 12:54:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: No, No, & No. Trying to force a predator into an area that is used by people for hiking, hunting, back packing, horseback riding, cattle range, agriculture is not a good predator to re-introduce. I am pretty sure there are few that range into the most northern area on their own & haven't caused much commotion with people or agricultural areas or ranchers with grazing. As far as federal, tribal or state agencies keeping them in check, I don't have alot of faith. I have seen how tribal treat the elk herds in Colockum area... NO Respect for the animal or safe zones put in place for the elk; wasted meat, shooting for antlers only & driving motor vehicles on closed land. Tribal Enforcemnet doesn't do anything. Our State Game dept's hands are apparently tied since nothing is done about it due to the bureaucratic crap in Olympia. I am pretty sure if people want to see Grizzly bears up close they go to parks like Yellow Stone or Glacier Park in Montana where they are set up for grizzly populations. The way I see it it's just one more step in limiting or reducing all together hunting for families who want to provide food for themselves as well as educate their children about the outdoors and how to take care of it for future generations. This is 2023 not 9000 + years ago, too many people are out in those areas enjoying the wilderness without threat of a bear possibly attacking them, ranchers being able know their cattle are safe, farmers with crops not having damage, or deer/elk/fish being reduced due to predation of some grizzly bear. Just a thought maybe Mother Nature takes care of what should be balanced in our ecosystem... seems like every time government gets involved in anything, things go south in a heartbeat.
Thanks for reading my comment.

Correspondence ID: 1646Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Arlington, WA 98223
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,09 2023 12:58:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Good morning. my request is that you please do not reintroduce grizzly bear into the Washington state cascade mountains. introduction of grizzly into the cascades will remove my ability to enjoy our national park lands. I am an avid (leave no trace) hiker and I am heartbroken at the idea of losing access due to my own government putting my safety at

risk in this manner. if this occurs, i will not vote for Biden this time and will actively campaign for the republicans no matter how wack they are.

thank you.

Correspondence ID: 1647Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Vancouver, WA 98661
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,09 2023 13:03:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I can't comprehend the need to bring a top level predators back into areas where they've been gone for quite a while. Montana with a very large state and few people regularly has human and grizzly interactions that generally don't go well for human(s) and later that animal. So now you're wanting to bring grizzlies to a small state with a huge human population. The people that make these decisions should be the ones who have to tell family members and loved ones that they're family member has been mauled to death or severely maimed for life because the notifier's wanted grizzlies reintroduced. These people shouldn't be allowed to hide behind others to make these horrific notifications. They should be the ones who carry the burden of that decision to reintroduce and carry the weight of notifying family members of an attack or mauling. It's not a matter of if it will happen, just how often will it happen with the amount of people in Washington.

Correspondence ID: 1648Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Florence, OR 97439
United States of America

Outside Organization: Self Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,09 2023 13:19:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am a member of various camping groups in the north west. It seems humans with their managed hunting certificates are keeping the herds of elk,deer, mtn lions, and smaller game down, so why re-introduce a potentially deadly bear to humans? So only those people with really big weapons will be camping in the cascades?

It sounds irresponsible. If your department has overage of cash, please share some with hungry families.

I,ve seen overly educated people looking for things to do, but really?

Sorry if i hurt feelings, i was a single mom, praying some days my son wouldnt ask for different food. They give hungry kids at schools spaghettos and raviolis yuck. Have you tasted those?

Now let us show them some beautiful nature that you want to pollute with more deadly animals. Please check your priorities.

Sad in the northwest. [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 1649Project:112008Document:132104

Address: colville, WA 99114
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,09 2023 13:20:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I don't believe the re introduction of grizzly bears into our region is the wisest decision. We have already noticed a rapid decline in wildlife numbers dropping since the re introduction of wolves, and the rising number in cougars. We as ranchers love wildlife , nature and our ways to help create a healthy thriving eco system. You can not keep reintroducing predators into those ecosystems that have not even been able to adapt to protect themselves. Growing up we use to see moose , elk , deer , rabbit, grouse even black bears . We hardly if at all get to see any of that anymore. I don't want my kids growing

up only being able to see these in picture books.

I don't think the predator population has been managed at all. They are over taking everything. Why are we repeating history ? Our ancestors obviously knew they was a good reason they had to stay at limited numbers . We will all suffer from this, and already are.

I hope a lot of thought and wisdom goes into how this is really going to impact not just humanity but even the animals .

Correspondence ID: 1650Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Graham, WA 98338
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,09 2023 13:29:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Do not reintroduce grizzly bears into the cascade mountains. Conflicts are a common news headline. reintroduction will eventually get someone likked. There are plenty of grizzly bears in North America. they are not in danger of extinction and do not need to be reintroduced.

Correspondence ID: 1651Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Massapequa, NY 11762
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,09 2023 13:37:01

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My children are avid hikers who live in Seattle and frequently hike in Cascades National Park and I travel out west yearly to hike with them I understand the desire to change an environment back to its original state. However, with human population increasing in visiting national parks and such, the chance of encountering a grizzly bear increases. Which is extremely deadly. And for what benefit? An encounter with a black or brown bear may be resolved with bear spray- an encounter with a grizzly would require a gun. I believe grizzly bears should not be reintroduced in the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 1652Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98144
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,09 2023 13:56:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello,

I am in strong support for restoring and reintroducing grizzly Bears into the north cascades. This apex predator is a valuable and irreplaceable part of the ecological and cultural landscape.

Thank you,
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 1653Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Port Angeles, WA 98362
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,09 2023 13:56:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a frequent user of most of North Cascades outdoor trails and recreation area, my wife and I plead you to use Alternative A in your posted plan that we have read throughly. While we do not want to see the Grizzly Bear to become extinct, we believe that it will be counter productive to their overall survival to place them in a new location such as the proposed are in the North Cascades.

It will definitely cause us and those we know to not visit the park's areas where the bears will be released. Adverse encounters with Grizzly Bears are too widely publicized on the internet and news often creating hostility to their overall conservation. US populations unfortunately, do not support the reintroduction of all species that are possible in Canada, Yukon and Alaska.

Black bear populations are healthy and they represent the apex predator of biodiversity that our northwest parks thrive on. Black bears are less likely to have adverse incidents with park users.

Any other than Alternative A will divide our communities, increase public safety costs, and because adverse Grizzly interactions are rare, will eventually result in the death of people. As what was seen in the recent interaction in Canada, when the bear has less than the required fat level in the fall, you can do everything according to conventional wisdom and the bear still has to be killed, after significant loss of life.

Who will ultimately responsible for the first person's death as a result of this release?

Respectfully, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 1654Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lake Stevens, WA 98258
United States of America

Outside Organization: n/a Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,09 2023 14:14:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The North Cascades ecosystem is already under strain from mismanagement of large populations of existing predators besides the grizzly bear. Re-introducing grizzly bears would further strain the ecosystem, especially in regards to ungulates. Equally important, hikers, hunters, and the like are already watching their back for grizzly and black bears (myself included), and if safety is a priority, we do not need to more of them on the landscape. After all, they will reproduce on their own. If they belong here, they will come here on their own. Please do not reintroduce these dangerous predators to the landscape.

Correspondence ID: 1655Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tillamook, OR 97242
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,09 2023 14:38:12

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Prehistorically there were grizzlies in Washington state's North Cascades. Historically they were eliminated by increasing human populations in the region. Proponents of reintroducing the bears into this region tout the ecological benefits, without specifying them.

This proposal smacks of a nostalgia for having things the way "it used to be."

The only obvious ecological change is a reduction in the population of black bears. It is obvious that grizzlies are dangerous to the present human population, domestic animals and humans who recreate in the area. It is well documented that the present areas of extant grizzly populations are sufficient for maintaining a healthy population of grizzly bears.

That leaves the only reason for reintroduction of grizzlies into the North Cascades is that that's the way it used to be.

This same logic can used to deprive women the right to vote. We could say that white egrets should be exterminated in the Pacific NW because they didn't use to be there. Environmental management is good when it is helpful. Environmental nostalgia is environmental nonsense.

Correspondence ID: 1656Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Chehalis, WA 98532
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,09 2023 15:13:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly oppose reintroduction of grizzly bears in the cascades. Grizzly bears will kill people!! As an avid hiker and hunter I do not want Grizzly bears in the cascades!! They present a danger to anyone in the woods. There are to many people in Washington, we will have more deadly bear encounters than idaho, Wyoming, and Montana put together.

Correspondence ID: 1657Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Moscow, ID 83843
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,09 2023 16:20:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am a large mammal, landscape-level biologist who supports the restoration of grizzly bears to the transboundary North Cascades Ecosystem. I am well versed in the deep backcountry of the North Cascades on Forest & Park Service lands. The region is prime grizzly bear-supporting habitat. My observations over the years sure seem to indicate that black bears are currently functioning as foraging surrogates to grizzly bears. Productive huckleberry patches cloaked by black bears in the North Cascades would be disproportionately used by grizzly bears without the human caused displacement & mortality of grizzlies that the ecosystem has experienced. The Pacific Northwest is dominated by Public Lands, entitled equally to all Americans, so I hope you will make a decision based on collective input from across the nation, while also acknowledging the needs of local residents and their livelihoods. A restored grizzly bear population will benefit the region, Canada included. To be most effective, strong coordination among US and Canadian agencies is needed. A strategy that jump starts the population in Washington's North Cascades, with landscape mitigation measures implemented across major transportation corridors, including Highway 3, is needed. I support relocating 25 bears to the area north of Highway 2 in 2-4 different release areas. Doing this should 'jump start' the population's heartbeat within a decade after releases are completed. Then, let the grizzlies distribute themselves across the rest of the ecosystem. Time is of the essence to implement this strategy, given the trajectory of human population growth along the I-5 corridor. Inaction on this matter at the federal level has occurred for far too long. Thank you for your consideration.

Correspondence ID: 1658Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Everett, WA 98208
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,09 2023 16:21:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Returning bears to the North Cascades is a crucial step toward recovering them under the Endangered Species Act. Moreover, grizzlies are the ideal ambassador for the whole-ecosystem, large-landscape connectivity and restoration we need to protect biodiversity in an era of runaway climate change.

Correspondence ID: 1659Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Prosser, WA 99350
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,09 2023 17:02:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am against the introduction of grizzly bears into Washington state.

The negative impacts far outweigh the benefits to wildlife, livestock and public safety. It is not hard to find news reports of grizzly attacks as well as the need of fenced camping spots to be safe in the back country. The wolves are already having a massive effect on wildlife and livestock, none of it good! So please don't compound the damage with grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 1660Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Eastsound, WA 98245
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,09 2023 17:08:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Good luck with the effort! You have my approval. The bears should be there.

Correspondence ID: 1661Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98102
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,09 2023 17:25:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do not think it wise to reintroduce grizzlies into the North Cascades. This state has become increasingly popular for hiking, drawing a lot of less experienced/novice/downright stupid people who will inadvertently get themselves killed. This will cause a drain on resources and perhaps even misplaced fear of the wilderness. The cascades are thriving, save the forest fires, and do not need another apex predator introduced.

Correspondence ID: 1662Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Buckley, WA 98321
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,09 2023 17:31:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: This is the stupidest decision! We all know how introducing the wolves went! Common....this is pure insanity and dangerous! you can't even control the cougar problem we have because it's being poorly handled and too many hunting restrictions. Get it together!

Correspondence ID: 1663Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,09 2023 17:35:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a born and raised Montanan living in the Methow Valley, I do not think grizzly bears should be reintroduced to the North Cascades. I have seen firsthand the interactions between humans and grizzlies, and it is typically not peaceful.
The Methow Valley is rapidly increasing in population, and more Seattlites are making their way into the Cascades for recreation. If you drive on Highway 20, you'll see miles of parked cars outside of trailheads, the length seemingly increasing with each year - even at the "secret" spots. Many of these cars bring city-dwellers with little to no knowledge of wildlife and often no idea what to do if they come across one of the grizzlies being reintroduced. I think throwing bears into the increasingly popular North Cascades is a recipe for disaster for both human and bear.
The government agencies in the area are woefully understaffed as it is: there is often no one to help if a resident spots a black bear in their chicken coop. What happens when that's a grizzly threatening their property or livestock? The local agencies are not prepared to step up in those situations.
Safety is a huge concern that I believe the Parks Service is brushing off. Being able to recreate alone is a luxury rarely afforded to those living so close to nature, and it breaks my heart to think that soon we may lose that privilege. As the owner of a fruit tree and berry bush loaded property adjacent to public forest, I worry about the safety of my young family in my own backyard when the grizzlies inevitably make their way down from the Cascades into the Methow Valley.
While this discussion is taking place, the Department of Fish and Wildlife is planning on closing a majority of their public land in the Methow Valley due to the decline in mule deer population... I can't help but wonder what the reintroduction of a

major predator will do to their numbers. It's odd to me that these conversations are happening simultaneously. Living in the mountains means coexisting with wildlife - this is just a fact of life that I have been familiar with my entire life. However, adding a predator to an increasingly populated area with an already-strained prey population is a recipe for disaster. I do not think the Parks Service should go forward with the reintroduction of grizzly bears in the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 1664Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Arlington, WA 98223
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,09 2023 18:10:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Read more: <https://www.ammoland.com/2023/10/two-fatalities-in-attack-with-bear-spray-used/#ixzz8FgruIMie>
Under Creative Commons License: Attribution
Follow us: @Ammoland on Twitter | Ammoland on Facebook

Early reports are two dedicated hikers and campers, Doug Inglis and Jenny Gusse, his wife, and their dog, have been killed by a grizzly bear in a remote part of Banff National Park in Canada. At least one empty can of bear spray was found at the scene. From Calgary Herald.com:

Just three of the many reasons not to introduce another apex predator into a region with high human population. Don't need them, don't want them. This is a solution to a non existing problem.

Correspondence ID: 1665Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Johnstown, PA 15906
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,09 2023 18:27:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As one who teaches a university senior seminar on wolves, whales, bears, and pumas, news of the reintroduction of grizzlies to the Northern Cascades is a rare spot of good news!
My students in central Pennsylvania are passionate about defending reintroduction efforts.
We applaud this 30 year effort and hope that it will help pioneer grizzlies to bridge gaps between islanded populations, ensuring their survival in the lower United States and working toward the Y2Y initiative.

Thank you to all those who are striving to share our world with wild grizzlies!

██████████
██████████████████
██████████████████████
██████████

Correspondence ID: 1666Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Post Falls, ID 83854
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,09 2023 18:30:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I work as a full time forester in northeast Washington State. I have spent more than 24 years in my occupation and understand these issues very clearly. I began my career in Oregon's Cascade Range. My current area covers all of Ferry County, Pend Oreille County, Stevens County and Spokane County. The idea of reintroducing grizzly bears into northern Washington or anywhere else for that matter, is ABSOLUTELY ABSURD. Just because they once existed here

doesn't mean we can forget about the past 150 years of human expansion into these areas creating recreational opportunities, family outings, natural resource utilization, and peacefully enjoying outdoor experiences.

First of all, our youth and young families will suffer. Psychologists have determined that our youth are plagued with a crisis of not connecting with nature due to exposure to excessive screen time instead of healthy outdoor experiences. This has grown to be such a problem with our youth that the USFS has launched an aggressive "Get Outside" (sic) program to detach our youth from their couches and experience nature. Introducing grizzly bears is only going to chill this important effort. Any apprehensions our vulnerable youth felt about experiencing the outdoors before, will only now be a solid reason for them to stay attached to the security of their screens at home. This would result in a negative result and undermine efforts in expanding any outdoor youth experiences.

Not only are our local youth outdoor at risk, but the lack of forethought concerning ecological function is on display with this decision. Like with prescribed fire, we cannot just light a fire in July at one end and then see what happens in the fall just because we have romantic notions that the land was once a fire dependent ecosystem. This is the same philosophy being applied with grizzly bears. These animals don't confine themselves into a nicely fitted box that radical extreme environmentalists and arrogant managers presume these dangerous apex predators will remain inside of. This concept may work well in greater Yellowstone ecosystem and in Alaska's remote tundra regions, far removed from human populations, but in Chelan County? Are you kidding me? This idea is absurd and needs to be scuttled immediately. Instead, managers should seek to explore opportunities to expand other truly at risk species that are NOT apex predators such as the northern spotted owl by breeding and introducing spotted owls into areas to expand and monitor THEIR numbers.

Next, introducing grizzly bears into fire dependent ecosystems will only delay and interfere the important work for forest restoration. Where grizzlies are sighted, natural resource personnel will be deterred from entering these areas for their own safety. Even with an aggressive bear deterrent effort, this whole concept will only complicate the far greater ecological work that is needed to reduce the risk of catastrophic fire on the landscape. Complicating this important forest restoration effort is the last thing our at risk forests and communities need.

Thank you for considering these comments. Please do not just disregard them with a predecisional mindset that this comment period is simply just a box to check formality.

Correspondence ID: 1667Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,09 2023 18:40:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We thought this issue was settled a couple years ago.

What is the reasoning behind this proposal? The Native American population was so small when the European settlers came into this region and killed the bears. There are SO many more people here now!

Do you know how many people have been killed this summer by grizzlies? Several! The bear was killed. Look it up. How many maulings in the last couple summers? And we have way more hikers and campers I would think. Look at the Yellowstone area, Montana, Wyoming. And these areas are much less populated than the North Cascades. We draw from Seattle and other big cities!

Ask the folks who help run the Pacific Crest Trail. They have a lot of hikers each year. Many of them are young people. Having grizzlies in the park will not be a welcome piece of news for them.

Put them in parks or places where the people want them. We do not. We have enough bears already. We also have cougars, deer, and Big Horn sheep that are all doing very well in our area. Let the hunters and winter do the culling.

Please reconsider. With our population we cannot go back in time to make areas the way they used to be. We are expected to have at least 100,000 people move into Washington state in the next 10 years.

Thank you,

In fact what is the point? There are no diseases affecting our deer population.

Correspondence ID: 1668Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,09 2023 18:44:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This plan seems completely unnecessary. While grizzly populations have been threatened in the past, reintroducing them would cause considerable distress to the citizens of Washington state. I feel so comfortable hiking anywhere in Mt Baker and Mt Rainier knowing I won't get attacked by a grizzly. To reintroduce them at the expense of the safety of the human population in Washington state demonstrates blatant and utter disdain for the well-being of humans in the North Cascades area.

I vehemently oppose this initiative.

Correspondence ID: 1669Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Richland, WA 99352
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,09 2023 19:38:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am most definitely against the Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan!! These predators pose a significant and dangerous risk to those who enjoy the unsurpassed beauty of the Pacific Northwest, as hikers, campers, and enjoyers of nature. There are numerous examples of the danger posed to the public by these animals. We do not need or want to bring that risk to an area so enjoyed by families and individuals. Think of the potential dangers rather than enacting such an ill-advised plan. PLEASE!!

Correspondence ID: 1670Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Dayton, WA 99328
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,09 2023 19:41:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am a retired fish and wildlife biologist so I understand the biological and ecological reasoning to want have grizzly bears in the cascades in WA. However, I think the proposal to introduce grizzly bears into the cascades lacks common sense.

The proposal to bring bears into the state is completely different and has different societal implications than managing them when they come in on their own. If bears come into northcentral WA on their own, then according to state law they would be managed for conservation of the species in WA. Transferring bears into WA does not make sense and would cost the citizens of this state large sums of money for years to come. WA is the smallest western state with the second largest human population in the west. The federal lands in the cascades are relatively close to the high human population areas near Puget Sound and southwest WA, and these bears would not likely remain solely on federal or other public lands. This situation in WA is not like in Montana or Wyoming where large states have relatively small human populations, and NO major large

cities exist anywhere near the primary grizzly areas on federal lands.

Please learn from what happened with wolves in WA. If you consider the huge amount of conflict, lawsuits, and hard feelings created by the natural entry of wolves into WA and what that has cost the citizens of WA and the WA Dept of Fish and Wildlife in terms of many hours of work, meetings, planning, and trying to work with parties with conflicting interests, plus very large expenditures of funds, the management of wolves is likely relatively minor compared to having to deal with introduced grizzly bears, especially off federal lands. Dealing with both wolves and grizzly bears very likely would substantially reduce the WDFW personnel and state funding available to conserve other species in peril in WA (and there are many!). This proposal for introducing bears has tunnel vision when considering trying to save biodiversity and native species in peril in this state. PLEASE reconsider your preferred option so that you would not reintroduce grizzly bears, but you would develop a plan to conserve and manage these bears if, or when, they arrive in the cascades on their own. I hope that you will do the right thing and not introduce these bears in WA.

Correspondence ID: 1671Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98273
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,09 2023 20:32:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I would love grizzly bears in our mountains. Big, beautiful and majestic animals! Yes they are an intimidating animal but left alone in there own territory and space everything should be peaceful right?

Correspondence ID: 1672Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Buckley, WA 98321
United States of America

Outside Organization: Cascade mountain outfitters Business

Received: Oct,09 2023 21:01:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hi there,

Please take the time to read through my suggestion.

I strongly disagree to the grizzly bear restoration plan. Let's try to think of what really comes out of this plan. Hunters and conservationists will be extremely impacted, us hunters are already struggling with predators. With grizzly bears introduced I fail to see the positive outcome. These are amazing animals but un needed in the north cascades. It's an improper use of our money and does not Benefit anyone.

Thanks for your time.

Correspondence ID: 1673Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Red House, WV 25168
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,09 2023 21:19:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think "introducing" grizzly bears in an already unmanaged bear state is a very poor choice. There are already so many issues with other bears and grizzlies are starting to migrate into WA on their own. I think the introduction of dangerous animals in a heavily human populated state is against better judgement. Let's focus on the things that matter rather than spending funds just for the sake of spending them.

Correspondence ID: 1674Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,09 2023 21:33:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: RE: Ecosystem Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan

Leavenworth, Washington, a bustling tourist town with vast areas utilized for recreation around the city. This area has already been dealing with increasing interactions between people and wild animals year after year. Black bears migrate through our area regularly and have learned how to feed in suburban areas by raiding garbage cans. There are also massive pear and apple orchards in this area that entice all sorts of wild animals, including bears, coyotes, cougars, bobcats, and, of course, deer. Once or twice a year a person is injured by a chance encounter with a wild animal. Sometimes a pet is injured or killed.

The people who live in this area and most who visit here love the wildlife in this area and respect this as the animals' place to live, too. However, it is a delicate balance. Allowing grizzlies to roam as close to the city of Leavenworth as is shown on the map in the Ecosystem Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan does not seem like wise planning to me. To the north of the city of Leavenworth is a year round playground in the Ski Hill area. In the summertime, hikers and bikers abound. A chance encounter with a grizzly could be deadly for any unsuspecting person or group of people. Tourists often go into recreational areas often go in unprepared for a day hike nevertheless a possible encounter with a black bear or, now, possibly, a grizzly bear; cougar, bobcat, etc. These animals deserve a wide berth and so do the people in the area. The Enchantments entrance used to be a little busy on the weekends. It is now overcrowded most of the summer with cars parked way down the road from the entrance. Grizzlies in this area might be just new and even more dangerous accident waiting to happen. Yes, grizzlies did exist here in the past. The difference now is nothing is the same as it used to be. Humans have entered the area in droves.

I suggest moving the area further north of Leavenworth, Plain and the Lake Wenatchee area to mitigate possible encounters.

Thank you,

██████████
██████████

Correspondence ID: 1675Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Tacoma, WA 98408
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,09 2023 21:43:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I agree with the plan to restore grizzly bears to the North Cascades. The area is very remote and would be the best location to reintroduce this keystone species.

Correspondence ID: 1676Project:112008Document:132104
Address: BELLEVUE, WA 98006
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,09 2023 21:54:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I believe alternative C is the best option. Though there are concerns about the grizzlies impacting the safety of locals and visitors in the NCE - which would be one of the biggest concerns for many, grizzly bears have been living in canadian rockies and other human populated areas such in many towns in Alaska with very few incidents if any. Bringing them back will restore the historical cultural landscapes of the NCE and hopefully bring them back their population from being threatened to stable.

Correspondence ID: 1677Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,09 2023 21:56:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I fully support the reintroduction of Grizzly Bears into the North Cascades. The North Cascades is one of North America's premier intact ecosystems, but it is incomplete without grizzly bears. I really hope this can happen.

Thank You

Correspondence ID: 1678Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98105
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,09 2023 22:27:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My preference is alternative B for the grizzly bears that would let them be taken under various terms of either defense of life, federal, state, tribal scientific or research activities, removal of grizzly bears involved in conflicts by authorized federal, state, or Tribal authorities. These terms are allowed as long as they are reported to the FWS, which I think is the best choice for them.

Correspondence ID: 1679Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 91505
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,09 2023 22:30:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The alternative I am choosing is alternative B, which would govern grizzly bears to be taken under various cases that involve defense of life, federal, state, tribal scientific or research activities, or removal of grizzly bears involved in conflicts by authorized federal, state, or Tribal authorities. This alternative is permitted as long as the above cases are reported to the FWS.

Correspondence ID: 1680Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Spokane Valley, WA 99216
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,09 2023 22:51:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Changing the Western side of Washington by adding Grizzly Bears would forever change the accessible beauty of the state and the living conditions. These Bears are very aggressive and unpredictable at times. This will disrupt kids walking to and from school, chicken coops and other livestock, and add pressure to the growing black bear population. Grizzly Bears are not welcome by the majority of nature users, fishermen, hunters, bird watchers, hikers, etc. People who do support them do not know the dangers of them and the added problems to the environment. Western Montana and Northern Idaho has begun seeing many many more problems increasingly more than many experts say. Just this year, two hunters were charged by a Grizzly and had to be put down with a handgun in self-defense or they would have been mauled. Western Montana recently had a woman dragged out of her tent right near the post office of a small town without warning. These are acts of nature, but this is not needed to be added back into the Cascades unnaturally through relocation. This a terrible idea and short sided only needing more money spent to manage them and 'study' them. We do not need to study them on the west side if introduced by relocation. Do not support adding the very aggressive and dangerous Grizzly bear by unnatural relocation.

Correspondence ID: 1681Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Woodinville, WA 98072
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,09 2023 23:04:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am a 60-year old avid backpacker living in Washington. I have spent the past 35 years hiking many trails in the NCE and elsewhere. I have hiked the Pacific Crest Trail from Snoqualmie Pass to Stehekin (High Bridge) and intend to hike from Stehekin to Manning Park in B.C. in the next few years. I have read your draft EIS.

I am opposed to any reintroduction of grizzly bears into the NCE. I would never have hiked the portions of the PCT that I did if 280 grizzlies lived in the NCE. The no-action plan is the only reasonable approach to maintaining a decent balance between the existing low-impact human use of the NCE and allowing a bear population.

Reintroduction to promote a balanced ecosystem is nonsense. I have never seen any area overrun by any animals or plants because of the absence of grizzlies.

Reintroduction of grizzlies will undoubtedly lead to injuries and death to humans. It will also seriously inhibit hiking and other good, established recreational uses that currently occur without harm to the environment.

Reintroduction of grizzlies places a higher value on bear life than human life. Under the circumstances, doing so in the NCE would be foolish, detrimental and immoral. The proponents of bear reintroduction must have a distorted world & life view. Any plan beyond the no-action plan would be illogical, ignorant and demented.

Correspondence ID: 1682Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98506
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,09 2023 23:33:37

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I would like to express my support for allowing the existing grizzly populations to expand into No Cascade National Park.

Due to its remote nature and location, the park is an ideal environment for the grizzly. It would be hugely beneficial to build a continuous habitat with northern Idaho and Montana for breeding purposes in the northern US. This should be an immediate and continuing effort so we could safely take the grizzly off the endangered species list.

Correspondence ID: 1683Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Toledo, WA 98591
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,10 2023 06:55:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Do not reintroduce grizzlies. This will have detrimental results for all Washingtonians.

Correspondence ID: 1684Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bainbridge Island, WA 98110
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,10 2023 07:57:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: In my opinion, reintroduction of the grizzly bear into NCNP is long overdue. They are absent because our species exterminated them and changed /adversely impacted the area's ecology as a result of removing a top predator from the ecosystem. It's well past time we righted that wrong and restored at least some of the balance we humans destroyed.

Correspondence ID: 1685Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,10 2023 08:20:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have hiked all over the North Cascades and find the thought of Grizzlies being introduced to the North Cascades frightening. If this was a natural occurrence there would be some balance. This is a good way to reduce the number of humans in the park. What are you thinking?

Correspondence ID: 1686Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98122
United States of America

Outside Organization: [REDACTED] Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,10 2023 08:33:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think it's about time we start trying to restore the remaining wild habitats we have left. I assume that there has been significant research conducted on this proposal and have taken into account safety of people and the animals (I have downloaded the draft and will read).

As a strong advocate of "rewilding" (I am restoring land at Ocean Shores, WA), I am a strong proponent of trying to restore as much wildlife habitat and ecosystems as is possible.

Thank you for your consideration.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 1687Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Edmonds, WA 98026
United States of America

Outside Organization: Mule Deer Foundation Non-Governmental

Received: Oct,10 2023 09:02:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am opposed to the implementation of this this plan. There are many Grizzly bear naturally increasing throughout the West, and we in Washington are happy to hike, fish, camp, and hunt without major threat of an attack by a species which is known to be aggressive towards humans, pets, and livestock. I own 15 acres in Ferry County and the increasing population of wolves there has had a negative impact on the quality of life.

Correspondence ID: 1688Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Friday Harbor, WA 98250
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,10 2023 09:15:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing in full support of the decades-long efforts to return the grizzly bear back to the North Cascades Ecosystem. Washington State has an amazing opportunity to restore a top predator to their former range and I have full trust in the biologists and ecologists who have been working on this issue for so long to do a thoughtful and careful reintroduction. I am a professional biologist working on other rare species work (much tinier than the grizzly) and fully understand that some conservation-dependent species, such as the grizzly, simply cannot return and establish a healthy breeding population without human intervention. I am also a third-gen Washingtonian and outdoor enthusiast. I know that having grizzly in my beloved North Cascades could add an element of danger-- but it is a risk I fully embrace, knowing that

with smart bear country travel, interactions would be extremely rare. We are losing other species (whitebark pine, etc) due to the loss of the grizzly and to have a fully functioning ecosystem, you simply need these keystone species. Finally, the lobbying by the livestock industry has been a powerful force, but in my opinion, should not be held in higher regard than the animals that are part of the public trust. Grazing livestock on public lands is an antiquated idea (a holdover from an earlier era which makes no sense in modern times-- why does a private commercial livestock grower get to benefit financially from our public lands AND have the loudest voice in the room when it comes to top predator reintroductions?) Claiming financial difficulty is a moot point as there are ample programs to reimburse for livestock loss. PLEASE do not let this loud, vocal minority guide your policy. Those of us who aren't in the rooms shouting OUTNUMBER these folks-- you just don't hear us as loudly. Bring these magnificent, important, animals back to our mountains where they belong-- and thank you for not giving up.

Correspondence ID: 1689Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Sammamish, WA 98075
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,10 2023 09:45:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear WA,

As the outdoors grows in popularity so does the number of uneducated hikers. Grizzly bears can be far more dangerous. I'm against increasing their population in the Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 1690Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Blaine, WA 98230
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,10 2023 09:53:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I don't think this is a good idea, there is way too much human recreation in those areas by people who are new of visiting the area. Most are not educated in bear safety. It's not worth human life to move them when they have other habitats currently.

Correspondence ID: 1691Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Richland, WA 99352
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,10 2023 09:54:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not think that this is a good idea at all. Grizzly bears should not be reintroduced as they are incredibly dangerous to people and animals. If the Grizzly bears migrated elsewhere, or no longer live there, it does not make sense to reintroduce them to the area. Perhaps the reason why they moved away is due to a lack of food.

Correspondence ID: 1692Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Tacoma, WA 98406
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,10 2023 09:57:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The grizzly belongs here and deserves to be reunited with it's ancestral lands, .

Correspondence ID: 1693Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Poulsbo, WA 98370
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,10 2023 10:12:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: All for it!! Any species that lived there before should be awarded their rightful homes where we can assist. We are likely the reason they aren't there anymore. Let's do the right thing and fix where we can!

Correspondence ID: 1694Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98133
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,10 2023 10:12:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: So happy to learn about rebalancing the ecosystem. I spend much time hiking, camping, and backpacking in the cascades and am enthusiastic about protecting grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 1695Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Chelan, WA 98816
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,10 2023 10:17:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: This is an incredibly dangerous idea. I am a grandma and six of my grandkids live in Chelan. My grandkids love the outdoors, hiking, riding bikes etc. We have seen black bear, moose, elk, rattlesnakes and more and know how to respond. To think that our government would even suggest introducing a Grizzly Bear is unbelievable. Grizzly's are known to be one of the most aggressive creatures in the wild. This is an absolute nightmare scenario for the residents who live here. Do not put my grandkids at risk.

Correspondence ID: 1696Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98105
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,10 2023 10:29:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do not agree with reintroduction, a couple and their dog was recently maled by a grizzly in Banff while they slept in their tent, this will severely restrict exploration by families with young children. I urge you to reconsider.

Correspondence ID: 1697Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellevue, WA 98006
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,10 2023 10:42:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: This is unnecessary and would end up directly threatening people and children. Please do not move forward with this in WA.

Correspondence ID: 1698Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Yakima, WA 98908
United States of America
Outside Organization: Retired Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,10 2023 11:06:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Allowing grizzly bears to run free in our forests and lands is akin to allowing rabid dogs in our neighborhoods and on the streets.

Correspondence ID: 1699Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Issaquah, WA 98029
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,10 2023 11:17:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I would prefer not to encourage/restore Grizzly in our area. If they are coming here by themselves, that is fine. However, I would not intentionally restore/encourage their habitat. We have such beautiful state and large outdoor enthusiasts population that are not used to Grizzly and will require more education and awareness. It may disrupt the balance in the ecosystem unnaturally.

Correspondence ID: 1700Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Marysville, WA 98270
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,10 2023 11:25:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am thankful there is a plan to reintroduce Grizzly Bears back to our local range. It's the only chance they seem to have to come back where they belong. I have concerns about coming in contact with one, but am prepared to deter them if an encounter ever occurs.

Correspondence ID: 1701Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Melbourne, FL 32935
United States of America
Outside Organization: Zoological Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,10 2023 11:39:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: please bring back the bears

Correspondence ID: 1702Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Lake Chelan, WA 98816
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,10 2023 12:04:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To whom it may concern:

My wife and I are saddened and angered to learn of the National Parks Department's renewed plans to populate our region with grizzly bears. It appears that the Department's drive to do so has led it to again and again reintroduce the issue, even in the face of resident's opposition and logical fears. Statistics which proclaim attacks on humans to be "rare" offer little comfort, especially in the immediate wake of the killing of two grizzly savey hikers in the Banff national park, to the north of us.

Introduction of grizzlies into the north Cascades places these threats much closer to us, despite "reassuring" PR nostrums like "live with grizzlies" or "they are just doing what bears do, and just passing through."
Moreover it would serve to increase anger and division between environmental idealists and those directly affected by the fear and danger introduction would bring.

Since 1967, my family has owned a residence on [REDACTED] at Lake Chelan, Washington. The small house was built in 1928, and sits amidst what is now known as "cougar alley" due to the boom in the cougar population brought on by hunting restrictions. (We just recently had a large cougar cross our deck with impunity, within 20 feet of us.) In addition large black bears abound and have threatened us from as close as 3 feet. Finally, we last year "hosted" three wolves killing a deer within 200 ft of our house. Although the issue here is grizzlies, please consider the extent of worry already in place for grand parents such as we are, both for ourselves and vulnerable grand children.

The project will further divide our region between rural and urban residents. Not only will the National Park Service's involvement alienate many from its other worthwhile efforts, but it will further diminish public support for other forestry and park goals at federal, state, and local levels. If nothing else, support for funding may suffer, and use of campgrounds and forests may well continue to dwindle, given increased dangers. In this day and age, our divided state and nation does not need even more, contentious hot button issues.

The North Cascades is a narrow strip of habitat extending through the heart of our part of the Pacific Northwest. We can not accept the discretionary introduction , artificial or otherwise, of dangerous apex predators into a sanctuary located a short food-hunting wander away from our populated areas.

Thank you [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 1703Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98125-8129
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,10 2023 12:14:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'd like to add my voice by voting in favor of grizzly bear reintroduction in the North Cascades - bring our natives species back to their historic range.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 1704Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Stehekin, WA 98852
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,10 2023 12:14:12

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My family and I have had a seasonal house in Stehekin for 20 years. Our community is terrified of the prospect of introducing grizzly bears locally, and I wanted to comment in strong opposition to the plan. Grizzlies have never been native to the area while we've been around. No one we know locally has ever seen them.

Nonetheless, they do pose a significant threat to humans. Grizzlies are known to stalk and attack humans without provocation. In my life I have been near a grizzly attack in Montana where a hiker was stalked and killed. A couple out hiking with their dog was killed in Alaska within the last several days. We are hoping we do not have to start carrying 10mm handguns as sidearms for safety, but we will have to make this change if grizzlies are introduced. Please, help keep the local population of Stehekin safe and do not introduce grizzly bears into the surrounding area.

Correspondence ID: 1705Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Shoreline, WA 98133
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,10 2023 12:15:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As an outdoor enthusiast, I think we should give this world back to the things that should own it. I'm ok with brining back the "Wild" into Washington.

Correspondence ID: 1706Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98104
United States of America
Outside Organization: None Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,10 2023 12:15:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Humans were responsible for removing grizzlies from the North Cascades and it's our responsibility to bring them back home.

Correspondence ID: 1707Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,10 2023 12:27:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support restoring grizzly bears to the North Cascades. Original species belong in their native environments. They were here before us, and we need to learn to co-exist with them - not eliminate them. There are so many studies that show the value of restoring species to their native environments that continuing to do so should be our norm.

Correspondence ID: 1708Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98199
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,10 2023 12:50:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Bring back the bears!

Correspondence ID: 1709Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Snohomish, WA 98290
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,10 2023 13:00:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Do it.

Correspondence ID: 1710Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Redmond, WA 98052
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,10 2023 13:31:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I disagree with the plan to restore grizzly bears in the north cascades national park. Bringing them in that park inherently puts pressure on other wildlife flourishing there. Makes human life more difficult to hike and camp. Love the way it is today.

Correspondence ID: 1711Project:112008Document:132104

Address: LIVINGSTON, MT 59047
United States of America
Outside Organization: Getting Better Foundation Non-Governmental(Official Rep.)
Received: Oct,10 2023 13:58:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I'm in favor of reintroducing grizzly bears into the Cascades. This plan seems fit for relocation of expanding MT populations of bears and the Cascades are perfectly suited to receive them food wise, space wise, and human knowledge wise. I'd suggest looking first at Yellowstone bears due to their high population, to reduce human-bear friction there, and in the interest of breeding farther apart from the British Columbia bears they'd be apt to encounter. Followed by Glacier bear relocations.

Correspondence ID: 1712Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Renton, WA 98059
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,10 2023 14:00:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do not follow through with this choice of reintroduction of Grizzly Bears. We have spent time in Grizzly country (Montana, Wyoming) and it forces us to be extremely careful and cautious being in nature. Walks, hikes, bike rides are no longer casual outings, but they become planned events where we cannot go out without all necessary precautions. Bear bells, air horns and bear spray must be on us at all times.

According to this bear expert, he believes mountain biking and trail running should be banned from grizzly country. With grizzly bears in our local mountains this would limit our ability to be in Nature safely with our small children.

<https://podcasts.apple.com/us/podcast/out-alive-from-backpacker/id1462484363?i=1000627740991>

Correspondence ID: 1713Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Maple Falls, WA 98266
United States of America
Outside Organization: ██████████ Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,10 2023 14:17:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please rethink the reintroduction of brown bears to the North Cascades.

I believe that past history of human meddling in reintroduction or eradication "solutions" have failed.

Brown bears will move back down into the North Cascades from Canada in their own time, as they see fit. We are not more intelligent than them, nor are we able to fully comprehend all of the nuances and intricacies of their lives.

Taking bears from an environment (Wyoming) far removed and ecologically different from their planned new home is cruel and unnatural. I believe it would create a more hostile animal. Imagine after being sedated and upon waking, finding itself in a completely new and foreign environment. This would completely disorient the animal as well as create trauma association for the bear with humans. If the last thing it sees before waking up in this new place is a human, pointing a gun at it, what would the repercussions be upon seeing a human in the wild once it is in it's new "home"?

I work in Alaska, have spent ample time around brown bears and can't imagine putting them through this process of reintroduction. The benefits (to whom or what?) don't seem to outweigh the risks.

I'm baffled by why humans insist upon knowing what's best for the earth and its creatures. Clearly, by the current state of the world and the environment, it doesn't seem like a stretch to understand that maybe we just don't.

Thank you for your time,

Correspondence ID: 1714Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Edmonds, WA 98020
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,10 2023 14:35:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Thank you for taking my comments.

I am concerned about safety while hiking in the Leavenworth and Lake Wenatchee areas.

We have property that borders the NFS property and do not want to encounter Grizzly Bears.

We think the area will be fine without these dangerous animals.

I am against the Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan for the North Cascades. I hope this plan will not go forward.

Thank you,

Correspondence ID: 1715Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,10 2023 14:48:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My vote on this would be neither a yes nor a no, but rather a "First ___, then___":

I am a mother of 2 young children and we love visiting the outdoors near our home. We have learned the tips for black bears, even though we feel nervous in black bear country. Grizzly bear country is another story. I noticed that there seem to be some human-bear problems already in the Cascades such that certain campgrounds must be shut down because the bears that are already there have become too accustomed to finding human food in those locations. It would be nerve-racking to have any bear wander into campgrounds, but especially so with a Grizzly - before reintroducing Grizzlies, I would hope there would be stricter and better enforced regulations on campers in order to prevent bears becoming accustomed to and visiting campgrounds. As a tent-camping and hiking family, we want to feel safe enjoying the outdoors. While I think bears and humans can do this, it is clear that something already isn't working in the black bear-human mix in the Cascades if campers are luring bears in such that campgrounds are already being shut down. I'd like to see that addressed first before a bear that is substantially larger than a black bear is reintroduced.

Ultimately, I want to see Grizzlies survive for my kids and I'm guessing reintroduction to the Cascades is part of making that happen in the face of habitat loss. At the same time, if the bear-human interaction isn't figured out in a healthy and positive way from the get-go, it might be counterproductive. I would hope we can figure that out first, then move forward with reintroduction. :)

Correspondence ID: 1716Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98177
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,10 2023 14:49:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to encourage you to restore grizzly bears to Washington state. They are a valuable part of our eco system, and deserve a chance to repopulate. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 1717Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Gig Harbor, WA 98335
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,10 2023 14:55:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I favor alternative A (no action). I am an active hiker and backpacker in the greater North Cascades area. This animal represents a treat to human safety for those in the backcountry that I do not feel is necessary. In addition if bears were in the NC area many persons will feel that they needed to carry firearms with them which can lead to other accidents and issues. If grizzly bears were extinct and this was the only area that it was felt that was proper habit for them then I would probably be for releasing them back into the NC area. However, at this time if you want to see a live grizzly you can visit Yellowstone NP and see them from many different roads.

Correspondence ID: 1718Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,10 2023 15:58:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: A bad idea. The North Cascades Ecosystem is very different than Alaska, Canada, and the Rockies. We lack the salmon runs and wildlife to sustain these 1000+ pound creatures. They can and will travel to lower elevations east and west of the Cascades to find food. We are supposed to be reassured because the bears will be collared. However, their cubs will likely not be collared. Also, collars do not prevent bear-human encounters. As a physician, I have personally cared for 3 grizzly attack survivors and one black bear attack survivor. All were severely disfigured years later with missing eyes, ears, and noses. So, yes, I am biased a bit. However, unlike the proponents of this release program, I have witnessed the potential life changing effects that these bears can have on humans.

Correspondence ID: 1719Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Manson, WA 98831
United States of America
Outside Organization: Citizen Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,10 2023 16:04:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: There is no place in our modern ecosystem for grizzly bears.the population growth in this state leaves no room. Why should the ranchers risk livestock for the re introduction? Why should hikers and outdoor recreational isthmus put their lives at risk for this endeavor. There is a reason that grizzly bears have been eliminated in this state. They are dangerous and un predictable animals.The people who live in Eastern Washington have spoken loudly against it. Please honor our wishes

Correspondence ID: 1720Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mercer Island, WA 98040
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,10 2023 16:15:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly oppose the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the NW Cascades and to Washington in general. A grizzly bear is a killing machine. They do not coexist well with humans. How many people will die or be mutilated when accidentally coming upon a brown bear? This decision will profoundly change the safety and enjoyment of people hiking the cascades. I feel that one human life is worth more than an idealized principle.

When I was young, my family vacationed several summers in the spectacular Bob Marshall Wilderness Area of Montana. Each summer there were incidents of people being mauled or killed by grizzlies, for merely coming upon one. How crazy is it to reintroduce this dangerous belligerent animal!!!

My days of enjoying the backcountry are long over, but this old lady thinks reintroducing grizzly bears is an immoral and misguided idea.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 1721Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bothell, WA 98012
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,10 2023 16:21:52

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: WDFW has enough trouble managing the game population currently and is proposing reduced predator management. With added predator pressure this will upset the delicate balance that has been constantly upended by human encroachment and development.

There are no guarantees that the bears will stay in the national park. Also, historical populations doesn't necessarily justify forcible introduction. Black bears and mountain lions were once quite populous in what are now very dense population centers (Seattle, Bellevue, etc.), I don't think anyone would argue it's a good idea to move bears into those areas.

Attacks from grizzly bears are becoming more and more common across North America and we don't need to encourage population development and migration that can happen naturally.

Correspondence ID: 1722Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98512
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,10 2023 16:58:24

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The idea to import grizzlies into the north Cascades is incredibly foolish if you have any regard for human life. Don't do it.

Correspondence ID: 1723Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,10 2023 17:26:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am all for reintroducing grizzly bears to the North Cascades. I live in the area and do not hesitate to share my landscape with these important animals. In order to bring the ecosystem back into balance we need these bears to dig up meadows and to fill the gaps in the balance of other animals.

If they are threatening livestock I believe that ranchers should be commentated for losses and that bear dogs could be used to protect domesticated animals and other means to control them just like wolves and other bears.

I know there is some small risk to recreators but folks have live in Alaska and deal with it and I have lived in Montatna and lived with them near Glacier National Park.

Please count me as a 'Yay' vote. They are magnificent animals and should be allowed to live where they belong. They have already given up all of the Great Plains. We should leave them something and if it is a problem let our grandchildren have a chance to chose.

Correspondence ID: 1724Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Pasco, WA 99301
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,10 2023 17:30:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: People like to go camping, hiking, fishing, in our beautiful forests and mountains without having to worry about getting attacked, killed and eaten. Bears, especially Grizzlies should not be where people are! It's utterly stupid of whoever wants to put bears where they will kill people and other wildlife. All bears should be eliminated they are too dangerous to be allowed to live. They serve no purpose

Correspondence ID: 1725Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,10 2023 17:38:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please reintroduce Brown Bears back into the North Cascades. Nature has her own balance; keeping bears out of it due to human greed or fear is not balance. Thank you, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 1726Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Burlington, WA 98233
United States of America

Outside Organization: Skagit Valley Farm Business(Official Rep.)

Received: Oct,10 2023 17:40:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The introduction of Grizzly Bears into eastern Skagit County will be devastating to the local cattle and ranching community. Additionally, there are A LOT of people who live in the eastern part of the county and bears will constitute a major hazard. Teh ecosystem seems strong as is. All things working well (except there are also WAY to many elk) I strongly advise AGAINST introducing grizzlies back into Skagit County.

Correspondence ID: 1727Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Yakima, WA 98908
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,10 2023 17:57:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly oppose the release of grizzly bears into Washington's northern cascades. This is a foolish move. Rangers are repeatedly, having to put grizzlies down because of attacks on human beings both here in the United States as well as in Canada. This will damage camping fishing hunting, hiking in the state of Washington. Those are all very important activities here.

Correspondence ID: 1728Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kirkland, WA 98034
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,10 2023 18:07:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the reintroduction/restoration of grizzly bears to Washington State.

Correspondence ID: 1729Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98502
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,10 2023 18:32:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not reintroduce grizzly bears into the North Cascades. This is a terrible idea from a public safety standpoint. Grizzly bears still kill humans. We should encourage changes to the national parks that encourage use not discourage use.

Correspondence ID: 1730Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spokane, WA 99201
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,10 2023 18:33:21

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The recent incident in Stevens County, where a grizzly bear was captured, is a testament to the growing predator challenges in Washington. Our state is already grappling with managing wolves, cougars, black bears, and more. Considering the strain on our ungulate populations, I cannot support the idea of reintroducing grizzlies into the state.

Correspondence ID: 1731Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Redmond, WA 98052
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,10 2023 18:39:56

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzlies are a keystone species and vital for the healthiness of the ecosystem. Please consider Northern Cascades as a site for reintroduction to help revitalize this ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 1732Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Purcell, OK 73080
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,10 2023 19:24:15

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm writing to express my concerns about reintroducing grizzly bears in Washington. Their natural migration from regions like BC and Idaho is evident. With the state's current wildlife management challenges, adding another apex predator seems ill-advised

Correspondence ID: 1733Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Orting, WA 98360
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,10 2023 20:02:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: It will be a mistake to reintroduce Grizzlies.

Outdoor activities will be detrimentally impacted.

Hiking opportunities in the Cascade range will be reduced with increased risks and dangers of Grizzly attacks and deaths.

We are not in favor of reintroduction.
Please consider our input.

Correspondence ID: 1734Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Clayton, WA 99110
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,10 2023 20:21:48

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The reintroduction on grizzly bears is an irresponsible emotion driven effort. Grizzly bears will migrate into the area from Canada and north eastern Washington. Our limited wilderness spaces are already predator heavy which is hurting prey populations. Artificially introducing another predator will upset the balance and harm the prey populations further with another endangered, unmanageable predator. Allow the natural reintroduction process to occur and stop forcing endangered unmanageable predators in rural residents.

Correspondence ID: 1735Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Suquamish, WA 98392
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,10 2023 20:28:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I recommend that no action be taken re: grizzly bears in the N Cascades

Correspondence ID: 1736Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Yakima, WA 98903
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,10 2023 20:28:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This state does not need anymore apex predators. Wildlife in this state is a lot like our chicken eggs and the commission is like my 2 year old son. They can't be trusted to handle it properly

Correspondence ID: 1737Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Pasco, WA 99301
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,10 2023 20:29:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Reintroducing Grizzlies to Washington has to be one of the most irresponsible actions this agency has ever done. The wolf re-introduction across the west was a feel good story that has decimated ungulates across the board. If the agency's agenda is to only have predators on the landscape then they are well on their way.

Honestly, what does this actually accomplish? A success story for people that want to keep their jobs? Other than that there is no scientific (or should I say, realistic impact) other than to kill more ungulates and endanger the public.

As a person that loves to to recreate in North Central and Northeast Washington, this does nothing but add danger. As a Father of a 2 year old and a 6 year old, I can't imagine camping or recreating in these areas if this action goes through. My father was a school teacher in Chewelah and because of that I've always held that area special to my heart from the stories he has told. We spend many days throughout the year camping in that area every year. Not only will I not be doing this anymore because my children's lives are more important, but I won't be spending the money in all these small communities.

This agenda of reintroducing grizzlies only hurts the public at large. I may benefit the few looking to better themselves, but

not for the majority that it affects.

Sincerely,

Correspondence ID: 1738Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kingston, WA 98346
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,10 2023 21:02:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not think this is a good idea, with the environmental science that is out there, the local mule deer and elk populations are already struggling and with a massively growing population In the northwest adding not just an apex predator but the largest apex predator in the lower 48 to a region that is not familiar with its behavior on the landscape I believe not only creates a massive public safety risk but a huge risk to not only the ungulate population but the existing predator population already on the landscape.

Correspondence ID: 1739Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Toledo, WA 98591
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,10 2023 21:05:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is a terrible idea. This area of WA state sees a lot of backpackers and tourists that bring money to the local economy. The threat of being eaten by a grizzly is not going to be good for the locals bottom line as most tourists will prefer to go somewhere else that is safe. We already have plenty of grizzly's in Yellowstone and Glacier we only need one population of these apex predators that's plenty leave the rest up in Canada where they just ate two humans in Banf. Yellowstone grizz's have already killed one USA citizen and seriously injured another this year, both outside the park. They don't stay where you put them.

Correspondence ID: 1740Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Friday Harbor, WA 98250-8159
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,10 2023 21:28:10

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in full support of grizzly bear restoration.

Correspondence ID: 1741Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Duvall, WA 98019
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,10 2023 21:28:56

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I disagree with the reintroduction due to safety reasons. Please don't proceed. Thank you!

Correspondence ID: 1742Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America

Outside Organization: unaffiliated Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,10 2023 21:33:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My wife and I oppose any effort to reintroduce grizzly bears into the North Cascades. That includes opposition to invocation of the 10(j) rule. Our reasons are:

Grizzlies are not at risk of extinction. Rather, the motivation is cultural and political--much as wolf reintroduction was. However, as I understand it (from a professional wildlife bio who has done some bear research in the N Cascades), grizzly bears are not a keystone species as wolves are. Rather many of their ecological functions are fulfilled by black bears.

Human population density is so high the risk of dangerous and deadly encounters is unacceptably high. This is the case throughout the area you propose for reintroduction.

There are also huge political implications. Consider wolf reintroduction--which we both favor--which doesn't have nearly the safety issues as grizzlies. The social turmoil and hostility toward wolves--including killing them-- is not good for our body politic. Imagine how much worse it would be with grizzlies running around.

My wife and I both hike a lot, sometimes alone. We aren't sure it's fair for us to be at risk because there is a segment of the public that really likes the idea of grizzlies in the wild.

thank you

Correspondence ID: 1743Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Renton, WA 98059
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,10 2023 21:38:41

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the initiative to reintroduce grizzly bears to the Cascades. As am avid hiker, outdoorsperson, and environmentalist, I believe that humans should seek to lessen our impact on the environment and work to remedy past impact, including the reintroduction of native species to their previous habitats.

Correspondence ID: 1744Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sandy, OR 97022
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,10 2023 22:34:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: WA state is not ready for anymore predators. Politicians have turned a blind eye to conservation and over all well being of wildlife and the ability to co exist with humans. Past decisions have been made from emotions instead from facts. Emotions typically from those who live in suburban areas.

Correspondence ID: 1745Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Puyallup, WA 98371
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,10 2023 22:42:41

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Do whatever is needed to restore this ecosystem and the Grizzly bear population. If we humans want to survive as a species, we need to focus on ecosystem restoration and figure out some other place to hike, backpack, and camp, if needed.

Correspondence ID: 1746Project:112008Document:132104

Address: University place, WA 98467
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,10 2023 22:51:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am a physical therapist and avid hiker serving the communities near Mount rainier. Most of the locals frequent the ranges throughout the state with minimal concerns of fatal bear attacks given the infrequent news of it occurring in Washington and caused by black bears.
Several stories annually come from adjacent states following grizzly bear related deaths.

Why on earth the state would willingly risk the lives of its active population by introducing an apex predator with the capacity and occasional drive to attack humans is beyond me.
Would the same carelessness be used to try to put aggressive shark breeds into the sound? It's careless, and dangerous. At a minimum I hope that this choice Carrie's with it liability for the state for manslaughter when this choice results in death - and as someone who regularly hikes alone this goes double for myself.

Please do not introduce this potentially dangerous animal into our ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 1747Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98125
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,10 2023 23:01:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please don't reintroduce grizzlies in WA! I would like to be able to enjoy hiking the beautiful Cascades with my kids without having to fear facing a grizzly. I would consider myself as someone that properly prepares for hikes an always have a proper bear management plan in place, but grizzlies are unpredictable and aggressive animals and I don't believe there is a need to introduce these animals again and risk more bear attacks.

Correspondence ID: 1748Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America
Outside Organization: Kaiser Permanente Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,10 2023 23:21:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am not a proponent of the plan to bring back the grizzly bear. I would stop visiting the park with my family for fear of an attack. I understand their importance but people will die and it's not worth it. Keep the park open and welcoming for humans, please keep us protected from these predators.

Correspondence ID: 1749Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Ravensdale, WA 98051
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,11 2023 04:22:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am opposed to the reintroduction of grizzly bears under any conditions into the north cascades wilderness area, either now or in the future. I believe that all of those people involved in promoting it or in doing so have a reckless disregard for human health and safety, and should be held legally and financially liable for any death or injury caused by the grizzly bears if they are reintroduced. To introduce a large predator into a recreational area, that has a history of stalking and attacking, maiming and killing defenseless human beings with no provocation or warning, is completely reckless.
As a resident of Washington who has spent time in these areas, often with groups of youth, having a constant fear of being

attacked and maimed or killed by a large predator when in the outdoors would destroy everyone's right to safely enjoy the recreational opportunities in the north cascades, as well as the rights of those people who must live and work in the area. Please stop this proposed grizzly bear reintroduction into the north cascades now and at any time in the future.

Correspondence ID: 1750Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,11 2023 06:42:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please don't introduce grizzlies into the North Cascades. As our population grows and more people hit the trails, there is an increasing risk of life-threatening encounters.

Correspondence ID: 1751Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,11 2023 06:55:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: You are absolute dumbasses if you bring grizzlies back to Washington. Have you seen how dumb people have gotten? You will have blood on your hands from stupid but innocent people getting mauled. That's not counting family pets and livestock. Species have gone extinct for as long as life has existed on Earth. It is a cycle of life. You want to talk about the importance of nature, then let nature run its course. If you must, limit hunting on the animals you want to protect. Putting animals back in areas they no longer inhabit is irresponsible and a danger to everyone and everything involved. We don't want the grizzly bears back. They don't need to be brought back. How about do something useful with tax payer money instead of thinking up new and stupid ways to get innocent people hurt or killed.

Correspondence ID: 1752Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Anacortes, WA 98221
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,11 2023 07:59:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I wish to add my voice in support of restoring grizzly bears to the North Cascades.

We are in the middle of a sixth mass extinction driven by humanity. Biodiversity is crashing due to destruction of natural habitats by humans, by human population overshoot, and by an increasingly de-stabilized climate due to rising carbon emissions.

It's absolutely vital for people to do whatever we can to help restore natural ecosystems and populations. The time is late...humans must learn to give way and co-exist in a web where all life is inter-connected. If we don't, we'll perish along with the grizzlies.

Thank you for doing whatever you can to bring them back.

Correspondence ID: 1753Project:112008Document:132104
Address: East Wenatchee, WA 98802
United States of America
Outside Organization: Puget Sound Chiropractic Cente Business
Received: Oct,11 2023 08:04:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Sirs,
Introducing Grizzly bears into the north cascades is a very dangerous idea. We have tourists including hikers, campers, skiers, and also many locals that are in the north cascades year round. This would pose a very dangerous idea as Grizzly bears are much more dangerous than black bears. Do you want Grizzly bears attacking humans? Grizzly bears are much more aggressive than black bears. Also look what it would do to our animal population, destroying many animals that are native to the area.

Please do not introduce Grizzly bears into the north cascades.

Thank You ,
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 1754Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Redmond, WA 98053
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,11 2023 08:44:37

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Doesn't seem worth the risks to hikers, backpackers and campers who want to enjoy the beautiful PNW Cascades with their families. Pls consider option A: no action and save public funds. Thanks.

Correspondence ID: 1755Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,11 2023 09:16:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not support the reintroduction of grizzly bears in the north cascades at this time. We in Leavenworth already have a black bear problem and safety measures have still not been put into place even after a bear attack in city limits last year. We need bear proofing in place in all highly trafficked parts of Wa state before reintroducing grizzly bears.

Correspondence ID: 1756Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,11 2023 09:28:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of Grizzly Bears to the Cascades.

I have children who hike, I enjoy the peace and quite of a safe hunt, and I don't want to die by bear attack.

I still think that reintroduction of grizzly bears is the right thing to do.

Correspondence ID: 1757Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Auburn, WA 98092
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,11 2023 09:30:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No, no, no. If Grizzlies can live in the North Cascades then let it happen naturally. I do not support human reintroduction!

Correspondence ID: 1758Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Peshastin, WA 98847
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,11 2023 09:54:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I would like to see grizzly bears reintroduced to their native habitat with the greatest possible protections for human bear interactions. This is not only protects humans, but the bears as well. So my preference would be for Alternative C.

Correspondence ID: 1759Project:112008Document:132104
Address: TWISP, WA 98856
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,11 2023 09:56:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do not release grizzly bears into the The North Cascades eco system.

If they were meant to be here in numbers, they would ALREADY be thriving here in higher numbers. The amount of people who frequent these mountains is reason enough to not introduce more of these bears! There will be confrontations and people will die or get hurt. Women on their monthly cycle will be targets! These bears can be a menace. They are not like black bears and YOU know it.

It makes no common sense to release a Grizzly or Grizzly's where there is high human traffic.

If you must release them, take them somewhere where there is no human presence.

Also, who is going to come and take care of a problem bear? Locally is there a menace bear person? We have one local Game Warden that I am aware of. How are you going to ensure the safety of the public if a bear that you release wanders into a human populated area and starts causing havoc? The persons who release these bears (all the way from the Biologists pushing for it, the specialists etc) will be responsible.

Correspondence ID: 1760Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Snohomish, WA 98290
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,11 2023 11:02:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am a user of the North Cascades and I am so thankful for having access to such an amazing asset. With regards to grizzlies, I believe that man should allow nature to rebalance the North Cascades without interference aside from protections. With time, more grizzlies will find their way into the area. This will come without the costs and controversy of the proposed plan.
In August of 2016 my hiking partners and I encountered what was likely a grizzly near Suiattle Pass. Our inconclusive photo of the bear was reviewed by an Alaskan bear expert that I reached out to. He gave it a 60% chance that it was a grizzly. If it was indeed a grizzly, that was one more grizzly than I have seen cougar, bobcat, and badger combined in the North Cascades.

Regards,

Correspondence ID: 1761Project:112008Document:132104
Address: DEMING, WA 98244
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,11 2023 11:05:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support reintroducing grizzly bears into the North Cascades National Park. I want to see the ecosystems of our wild places as intact as possible.

Correspondence ID: 1762Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Darrington, WA 98241
United States of America
Outside Organization: (My Self) Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,11 2023 11:09:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am opposed to bring Grizzly Bears or Black Bears into the North Cascades. Why?

It will Impact the fish and wildlife populations due to the introduction of an apex predator. There would be potential risks to persons recreating or hunting in proposed area. There would be loss of hunting rights as the state and federal agencies move to protection of grizzlies over management. There are many reasons! We the people have rights too.
Thank you for listening to my comment.

Correspondence ID: 1763Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Yelm, WA 98597
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,11 2023 11:26:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I believe it is important and critical that Grizzly Bears/Brown Bears are released and introduced back to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 1764Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98133
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,11 2023 11:46:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please save Grizzlys! Introduce them tona protected and healthy environment in WA.

Correspondence ID: 1765Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98122
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,11 2023 11:48:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Absolutely no grizzly bears should be reintroduced. There would be too many conflicts with hikers, backpackers, and of course ranchers.

Correspondence ID: 1766Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Kent, WA 98033
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,11 2023 11:58:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am strongly in favor of re-introducing grizzly bears into the north cascades ecosystem that includes the National Park, the National Recreation areas and Mount Baker wilderness. This area is perfect for bears given the relatively low human utilization of the National Park. By its very nature this area is remote and provides excellent habitat for bears. Furthermore, due to being wilderness or National Park administered lands there are limited impacts on domesticated livestock operations.

I have just finished watching and voting for "Fat Bears" from the Brooks Falls area of Katmai National Park. It would be nice to someday have a "Fat Bear" experience in the Northern Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 1767Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Greenbank, WA 98253
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,11 2023 12:28:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am opposed to the relocation of grizzly bears to North Cascades for the following reasons:

- I don't believe the north section of NCNP between Baker Lake and Ross Lake is a habitat that will support a population and neither is the Pasayton Wilderness west of the Pacific Crest Trail. The population that currently exists north of the Canadian border in the vicinities of Skagit Valley Provincial Park and Chilliwack Lake Provincial Park has not expanded southward because the terrain and food resources are not conducive to their survival needs.

- The southern portion of NCNP may be a sustainable environment but their food requirements are going to drive them down the Sauk, Suiattle and Skagit Rivers and into an adjacent urban population of 4.3 million people, where there will inevitably be conflicts.

- Climate change has significantly altered the ecosystem of the North Cascades in the past 20 years and given us massive forest fires, this year on Sourdough Mountain above Ross Lake. Glaciers are disappearing rapidly, this year's mountain huckleberries are almost nonexistent, and the salmon runs are endangered. All of these conditions will lead grizzlies down into the lowland populated areas along the rivers.

- The number of people out hiking, hunting, fishing, and mountaineering are orders of magnitude above the areas around Yellowstone, the Selkirk Mountains, and other areas where programs have been implemented to reintroduce grizzly bears. Frequent confrontations between people and bears are inevitable.

- I am in favor of "Alternative A" - no action.

Correspondence ID: 1768Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Eatonville, WA 98328
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,11 2023 13:36:10

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am against introducing grizzly bears into the north cascade range. From a wildlife perspective the current animals that occupy this range have had no interaction with grizzly bear. Adding the bears to the landscape would result in devastation to our deer and elk numbers. Just look at what happened in Montana, Idaho, and Wyoming. There is plenty of data that shows this. Even if it is just 5 bears for now that is a huge number of deer and elk fawns that will be lost due to the bears being an extremely lethal predator that these animals have never had to deal with. Grizzly bears may naturally over time make their way into this area but at least by then the animals will have had a chance to adept. Releasing them this way will for sure cause destruction that our deer and elk populations will never recover from.

From a human perspective as someone who frequents the North Cascades I would be cautious for my life as well as other hikers, bikers, and outdoor enthusiasts. Where there are grizzly bears there are always human bear conflicts. We have seen a growing number of these conflicts that unfortunately result in death or serious injury. Again all we have to do is look at these

interactions from Idaho, Montana and Wyoming. It's not the bears fault, they are just being bears. I am not anti bear, they are beautiful and majestic creatures who deserve a spot on the landscape, but reintroduction in the Cascade range is not the right way to do it. Again, in time they may eventually return to this area on their own accord. We did not introduce wolves yet here they are. Animals do not have GPS and don't obey our boundary lines.

Correspondence ID: 1769Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98274
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,11 2023 13:40:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly oppose reintroducing Grizzlies into WA State, specifically into western WA for the following reasons:

Grizzlies already have access to the North Cascades and bringing more in would not be sustainable.

An increase in Grizzly population would cause conflict between the bears and the citizenry and seriously, negatively impact our ability to recreate.

By artificially increasing the amount of wildlife in the North Cascades, resources would become more scarce and adding more grizzlies would put that much more pressure on the ecosystem, negatively affecting other native species as well as the human population.

To quote our US Representative, Dan Newhouse, "Time and again, our communities have spoken to express staunch opposition to the introduction of these apex predators, which would be detrimental to our families, wildlife, and livestock alike,"

I am an equestrienne who rides the beautiful North Cascades. Please consider carefully how my safety would be jeopardized when confronted by a Grizzly.

Correspondence ID: 1770Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Prosser, WA 99350
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,11 2023 13:40:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am opposed to introducing grizzly bears into the North Cascades Ecosystem. My concern is for those who live in the large territory grizzlies will cover, most likely including towns and farms. By introducing grizzlies into this territory you will likely see an increase of farm animals killed, and at some point, people injured and killed. This plan is a direct assault on families who earn their living through small farms, families who will lose pets, families who will have family members who are injured or die as a result of this action.

In addition, many of us enjoy the beauty of the North Cascades through hiking and back-packing. By introducing grizzlies you are bringing an apex predator, a dangerous animal directly to those of us who hike and backpack. A quick internet search lists grizzly attacks, including very recently a couple hiking near Banff who were prepared for a bear attack, even using all of their bear spray can, and yet were still attacked and died.

I urge you to not introduce this animal into the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 1771Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,11 2023 14:31:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm a hiker and backpacker who thinks that there is plenty of space for both humans to enjoy nature and for Grizzlies to live and thrive in the North Cascades! Thanks for planning a safe and sustainable reintroduction plan. Also, I am a mom who wants her kids to grow up with Grizzly Bears in the Cascades just as we have Orcas in the Salish Sea!

Correspondence ID: 1772Project:112008Document:132104

Address: SEATTLE, WA 98103
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,11 2023 14:39:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We have a duty to do what we can to restore grizzlies back to the cascades. We can coexist and still enjoy going for a hike as it's our responsibility to be respectful of the environment and the creatures in the ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 1773Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,11 2023 15:01:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in support of reintroducing grizzly bears to their historic range in the North Cascades ecosystem. I live in a very rural area in the east side foothills of the North Cascades, many miles outside of the town of Winthrop. As such I could potentially be in grizzly range, although they would have to cross a major highway to get here. There is currently a large population of black bears and considerable community education and awareness of keeping our home areas free from bear attractants. I'm nervous about grizzly bears but also choose to live in this area and definitely am in favor of restoring and protecting the flora and fauna that make an ecosystem intact and healthy, and that includes it's large predators. We are close enough to the Canadian border and large provincial parks that grizzly bears occasionally do wander into Washington State. I like the idea of a slow re-introduction with regular evaluation of the results and the ability to change course if unforeseen problems are uncovered. Some people here are hysterical about wolves and grizzly bears; there were letters published in the local paper predicting wolves would be snatching kids from school bus stops. Hasn't happened. As long as you also protect the prey and vegetation and large areas that wolves and bears require there should be no reason for them to come into town or heavily populated areas looking for food. I'm aware that fires could change that, as well as continued use of National Forests for livestock. But there are also a range of non-lethal deterrents for both bears and wolves and you need to tout them and encourage people to use them.

Correspondence ID: 1774Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Herriman, UT 84096
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,11 2023 15:23:01

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Natural migration into Washington is already occurring. Let nature heal at it's own rate and avoid the government overreach that comes with an expensive and politically charged reintroduction.

Correspondence ID: 1775Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Klama, WA 98625
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,11 2023 15:33:21

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The state cannot decide on the predator management in the state with what we have now. They need no more. Challenges to wildlife management. They cannot even get black bears right. They'll screw G bears up even worse.

Correspondence ID: 1776Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,11 2023 15:50:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am strongly in favor of Alternative B and C and would very much like to see grizzly bears reintroduced to the North Cascades. I think that their addition to the biodiversity of this landscape is unmeasurable. As someone who studies ecology and naturalism and tries to teach others about it, I am a bit concerned that the document alone that is 300+ pages will be too challenging for everyone to read and to persuade those who are on the fence about this subject. Many people will likely view this as a debate between humans' safety and biodiversity/"cool new animal in the landscape". I think it would be very beneficial for y'all to try coordinating with local organizations to create educational content that describes the multitude of ecological benefits that grizzlies have on the environment. Their benefits far outweigh the potential harm they might do, and this ought to be shown in greater (and simpler) detail to the general public if possible. I hope y'all are successful in this, as Grizzlies are excellent seeds spreaders, plant propagators, forest-health enhancers, nitrogen movers, forest fertilizers, climate improvers, etc. They do many things through a domino effect. I hope they are successfully reintroduced.

Correspondence ID: 1777Project:112008Document:132104

Address: PESHASTIN WA,, WA 98847
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,11 2023 16:38:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To bring Grizzly bears to this area will bring harm to people, not if but when!

I've heard the arguments pro and con, but the bottom line is that people are people and grizzly bears are predators. Human blood will be on your hands, period.

As the Grizzly bear population increase, which is the clear goal here, then the threat you have created will only grow. Now if in the course of nature grizzly bears migrate into this area, then study them and continue your efforts to educate people. Let nature take its course.

Correspondence ID: 1778Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Gig Harbor, WA 98335
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,11 2023 16:51:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in favor of alternative B, restoring grizzle bears to NCE. NCE was grizzle territory before man destroyed them and I believe they should be reintroduced, maintained and protected.

Correspondence ID: 1779Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Everett, WA 98204
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,11 2023 16:53:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I love all animals but I do not support the reintroduction of grizzly bears into Washington State. There are currently more and more issues with the current grizzly bear population not having enough food, leading them to move closer into civilization. There have been several close encounters with grizzly bears, some fatal to humans. We need to work on restoring their natural food sources where they currently reside. Bringing them back to Washington State will only bring the existing problems to our doors. With a lot of my family residing in the rural North Cascades, I do not want this to be yet another issue in their communities. Again, restore their natural food sources but do not reintroduce them here.

Correspondence ID: 1780Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,11 2023 17:05:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I remember seeing a grizzly mom and cub while hiking in the northern Cascades in 1990. It was part of the experience that made it so special, and I remember it to this day. They kept their distance from us and we were responsible backpackers who followed the park rules. It saddens me to think that they are no longer today because of the actions of people. The wilderness belongs to them first.

I fully support bringing grizzlies back. I am an animal conservationist and zoo volunteer. Seeing the grizzly rescue Fern at the Woodland Park Zoo is a wonderful experience, but it shouldn't be the only place to see them. They belong in the PNW wilderness.

Thank you for taking comments.

Sincerely,

██████████
██████████

Correspondence ID: 1781Project:112008Document:132104

Address: SANTA ROSA, CA 95409
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,11 2023 17:08:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Enough with Grizzly Bear Reintroduction programs!!
Unless you have a management program including hunting as per the North American Wildlife Model, there is no reason to consider reintroducing another apex predator into the ecosystem. The issues in other western states being caused by Grizzly bears are a cause for alarm. Preservationists groups that fight against bear population control for the safety of people and resident ungulant species create dangerous and expensive control measures when these population interface with humans.
Thank you for your consideration,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 1782Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,11 2023 17:23:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing today to support the restoration of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem. These big, bold creatures are known to play an essential role in forest ecosystems, churning up and fertilizing forest soils, spreading seeds and controlling the overpopulation of deer, elk, and moose. They are an essential piece of the web of life, and they are facing undue pressures as we lose our forests every year. They bring essential biodiversity to our wild lands and in a place as environmentally conscious as Washington, this is the right thing to do for us and for our future generations.

Correspondence ID: 1783Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mountlake Terrace, WA 98043
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,11 2023 17:32:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am strongly in favor of allowing grizzly bears back into the Cascades in Washington State. This was their home and they should be restored. It has been shown at Yellowstone that returning apex predators to their environment goes a long way toward restoring the health of that ecosystem.
I am a hiker who has enjoyed several forays into the north Cascades. I realize the risks and am still sure that grizzly bears should be returned.

Correspondence ID: 1784Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spokane, WA 99208
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,11 2023 17:38:55

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I believe that introducing grizzly bears into an ecosystem already overrun with with predators would be a huge mistake. Washington has done a really poor job managing predators to the detriment of its ungulate population. It would be nice to see Washington use sound management practice not determined by the emotion of a few. Please do not bring grizzly's to Washington.

Correspondence ID: 1785Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,11 2023 18:00:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the proposal to reintroduce grizzlies to their natural habitat. Humans were responsible for removing grizzlies from the North Cascades and it's our responsibility to bring them back home.

Correspondence ID: 1786Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sequim, WA 98382
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,11 2023 18:37:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: After reviewing the Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan, I believe Alternative A (No Action) to be the correct solution. Bears have been on Earth for over 20 million years. Their natural migration & evolution patterns fall well outside humans' capacity to accurately monitor, regulate or understand. Our efforts to restore Grizzly Bear in the NCE should be aimed at removing natural or constructed barriers. Establish natural migration corridors from the other ecosystems which minimize interaction with humans and facilitate movement. Let the bears choose where to live and when.

Sincerely,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 1787Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Port Angeles, WA 98363
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,11 2023 18:49:41

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Do not introduce grizzlies into the state. Things are currently fine AS IS. Introducing grizzlies will cause more deaths to inexperienced tourists and will cause an uptick of gun purchases and carrying. Introducing grizzlies does more harm than good and will cause unnecessary conflict, damages, and killings both of people and bears.

Correspondence ID: 1788Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Orting, WA 98360
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,11 2023 19:33:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do not re-introduce grizzlies to Washington. As a resident I greatly fear for potential safety issues which we are already dealing with the mountain lion, bear, and wolf populations. In addition to the safety concerns for residents I worry about the effect that adding another dominant predator could have on other wildlife in the area. I believe the best course of action is to let the grizzlies repopulate naturally.

Correspondence ID: 1789Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,11 2023 19:44:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please stick with status quo. I recreate a lot in the Cascades north of route 2 and have no desire to have a new dangerous animal on the landscape

Correspondence ID: 1790Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Arlington, WA 98223
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,11 2023 19:48:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am against the reintroduction. Although rare, grizzly bear attacks do happen. Eventually someone will be in the wrong place at the right time and a persons life will end. Grizzly attacks are a yearly occurrence in the Yellowstone ecosystem and many sad stories have been written. If we can save lives by not introducing grizzlies here it's the right thing to do. No grizzlies please.

Correspondence ID: 1791Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Monroe, WA 98272-9566
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,11 2023 20:03:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Bad idea I think with the uptick grizzly bear human interaction we have seen this year that this reintroduction will lead to more issues with Grizzly attacks.

Correspondence ID: 1792Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Washougal, WA 98671
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,11 2023 20:15:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the no action alternative. Under no circumstances should any grizzly bears be purposely relocated into the North Cascades ecosystem. Consider the recent fatal attacks on campers and hikers in Montana and BC. The reason the North Cascades is pristine and uninhabited is because it is harsh and high elevation. Beautiful yes, but any grizzly relocated there would likely head for low elevation greener pastures on both sides of the park. North East Washington grizzlies are already moving West and having negative interactions. Someone will be killed sooner or later by one of these

wandering bears. Does the USFWS really think that grizzly bears will ignore Okanogan County apple orchards, salmon, and stupid cows wandering the State and National Forests?

If the North Cascade habitat is so ideal, grizzlies would have relocated themselves and thrived years ago without USFWS spending millions of dollars. In Montana, Idaho, BC and Alberta recovering grizzly populations are on the move and being documented hundreds of miles from their now peopled past ranges. If grizzlies do wander into the North Cascades and stay, so be it, more power to them. For now, black bears have replaced and successfully filled the environmental niche that any grizzlies that may have had in the North Cascades in the past and it's disingenuous to suggest that they are necessary to maintain the ecosystem. Bison were native to the East coast of North America, transplant some to the parks in Washington DC.

Sorry, thanks,

Correspondence ID: 1793Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sedro woolley, WA 98285
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,11 2023 20:16:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Worst idea I could think of being a person who lives near by. Look at the wolfs for example when they were released and now destroying deer populations and other wildlife but also peoples cattle and more money come out of my pocket. I have nothing against grizzly bears or reintroducing wildlife but this need more study time and realistic thinking.

Correspondence ID: 1794Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Everett, WA 98203
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,11 2023 20:16:08

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: If indeed the Cascade mountain range is suitable habitat for grizzly bears, then their range will and should extend to Washington's portion of the Cascade range. However, they should do so through natural migration. I strongly oppose human driven transplantation of grizzlies from their current habitats to Washington State for the purposes of establishing a population of bears in Washington. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 1795Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Yakima, WA 98903
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,11 2023 20:44:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not support the reintroduction of grizzly bears. Every year, a few hunters & recreation enthusiasts are mauled or killed in Wyoming or Montana. As a WA hiker, runner, and hunter, I do not want to fear for my life every time I enter the North Cascades. I don't want that for my fellow Washingtonians either.

Correspondence ID: 1796Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bakersfield, CA 93306
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,11 2023 20:46:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly oppose the reintroduction of a species with an documented history of mauling and killing humans. This will increase the risk to visitors and residents alike. It will almost certainly increase the practice of carrying firearms for self defense because bear spray is ineffective as demonstrated in the recent killing of an experienced couple practicing appropriate back country protocol near Bamff. We have children, a grandchild, and extended family living in Washington and Oregon so have visited and enjoy the National Parks in the area. Unfortunately, grizzlies and guns in the North Cascades would provide two powerful arguments to stay away.

Correspondence ID: 1797Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bakersfield, CA 93306
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,11 2023 20:47:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am an avid hiker and backpacker, in the Eastern Sierra Nevada mountains of California. My sister lives in Washington state.

I read with distress the plan to bring grizzly bears back into the contiguous USA. Grizzly bears and humans are not compatible in the 48 states. They are far too aggressive and dangerous. And people are far too "populous", even in the back country. If grizzlies are "reinstated", there WILL be human casualties.

I backpack with my husband in mountains known to contain black bears, and we are not afraid. We secure all food as per Ranger recommendations. We have never had a problem. But if grizzlies are brought back - even starting in northern Washington, they would extend their range... and for those hiking in the Cascades, they would pose a serious threat.

The recent news of the experienced backpacking couple and their dog who were killed by a grizzly bear in Banff, even though they were "doing everything right" should be a sober warning to even considering such a plan.

Please, I beg you, do NOT bring grizzly bears back! It would be completely irresponsible to human life, and to the millions of Americans who love to get out into the wilderness areas. There is plenty of open, available wilderness space in Alaska and Canada for grizzly bears.

Correspondence ID: 1798Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,11 2023 21:00:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I believe that alternative C is the plan written in the best interest of the grizzlies and the general population. I think it's necessary to protect these bears while also considering public safety. Grizzly bears are historically important in Native American culture, and important for the health of the NCE. Grizzly bears could be considered a keystone species and apex predator of the NCE, as their absence has shown how profound their impact is on the ecosystem. Grizzlies control the size of other populations living in the NCE, as well as turn soil and scatter seeds.

As I mentioned, Grizzly bears can affect the human population in the NCE as well. The Upper Skagit Tribe has spoken out about the Importance of these bears to their culture and land. Historically, the Upper Skagit Tribe and grizzly bears coexisted in peace. Plan C stood out to me because if grizzly bears were to create any issues, it would give the authority the ability to intervene for safety. Thus, protecting those who might come across a bear, like hikers for example. The reintroduction of grizzlies may also provide education opportunities on the ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 1799Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98501
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,11 2023 21:23:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Address: Everett, WA 98203
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,11 2023 22:16:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The grizzlies are not present in the area for a reason. Fix the habitat first, remove the dams, and then think about reintroducing the animals or maybe perhaps they will come back naturally.

Correspondence ID: 1803Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,11 2023 22:40:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 1804Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98274
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,11 2023 22:42:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do not support grizzly reintroduction.

Correspondence ID: 1805Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Maple Valley, WA 98038
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,11 2023 22:53:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I oppose the decision to re-introduce grizzly bears into the north cascades. Grizzly bears populations are already rising and continuing in the state of Washington. With no way to legitimately manage overpopulations of grizzly bears, the threat of our state facing the many hurdles that states like Wyoming and Montana face it's a concern to Washington outdoorsmen and women, alongside outdoor enthusiasts of all kinds. We must then be concerned with our ungulate populations, who are already subject to predation with other carnivores, where ethical hunting and management in our state are being reduced.

Correspondence ID: 1806Project:112008Document:132104
Address: LEAVENWORTH, WA 98826
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,11 2023 23:06:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Thank you for considering grizzly bear reintroduction. I live in Leavenworth, Chelan County, Washington and I fully support the reintroduction. More specifically I support Alternative C, redesignating grizzlies in the North Cascades as an experimental population.

I have lived, backpacked, camped and hunted in grizzly country, in Montana, Wyoming, Canada and Alaska. One of the draws to those areas, for many residents, tourists and me, is the wildness that results from the presence of grizzly and wolf populations. The possibility of seeing these apex predators is one of the reasons people travel to places like Yellowstone, Glacier and Denali National Parks. The animals' presence does not keep people away, as some people who are opposed to the reintroduction suggest. Those parks are full of hikers, backpackers and campers hoping to encounter a grizzly or even to just

know that they are walking in the same valley or forest as one of these bears.

After generations of exterminating predators, we now know that they are essential to healthy ecosystems. Returning grizzlies to the North Cascades will help rebuild this ecosystem.

Education about living, hiking and camping in grizzly country will be essential for residents and visitors, once reintroduction occurs. It is very important for the safety of the bears as well as the people. There are plenty of examples from other areas that can be followed. The communities, towns and residents in grizzly country have been doing just that, and living with grizzlies for decades.

During my years of living in Montana, Wyoming and Alaska's grizzly country, I spent 1000+ miles on trails, usually backpacking, hiking and camping alone. I had dozens of encounters with grizzlies, one as close as the door of my tent, but never have I had an issue. This past summer I did another solo backpacking trip in Montana, unfortunately I did not get to see a grizzly, as I had hoped, but their sign was everywhere. Yes, one should camp and hike differently when in griz country, but the experience is so very much richer.

Selfishly, I hope to one day encounter a grizzly in the North Cascades. But, I also hope that we as a society can restore that ecosystem to some of its historic grandness, so that future generations can experience it as a true wild place, not the partly sanitized "wilderness" that it is now.

Correspondence ID: 1807Project:112008Document:132104
Address: North Bend, WA 98045
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,11 2023 23:06:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We already have grizzly bears in Washington. I have seen them myself while trying to enjoy the outdoors. Grizzly reintroduction will do nothing but create problems. I have had several other encounters with them in Idaho and Montana, and almost all of them had zero fear of my presence.

Washington State does not need a reintroduction program with this species. Watching reduced hunting methods with black bears and their population spreading into urban areas is the same thing that will happen with this completely protected species. Montana and Idaho are proof what happens when you introduce grizzly bears and have zero management on them. Two more people were killed and eaten by a grizzly bear on the Idaho/Washington border this past week. These interactions are becoming more frequent in the region. Alaska on the other hand gives every resident two free Brown/Grizzly bear tags because there's too many of them and they're becoming a nuisance to both life and property.

There are already enough grizzly bears completely protected in British Columbia, Idaho, and Montana where they can migrate here should their food source become a problem. Washington State is too urbanized and this reintroduction program will create more problems much in the same way it has elsewhere. It will do nothing more than cost the taxpayers of this State more money. Let them come here on their own accord.

Correspondence ID: 1808Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Birch Bay, WA 98230
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,11 2023 23:25:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I think we should do the alternative plan B. This is because the Grizzly bears are apex predators that can control populations of other animals. Grizzly bears are also known as a keystone species and can greatly affect the ecosystem. I think reintroducing them with the endangered species protection will allow them to get back up to the population goal of

200. Under the Endangered Species Protection Act grizzly bears can not be harmed unless it is in self-defense, allowing them to repopulate.

Grizzly bears can be dangerous. One problem is that they can get into trash cans. Grizzly bears can dig through trash which leaves a mess for people to pick up. They are also dangerous to campers. People go camping all the time, if there are a lot of bears, that means there is a greater chance for them to disturb the campers. They can also destroy property. However, they can bring in more traffic because people can go to parks to try to take photos of them, because they are cool to look at.

Correspondence ID: 1809Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Snohomish, WA 98290
United States of America

Outside Organization: Backcountry horsemen Non-Governmental

Received: Oct,12 2023

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Many of us are already increasingly anxious about riding in nearby areas because of the rise in the number of big cats and bears in local areas. I personally have seen two cougars while riding in Arlington this past summer, and one bobcat. Our neighbors nature cam has captured a bobcat and a black bear right on Dutch Hill in Snohomish. At Mann Rd there are 6 black bears (that happen to be brown) residing. Many of us understand that black bears aren't particularly aggressive and won't bother one if we just ride down another trail -- but grizzlies are very different. My best friend's uncle was killed by a grizzly in Yellowstone decades ago. He had no food in his tent, yet was mauled to death in his sleeping bag. You can't spin stories or expect me to believe a bunch of bad advice about how easy it is to avoid troubles with these aggressive animals. They are NOT shy, they are NOT easily avoided, and they are NOT easily discouraged. Introducing them back into Washington is idiotic in my opinion -- literally the idea of naive environmentalists who don't understand that Nature is not gentle. I've already heard a bunch of silly comments about how only idiots have been killed by grizzlies, people who did the wrong thing, or had a dog, or were in the wrong place at the wrong time. Well guess what? More and more casual hikers and their kiddos will get hurt because of imperfectly handled grizzly encounters if we introduce them into the areas we all love to explore. Or, worse yet, they will just stay out of the forests altogether if they have to have specialized equipment and knowledge to handle grizzly encounters. Discourage hiking and family adventuring, and there goes support for environmental protection. People who don't go into the outdoors don't value the outdoors. There will be a backlash of apathy, not only disinterest in protecting species but disinterest in keeping developers out of protected areas..... Keep natural areas safe for the public, and receive public support--make it unsafe and watch how little anyone will care to protect those areas over time. Stupid ideas need to Bo in the rubbish bin.

(I say all this knowing full well that this whole public input process is a sham, and you bureaucrats have already decided to move grizzlies into the state. Thanks for pretending to care.)

Correspondence ID: 1810Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Brewster, WA 98812
United States of America

Outside Organization: Non affiliated Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,12 2023 05:17:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: 4 Grizzly bear in Mt and Id have been shot in self defense during 2023 so far.

Here are what hunters are doing in Mt and Id.

Cut up natural sponges in 1" pieces and soak in liquefied bacon or hamburger grease. Do not touch them and place in freezer to harden. Spread many good size handfuls at dusk around Bear sign

It will kill bears, wolves and other non targeted predators.

I don't see this going anywhere good. Please reconsider this program.

Correspondence ID: 1811Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98502
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,12 2023 05:57:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: It would be unwise to introduce grizzlies back into the north cascades, for a multitude of reasons. First, being the fact that they are already a small number of bears there, despite the fact FWP denies it, while they actually confirm it as well. If there were no grizzlies in our state, then why do hunters have to take a black bear/grizzly identification test to hunt in the north cascades? I know many people who hunt up there and have physical seen grizzlies. Second, yet the proposed introduction only wants to add a few bears to start a breeding population. The number of bears on the landscape will be the straw that breaks the camels back, on our prey species in the region. Those animals are seeing a decreased population from the effects of other unchecked predator populations, since the 90's when dog hunting was outlawed. The population of mountain lions and bears has skyrocketed, also the cancellation of spring bear has not helped at all. And wolves have moved into the area, which have made a huge impact on the deer and elk population, the introduction of another predator, the apex predator of the west in fact, will do nothing but destroy the prey species numbers. Which leads into my third point, with prey species gone, they will turn to domestic livestock. Third, the presence of grizzlies on the landscape will lead to many human be at conflicts that will be deadly for humans, livestock, and bears. There are extensive trails systems through the north cascades, and it will not take long for hikers to deadly interactions with bears. The bears will false charge people who have no knowledge of grizzly behaviors and many bears will be shot and killed because of that, and as seen in places like Yellowstone. Hikers will want to get close and take pictures of the animals getting uncomfortably close, and the animals will kill them for food, and because they feel unsafe with the hum an presence. Bears will roam too, and with them decimating the prey species they will move to find livestock easy pickings. Farmers do not need bears eating livestock, which will take away from their livelihood, and it will be deadly for the bears. Bears that attack and eat livestock will be killed by farmers or by wildlife agents. Overall, it would be unwise to introduce grizzly bears into the north cascades, because they will have massive negative ecosystem impacts.

Correspondence ID: 1812Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98107
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,12 2023 06:21:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm a hiker and a hunter and would welcome grizzlies back to the North Cascades. They belong there.

Correspondence ID: 1813Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Hull, IA 51239
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,12 2023 06:30:03

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is a great plan, but keep the bears protected like they are in other states. Next send them to California. Maybe some of these people will see that management should be left to the states once they are forced to live with them.

Correspondence ID: 1814Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wauconda, WA 98859
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,12 2023 06:45:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Reintroducing grizzlies at this time is a terrible idea. The balance of predator to prey is already too far off. Since the reintroduction of wolves, we have seen the deer numbers falling steadily and the predation of livestock grow. This can only mean that the wolves have learned that as they kill off the deer that livestock are an easy target. Not allowing hunting with dogs to keep the cougars in check has added to there being too many of them also. Now they want to add grizzlies. Mother Nature is an amazing thing, if it's left to work, things balance out. When we start messing with nature, we always throw it out of balance. If this ground was still able to support grizzlies, there would be more around. They have moved where the food is. There are still some in the area. We see more black bear here too. We are being told a fairy tale. Why would you need to take a test that proves you can tell a black bear from a grizzly to get a tag if they weren't here?

Correspondence ID: 1815Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Olympia, WA 98512
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,12 2023 06:49:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Stop catering to a vocal minority. There is far more detrimental effects of bringing them back than benefits.

Correspondence ID: 1816Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Prosser, WA 99350
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,12 2023 07:29:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: This would be the worst thing ever for any wildlife in the cascade range. The elk and deer population already have a hard time with all of the other predators in the range. The most common deadly bear attacks in the 21 centuries is grizzly followed by black and last polar bears. This would increase the likelihood of attacks on people using the PCT due to already having a high number of black bears in the area.

Correspondence ID: 1817Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mountain Home, ID 83647
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,12 2023 07:49:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: While not opposed to bears being reintroduce to the North Cascades I do feel that we need to better manage the current population that are already established in Montana, Idaho and Wyoming. Removal of these animals as a "threatened species" so that state game management agencies can decide the best course of management would be a great start. I also feel that the information that is given about current populations is very misleading at best, as it only ever gives or focuses on the population in the "Yellowstone Area". However, Montana Game and Fish considers the entire western half of Montana grizzly country. So what is the entire estimated population of the whole state. Also, encounters between grizzlies and humans is only increasing every year which people are killed or severely injured with the current population and with Washington already closing spring Black Bear season there could not be any way to manage Grizzly in that state in the future. I also feel this in some ways is an emotional move to try and push hunters out due to the fact some hunters will stop based on a fear of these animals. Bottom line I feel that with the current expansion of the current population these animals will find their way into the North Cascades all on their own.

Correspondence ID: 1818Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America
Outside Organization: na Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,12 2023 07:49:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hello -

I have lived 5 miles North of Plain at the base of the Cascade Mountains for the last 33 years. I hike in the mountains north of me. For safety of people Who recreate, camp, hunt etc as well as residents- please do Not bring Grizzlies to our area.

Thank you for your time

Correspondence ID: 1819Project:112008Document:132104
Address: bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,12 2023 08:10:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: No bears please. We have a recreational paradise, bears change that.

Correspondence ID: 1820Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Kirkland, WA 98033
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,12 2023 08:51:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzly bears will naturally come back to the cascades. There is no reason to rush it that will only increase chances that you will have Bear human interaction that will lead to death of both bears and people.

Correspondence ID: 1821Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Spokane, WA 99005
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,12 2023 08:54:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a card carrying Native American and lifelong Washington Resident, I'm claiming legal standing regarding the issue of the augmentation of a remnant grizzly population in the North Cascade National Park.

I am solidly in favor of augmenting the last remaining members of my brother the bear.

In addition to the 550,000 acres of the North Cascades national park, there is the Paysayten Wilderness and the Mt. Baker Wilderness for the grizzly to thrive as was intended by the great creator.

As a native American I and my brethren revere the Grizzly. We lived in harmony with them for at least 25,000 years. We can continue to live in harmony with them.

Any residents who live in this area need to learn to keep their garbage in confined buildings, and not let garbage build up. They should eat their left overs not waste them.

Dan Newhouse should not stand in the way of this vital work. Please tell him so.

Correspondence ID: 1822Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,12 2023 09:25:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm opposed to the idea of reintroducing grizzly bear into Washington state. The greatest concern I have is that grizzlies would have a negative impact on mule deer and elk populations that are already on the decline in the eastern cascade mountains. Grizzly feed on young deer and elk fawns. We don't have an over abundance problem with these ungulates and current game management practices can be utilized to control populations if that became a problem in the future. Grizzly bear should be allowed to migrate into Washington if it occurs naturally but I don't see an upside to introducing them. We don't need them as a game species. Introducing them will inevitably lead to negative human interaction that otherwise could be avoided.

Correspondence ID: 1823Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bend, OR 97702
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,12 2023 09:34:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The human population and usage of that area has increased dramatically over the last few decades. Introducing grizzly bears will deter people from hiking, camping, and enjoying those areas. Do not introduce grizzly bears- fatal attacks are rare, but do happen.

Correspondence ID: 1824Project:112008Document:132104

Address: yakima, WA 98908
United States of America

Outside Organization: WSDA Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,12 2023 09:37:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please re-introduce the grizzly bear back into its native range in Washington State starting in the Northern Cascades and hopefully one day into the Olympic peninsula. This is an incredible first step to help these threatened species begin to re-inhabit the landscape where they belong.

Correspondence ID: 1825Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spokane, WA 99218
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,12 2023 10:00:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am a resident of the state of Washington living in Spokane. I frequently go camping to our national parks.

I am in support of the augmentation of the remnant, non sustainable population of grizzly bears in their historic grounds the "North Cascades National Park";

As the Mt. Baker Wilderness Area is contiguous with the North Cascades along with the Payseyton Wilderness across Ross lake there is certainly enough wild land for the augmented population to sustain itself.
Across the Canadian boundary lies more wild lands.

Genetic Diversity will be enhanced with the introduction of new members.

Our beautiful state has had the motto, "Keep Washington Green"; for decades, We should live up to this.

I do not understand Dan Newhouse's efforts to interfere with this comment period.

Correspondence ID: 1826Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,12 2023 10:09:56

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please STOP this plan, do not allow Grizzlies to be released in WA STATE. A grizzly bear is a powerful force of nature that cannot be controlled. As the population moves into the majestic mountains of our state to live and recreate, interaction with apex bears will collide at some point. With wildfires rising threat every summer, Grizzlies will need to change a typical roaming range to survive fires and changing environments. No one can predict where they may choose to roam once released. Keep the public on public and private lands safe from these predators.

Correspondence ID: 1827Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Temple Terrace, FL 33617-3702
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,12 2023 10:14:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: With only 24 people per square mile in this area, I believe the bears would have little to no negative impact on the people living in this area. The bears would have a positive environmental impact on their historic range and should be reintroduced.

Correspondence ID: 1828Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98512
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,12 2023 10:28:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please stop release of grizzly bears into Washington's forests

Correspondence ID: 1829Project:112008Document:132104

Address: RIDGEFIELD, WA 98642
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,12 2023 10:33:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The American Bear Foundation of Washington opposes the reintroduction of grizzly bears into the North Cascades. As stated by WDFW grizzly bears already exist in this range as they migrate in from Canada and Idaho. Along with an increasing human population, the existing challenges with the black bear, cougar, and wolf populations in Washington highlight the need to avoid adding more pressure on our wildlife. Humans should not be reintroducing more apex predators.

Correspondence ID: 1830Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seatt, WA 98103
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,12 2023 11:03:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not support the reintroduction of Grizzlies. Focus on rehabilitating and conserving the ecosystem. Bears will return on their own when the area can support them. If any proactive measure should be taken, it should be the addition/expansion of wildlife corridors and wildlife crossings.

Correspondence ID: 1831Project:112008Document:132104

Address: winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,12 2023 11:06:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am not in favor of the reintroduction of Grizzly bears into the north cascades ecosystem. I have spent time in Montana and Alaska and was forced to carry protection anytime I left my tent. I personally know many people that have been attacked. I do not wish to feel threatened while recreating in the north cascades. I believe we should keep the grizzly bears in their current range.

Correspondence ID: 1832Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,12 2023 11:19:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am a single female avid hiker. Living in the Methow on the edge of the North Cascades provides the ultimate location for this. The introduction of Grizzly bears is a major fear. I hike with dogs, and this would panic me. My safety and the lives of my dogs would all be in jeopardy with these massive bears. People in Alaska, Montana and Wyoming where these bears already live have stories of them killing and endangering people, pets and wildlife. Everyone living where grizzly bears roam wild have guns for protection. When COVID hit, the number of people that are adventuring in the North Cascades has skyrocketed, and only continued to be more populous. People should not have to carry weapons, and we all know bear spray isn't going to keep a grizzly bear at bay.

You currently have cougars and WAY more wolves than anyone at the fish and wildlife department want to recognize. They are demolishing the deer and moose populations in the North Cascades. So adding in another predator will decimate those remaining. When do the animals we already have here, deer, moose, and other small creatures become the priority? And when there is less and less food due to the increase in predators and decrease in their food populations, what will these bears eat? Hikers? Cattle?

Between the safety of the thousands of people that are experiencing the wonder of the north cascades and the animals that are currently trying to beat the predators survive, it seems foolish that anyone would think to reintroduce an animal that would endanger what is already living in the north cascades.

Correspondence ID: 1833Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,12 2023 11:20:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am a single female avid hiker. Living in the Methow on the edge of the North Cascades provides the ultimate location for this. The introduction of Grizzly bears is a major fear. I hike with dogs, and this would panic me. My safety and the lives of my dogs would all be in jeopardy with these massive bears. People in Alaska, Montana and Wyoming where these bears already live have stories of them killing and endangering people, pets and wildlife. Everyone living where grizzly bears roam wild have guns for protection. When COVID hit, the number of people that are adventuring in the North Cascades has skyrocketed, and only continued to be more populous. People should not have to carry weapons, and we all know bear spray isn't going to keep a grizzly bear at bay.

You currently have cougars and WAY more wolves than anyone at the fish and wildlife department want to recognize. They are demolishing the deer and moose populations in the North Cascades. So adding in another predator will decimate those

remaining. When do the animals we already have here, deer, moose, and other small creatures become the priority? And when there is less and less food due to the increase in predators and decrease in their food populations, what will these bears eat? Hikers? Cattle?

Between the safety of the thousands of people that are experiencing the wonder of the north cascades and the animals that are currently trying to beat the predators survive, it seems foolish that anyone would think to reintroduce an animal that would endanger what is already living in the north cascades.

Correspondence ID: 1834Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Cashmere, WA 98815-1713
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,12 2023 11:28:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As an avid hiker, hunter, and flyfisherman, I adamantly oppose any thought of adding grizzly bears to any part of Washington state, or for that matter, any part of the US. There are enough grizzly bears now, so don't mess with nature and increase the odds of grizzly bear attacks.

Correspondence ID: 1835Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Burien, WA 98168
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,12 2023 11:31:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We spend a lot of time in our forests and parks hiking, camping, exploring, and communing with nature. We are already terrified of the bears already here that tend to leave humans alone, introducing Grizzlies sounds like a terrible idea that will lead to death and injury for both humans and bears. PLEASE NO!

Correspondence ID: 1836Project:112008Document:132104

Address: La Center, WA 98629
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,12 2023 12:07:58

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: It has come to my attention that there are those who would like to reintroduce Grizzly Bears back into Washington State. With the location being that of Chelan County. While it is a remote location it is also very mountainous and during winter months they will migrate to lower elevations putting them closer to livestock and people. Montana is currently having to deal with ideas others had when they were introduced there. Loss of life for livestock and humans. Is this the path you desire to follow? "A state law prohibits Washington wildlife managers from transplanting or introducing grizzlies in the state"; The other harm that I see with this thought is the impact this would have on the wild salmon population. So please do not let this proposal move forward, stop it in its tracks now.

regards

████████████████████

Correspondence ID: 1837Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Roslyn, WA 98941
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,12 2023 12:35:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Thank you for reading my comment. I do not support the reintroduction of Grizzly Bears to this region. Washington State has significantly more human pressure on the landscape than other states with Grizzlies such as Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming. Despite less pressure on the landscape, there are still run-ins between bears and humans resulting in the mangling or death of both parties involved. We have established Grizzly populations in lots of areas across the country, the North Cascades does not need to be one of them, in my personal opinion. Thank you again, and please do not reintroduce these bears.

Correspondence ID: 1838Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tukwila, WA 98168
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,12 2023 12:42:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: It is essential that we take steps to support the ecological heritage of our region, including reintroducing grizzly bears. Grizzlies as a species are no less entitled to their ancestral home than the humans who adventure, live and work in the North Cascade. I think it would be wonderful to advance this proposal.

Correspondence ID: 1839Project:112008Document:132104

Address: OROVILLE, WA 98844
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,12 2023 13:30:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am OPPOSED to the reintroduction of grizzlies to our communities. IF there was plenty of food and habitat resources for the bears in this area, they would move in on their own. Your introduction of wolves to our communities have shown that you do not help with long term problems that come with reintroduction of these animals. Our deer populations are dwindling because of the wolf packs and the cougars that aren't being hunted. The bear will also impact the salmon runs in the area. What will you do to help when the bear are in the rivers running through our towns to get to the salmon? The bears will migrate where the food is. Not stay in an area you have designated as appropriate for them. I also DO NOT agree that activists that live in urban areas not effected by the proposals should have a say what happens in other communities. Bringing wolves to our communities were proposed by these same people yet they don't suffer the consequences of the impact of the action. We can discuss bringing grizzlies into our communities when THEY step up and bring wolves to their backyards!
I choose the DO NOTHING option of this EIS.

Correspondence ID: 1840Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,12 2023 13:37:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am not in favor of reintroducing brown bear into the North Cascades.

For one, I do believe that the grizzlies present North of the Canadian border are expanding their range and are naturally moving down into the park on their own. I have many friends who spend a lot of time in the mountains and several have reported seeing brown bears in Washington over the last decade, some as recent as last year.

Secondly, I do not believe that once reintroduced they will stay within the park. I believe they will start moving down into Skagit Valley and interfering with many of the farming and ag operations down there, as well as the surrounding National Forest areas.

Another concern I have is the effect on Elk and Moose populations. I am aware that preying on Elk and Moose calves consist

of less than 5% of an interior brown bear's diet, however, it does happen, and Western Washington/North Cascades are already struggling with both Elk and Moose populations.

Lastly, as exemplified most recently by the brown bear attack near Banff National Park, in the Red Deer River Valley, they are dangerous even for those who have grown up in grizzly territory and spent a long time co-inhabiting with these animals. I do not believe that most outdoor enthusiasts in Washington are prepared for the reality of recreating in grizzly territory.

Personally, I love brown bears - in fact, they are probably my favorite animal - and I have had the pleasure of spending quite a bit of time around coastal bears in Southeast Alaska. I cherish every opportunity I have to get close to these majestic animals, however, I do believe that coastal bears are typically far less aggressive and are much less likely to display predatory behavior due to having a surplus of food than interior ones.

It is for all of these reasons that I simply do not support the initiative to reintroduce brown bears into the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 1841Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Snohomish, WA 98296
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,12 2023 13:41:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We are greatly concerned that this would increase the conflict between humans and wildlife and would restrict us from doing any outdoor activity with kids in and near north cascade area

Correspondence ID: 1842Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,12 2023 13:44:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am writing to oppose the re-introduction of grizzly bears into the PNW. Having recently read about deadly attacks in Montana and Banff I think the risks (people will get killed) do not justify this action. While they have in the past been part of this ecosystem they have not been in a long time. And this is very different from, for example, reintroducing wolves to Yellowstone and beyond. Wolves have an ecosystem wide impact changing the whole system and the landscape itself, all of which has been well documented. Grizzly bears, on the other hand, present far more risk of death to people - especially people who are in the cascades all the time with NO GRIZZLY BEAR EXPERIENCE. This is a set up for massive problems, bear encounters, people getting hurt, and the bears getting tracked down and killed. Yes our region can support them but that is different from a massive ecosystem benefit (from what I have read there is no major benefit w Grizzly reintroduction - the ecosystem will remain as is mostly but it will include grizzly bears). That's just not worth the risk and there is also no risk that Grizzlies will become extinct - they are increasing in many places and thriving.

Correspondence ID: 1843Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Woodinville, WA 98077
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,12 2023 14:28:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I feel strongly about re-introducing and strengthening the population of Grizzly Bears in the Northern Cascades. They are an important part of our ecosystem. I do not believe that humans have the right to drive any animal out of their natural habitat. Let's bring the Grizzly bear back.

Correspondence ID: 1844Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Puyallup, WA 98374
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,12 2023 16:27:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: In what way is this going to help our deer and elk populations in Washington state
How is this going to support hunting for future generations

Correspondence ID: 1845Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,12 2023 17:08:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am opposed to in restoring grizzlies to the North Cascades. Please don't do it.

Correspondence ID: 1846Project:112008Document:132104
Address: White city, OR 97503
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,12 2023 17:17:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I think it's a great idea, they should be put into every city park in the country, as I am sure they once "historically roamed there".
It amazes me that people with "higher education" could possibly come to the conclusion that "this is a good idea".
Native Americans or Indians(not sure what your book called them?) historically roamed the entire continent. Maybe if all the bleeding heart liberal, Biden supporters book a trip to somewhere other than earth we could give them back there historic range.After that we could even bring back the dinosaurs. Your grandparents would be sick at your logic.
MORONS!

Correspondence ID: 1847Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Sedro-Woolley, WA 98284
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,12 2023 17:34:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We finally get a moose to make an appearance on Diablo Lake and we want to introduce a grizzly population to the park? Consider the damaged it will do to our current healthy ecosystem with the wildlife flourishing in the park. This is a damaging idea. The answer is absolutely not, no grizzlies,, our black bears are adequate.

Correspondence ID: 1848Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Arlington, WA 98223
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,12 2023 18:22:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzly bears deserve to be here just as much as we do. They are an important part of the ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 1849Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Tacoma, WA 98335
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,12 2023 19:44:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am in very strong support of this proposal, and am happy with Option B or C, but prefer Option C.

Option A seems bizarre and counter to the goals of re-establishing grizzly populations in the North Cascades.

Thank you

Correspondence ID: 1850Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Penrose, NC 28766
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,12 2023 19:55:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of grizzlies & would prefer them listed as an experimental population.

Correspondence ID: 1851Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Eastsound, WA 98245
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,12 2023 20:30:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: YES. I'm in full support of restoring grizzlies to their rightful ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 1852Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Acme, WA 98220
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,12 2023 20:42:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I strongly disapprove of the efforts to reintroduce grizzly bears into the north cascades.

Correspondence ID: 1853Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Davenport, WA 99122
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,12 2023 20:59:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzly's are in the state already. There is no need to reintroduce. There is no need to add more. We are doing fine. Humans have completely changed the landscape since grizzlies were more prominent in the cascades. Blame it on humans but there is no place for them anymore.

Correspondence ID: 1854Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Sequim, WA 98382
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,12 2023 21:32:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support wild places being left wild. But I must say the idea of introducing Grizzly bears into the WA cAscades sounds scary.

I would not be comfortable camping there in a tent, or even hiking. Especially after hearing about those backpackers in Canada who emptied a big can of bear spray and still got killed by an aggressive Grizzly.

I think it would be better to focus on putting money and effort into restoring the watershed and the salmon.

Leave the grizzlies where they are.

I know they used to be here, but really for the safety and peace of mind of most of the humans who live here, I think this idea of reintroducing this predator should be relinquished.

It just would be a matter of time before a tragic interaction with humans would happen.

Isn't there enough suffering in the world right now?

Correspondence ID: 1855Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98199
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,12 2023 23:03:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Our family supports the return of grizzlies as a necessary part of our region's ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 1856Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tacoma, WA 98443
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,13 2023 08:03:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in support of grizzly reintroduction into the North Cascades. They are the only large mammal native to the region that is still missing.

Thanks!

Correspondence ID: 1857Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,13 2023 09:05:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support reintroduction of grizzlies into the north cascades. They are a natural and critical part of this regions ecological health. Although the reintroduction will require human education, adaption and resources to ensure success, it is appropriate and right.

Correspondence ID: 1858Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Viola, ID 83872
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,13 2023 09:10:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Yes, I fully support reintroducing grizzly bears back into this area. As an avid outdoors person, I respect and appreciate the natural diversity that is supposed to exist in the wilderness. These proposed numbers are so small given the size of the territory that human Grizzly conflicts are very unlikely. I've seen the numbers on livestock killings and it's so ridiculously small. Human fears and greed are changing this planet permanently and that is a huge mistake. Bring in the bears!

Correspondence ID: 1859Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Snohomish, WA 98290
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,13 2023 09:18:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Ecological Balance: Grizzly bears play a crucial role in maintaining the ecological balance of the North Cascades by regulating prey populations such as deer and elk. Their presence helps prevent overgrazing and allows for a healthier, more diverse ecosystem.

Biodiversity Conservation: Reintroducing grizzly bears would contribute to the conservation of biodiversity in the region, as they are an integral part of the natural food chain. Their presence would promote a more robust and resilient ecosystem, benefiting various plant and animal species that depend on the natural balance.

Cultural and Spiritual Significance: Grizzly bears hold significant cultural and spiritual importance for many Native American tribes in the Pacific Northwest. Reintroducing them would help preserve cultural heritage and traditional values, fostering a stronger connection between indigenous communities and their ancestral lands.

Tourism and Economic Benefits: The presence of grizzly bears in the North Cascades would likely attract wildlife enthusiasts, researchers, and tourists interested in observing these magnificent creatures in their natural habitat. This could stimulate local economies by generating revenue through eco-tourism, outdoor recreational activities, and related businesses, thus supporting sustainable economic growth in the region.

Ecosystem Education and Research: Reintroducing grizzly bears would provide a valuable opportunity for educational and research purposes. Scientists and conservationists could study their behavior, habitat requirements, and interactions with other species, contributing to a better understanding of ecosystem dynamics. This knowledge could inform future conservation efforts and wildlife management strategies not only in the North Cascades but also in other similar habitats globally.

Correspondence ID: 1860Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Colville, WA 99114
United States of America

Outside Organization: self Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,13 2023 09:39:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Not a good idea. Restoration projects brings trouble to the area(s). Example: Turkeys "restored" in Stevens County, WA in 1961 have resulted in huge amounts of these peskt birds from Kettle Falls, WA to beyond Spokane. Wolves released in Eastern Washington have brought trouble for owners of cattle and sheep. Grizzly bears could bring a dangerous challenge to hikers and cattle and people living near the proposed drop-off areas. . Recently, a grizzly was relocated from Stevens County (Onion creek area) to Ione, Wa area because it had killed a cow and injured a horse, now it is again causing problems in the Ione area. It sounds like a "romantic" idea, why not introduce white sharks into Priest lake, Idaho? Good idea? Reason it out.

Correspondence ID: 1861Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sandy, OR 97055
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,13 2023 09:55:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I was reading about the possible grizzly reintroduction into the North Cascades and I just wanted to share my objections. While I have respect for animals and nature, I don't feel introducing grizzlies would be beneficial. I feel it poses a safety hazard to people that hike in those areas. I have a son who sometimes walks home alone and I'm sure there are

other parents who wouldn't feel comfortable knowing that a grizzly could possibly be close by. We live in a rural area and we enjoy hiking in the Cascades, but wouldn't feel safe doing that if we knew there were grizzlies around. I understand they are dwindling in numbers but they do have a habitat in Yellowstone and I don't understand what the benefit would be to having them elsewhere.

Correspondence ID: 1862Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Port Hadlock, WA 98339
United States of America
Outside Organization: Global Earth Repair Foundation Non-Governmental(Official Rep.)
Received: Oct,13 2023 09:57:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support grizzly re-introduction in the North Cascades. using the 10(j) rule.

I live and farm in the Methow Valley during the growing season and frequently hike.

It would be a shame if humans were the only dangerous animal left on the planet.

Correspondence ID: 1863Project:112008Document:132104
Address: TWISP, WA 98856
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,13 2023 10:11:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To Whom It May Concern,

I am a local resident in the area affected by the Grizzly Bear Plan(s).

I strongly support the RETURN of Grizzlies to Washington. Predators such as the grizzly are crucial to the ecosystem. An apex predator is key to the balance and additionally with climate change the apex predators will be indicators as to the health of the ecosystem as it changes in response to climate change.

The concerns of ranchers are real, of course, but all plans have some issues and reintroduction does not pose insurmountable burden on the human population.

Grizzlies improve the overall health of the system and the net benefit far outweighs the burden.

Of the plans, I most strongly favor Plan C.

Sincerely,

██████████
██████████

Correspondence ID: 1864Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,13 2023 10:21:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To Whom It May Concern:

As a member of the human species, I must express my whole-hearted support for the reintroduction of grizzlies into the North Cascades. As much as I love humanity and respect my fellow human beings, I will always support animal life because

of the unimaginable suffering that all animal life has endured at the hands of my fellow humans.

Bring back the bear and the buffalo, the wolves and all other great fauna. We need to make space, and if a few humans are unfortunate enough to suffer as a result, that is our karma.

██████████
██████████

Correspondence ID: 1865Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Yakima, WA 98908
United States of America
Outside Organization: Private Citizen Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,13 2023 10:53:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: ██████████

██████████
██████████
████████████████████

To: US Fish and Wildlife Service
Address: Some sort of a secret only the FWS knows
Probably somewhere in the US

I am opposed to the release and management of Grizzly Bear into the State of Washington and specifically the North Cascades National Park Complex. Presently, with the active brown bear population, the predator/predation ecosystem is at a suitable balance for the predation species. Introducing the grizzly would upset that system and cause it irreparable harm. In my opinion, the Black Bear is the only bear that can fit into present and future wildlife populations.

Additionally, for more reasons that I can detail in this letter, the Grizzly Bear is not compatible with established long term and area wide travel patterns of Washington State. A good example is the thousands of Pacific Crest Trail hikers who end their trek in the North Cascades south of the Canadian Border, having gotten there by passing over 2,000 miles of non-grizzly populations. Additionally, introducing Grizzly to Washington State will discourage families with young children, older visitors, and handicap. PLEASE, do not introduce or manage Grizzly in Washington State.

Sincerely, ██████████

Correspondence ID: 1866Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mazama, WA 98833
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,13 2023 11:06:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am in favor of the NPS and US Fish & Wildlife Service's grizzly restoration plan. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 1867Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98116
United States of America
Outside Organization: M Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,13 2023 11:49:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I have lived in Washington my entire life, studied environmental education and had the privilege of working in the North Cascades NP at the North Cascades Institute. I have studied grizzly bears from an ecological and

cultural perspective and it is abundantly clear to me that they should be reintroduced under "Alternative C". I currently work in Glacier NP where we have grizzlies and to me it is a perfect example of how humans and bears can cohabitate when people are properly educated. The North Cascades is the historic homeland of healthy grizzly bear populations and it only seems right that we reintroduce them to that land for their benefit, the lands benefit and for the benefit of humans as well.

Why this is still being discussed is beyond me. Why the government spends money and time on an EIS to reintroduce a species to their historical landscape that has the carrying capacity for them is beyond me, especially when getting an EIS for pipelines, lithium mines, copper mines, crossing or on indigenous sovereign land isn't often taken seemingly as serious... I digress.

I strongly support "Alternative C" and sincerely hope that Grizzlies will one day soon freely roam and thrive throughout the Northern Cascades. In addition I hope that community education is thorough and far reaching. As someone who worked closely with the public every day I know there are a lot of widely held misconceptions about bears, their behavior and what to do in case of an encounter and I hope that education is heavily emphasized and implemented as part of the reintroduction plan "Alternative C".

Correspondence ID: 1868Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98199
United States of America
Outside Organization: Retired Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,13 2023 12:31:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Why not bring back the dinosaur? Grizzlies SHOULD NOT BE BROUGHT BACK TO WASHINGTON STATE. It was a huge undertaking to get them removed from Washington state. They are dangerous and will create a problem for farmers, campers and hunters. Besides the obvious it will be a long costly project. Grizzlies ARE NOT endangered and are doing fine in Alaska. I/we are STRONGLY OPPOSED to returning the grizzly population to WA STATE.

Correspondence ID: 1869Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98125
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,13 2023 13:01:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: This plan seems reckless for park visitors and staff. I understand the rationale from an ecosystem and heritage perspective. But we have a status quo that works, and the most obvious option is to leave this as is. North Cascades is a difficult to access park, and I can't imagine grizzly sightseeing being something the vast majority of visitors along highway 20 would ever experience. I hope there would never be a grizzly down at Cascade pass. I don't buy the argument that this is for the enjoyment of visitors. For those of us who venture into the Backcountry, a grizzly encounter would be dangerous and terrifying experience. I think I this would actively deter visitation to the park. We aren't talking about reintroducing Fishers here. Even if grizzly encounters are rare, it is a matter of when, not if, a visitor or employee of the park will be seriously injured or killed. Our neighbors to the north already deal with this. The difference is that they have a continuous population of bears, and we do not. We don't need to do this. Please stick with the status quo

Correspondence ID: 1870Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,13 2023 13:18:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am 100% for the re-introduction of Grizzly Bears into the North Cascades with Alternative B preferred. I have lived and worked in Denali National Park for many years and know first hand that grizzly/human/animal interactions positively can be managed. Do what is right and bring these bears back!

Correspondence ID: 1871Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,13 2023 13:21:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in favor with the proposal to reintroduce grizzlies to their natural habitat.

Correspondence ID: 1872Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kennewick, WA 99338
United States of America

Outside Organization: self Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,13 2023 14:09:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is the most stupid idea since bringing wolves back. Why would we spend money to reintroduce them, so we can spend more money to manage and try to control them, then more money to compensate ranchers for damage from them? What is the point? Why would we do this, when they kill the very game that hunters pay a lot of money to harvest, do the bears pay taxes or do they buy licenses to kill our states resources? Hunters do, so why does this department, fish and game, constantly seek to destroy our opportunities? Why does this department continually mismanage the game? In the Blue Mountains, even for archery, the majority of the areas are spike only for elk while huge Bulls die of old age or from Native Americans basically poaching. The any elk areas have no elk in them, and what is the point of 3 point or better for deer, so the 2 pointers can do all the breeding? Maybe it is because the director of the fish and game, is a non hunting liberal that would rather that nobody hunts at all. I wonder if he or she would even have a job if the hunters did not pay for the privilege to hunt?

Correspondence ID: 1873Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Portland, OR 97215
United States of America

Outside Organization: none Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,13 2023 15:39:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears are a vital aspect of North Cascade ecology. Bringing b ack viable populations is good for the integrity of the land. The dangers of having them in this region have been distorted and overblown and it is about time that they return.

Correspondence ID: 1874Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,13 2023 15:39:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a lifelong advocate of wildlife and replenishing endangered species, I have been in support of plans to restore the grizzly bear to the North Cascades Ecosystem since moving to Twisp in the late 1970s. Living 13 miles from town up Twisp River, surrounded by the Okanogan National Forest and Lake Chelan Sawtooth wilderness Area, I got to know my wildlife neighbors quite well. Black bears were annual visitors to the lower meadows and aquatically occupied beaver ponds below my cabin. The only native species not present were those, like grizzly bears, who had been hunted and trapped to

virtual extinction in the previous century.

I had spent time in close proximity of grizzly bears while working in Alaska but had nothing like the countless experiences I've had with them as a wildlife photographer in Alaska, Canada, Montana and Wyoming. I can comfortably say that I've spent more time around more grizzly bears than anyone in this part of the country. I have a healthy respect for them, but I'm not afraid of bears, like so many people have been taught to be (especially by a state representative who makes his home down in Yakima and is actively campaigning against the species).

Grizzly bears prefer wild areas, devoid of people (if possible), so I highly doubt any politicians will have a problem with them breaking into homes around Yakima anytime soon. Personally, I'd much rather live near grizzly bears than anywhere near the crush of humanity in places like Yakima or so much of the country that, sadly, will never see the likes of grizzly bears again.

For these reasons and more, I'm in Support of the Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan for the North Cascades Ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 1875Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bothell, WA 98012
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,13 2023 16:34:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: If Grizzlies are going to show up in Washington, it should be from natural migration, not a human backed reintroduction. If bears are collected from an area where they have little to no contact with humans, what happens when human/bear contact is made, and the human has no weapon to defend themselves?

Correspondence ID: 1876Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Belgrade, MT 59714
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,13 2023 16:39:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears should not be planted in the North cascades, let them sleepy come down from the north.

Correspondence ID: 1877Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Colville, WA 99114
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,13 2023 16:50:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears are not in danger of extinction. We live in this part of the US to enjoy the outdoors and we are already threatened by the wolves and cougars. We don't need another predator.

Correspondence ID: 1878Project:112008Document:132104

Address: MAZAMA, WA 98833
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,13 2023 16:52:48

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I live in the Methow Valley and am a regular user of North Cascades NP and the surrounding NFS wildlands. I support the Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan, specifically alternative C because it will actively restore grizzlies in a slow, carefully-monitored process that includes management flexibility.

Under Alternative A, it is unlikely that grizzlies would return to the North Cascades on their own. Under Alternative B, local communities living in the recovery zone would have more limited access to conflict mitigation resources.

I support grizzly restoration in the North Cascades because:

-If not here then where?

-Grizzly bears have lived on this landscape for thousands of years and deserve to be here.

-Grizzly bears are an endangered species that we must actively recover or risk losing. Not supporting restoration is in effect supporting extinction.

-I hope to see a grizzly bear in the North Cascades one day. But even if I am never fortunate enough to see one, knowing they are there makes me happy and proud to live here.

Correspondence ID: 1879Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America
Outside Organization: N/A Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,13 2023 17:02:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: In Re: Grizzly Bear Reintroduction to the North Cascades Ecosystem

October 13, 2023

Dear National Park Service:

As resident of the North Cascades Ecosystem, I stand in support of the conditional reintroduction of *Ursus Horribilis*, the grizzly Bear, to the wildlands of the North Cascades. I am aware that my comments are part of the public record, and I have no concern over having them accessed by other publics, organizations, or agencies.

The concerns that should be thoroughly examined in the EIS to ensure the successful reintroduction of grizzlies while complying with existing laws are as follows:

- 1) Grizzlies to be reintroduced should be gleaned from areas where their population is presently stable. Alaska comes immediately to mind.
- 2) Every effort should be made to care for bears during the reintroduction process so that the shock of being drugged, transported, and placed in an unfamiliar location does not result in bear mortality.
- 3) The use of helicopters to relocate grizzlies should be minimized, and no helicopter landings should be allowed within designated wilderness. To release bears into desired locations within designated wilderness, a helicopter could be legally used so long as it released the bear from a sling without landing. However, as outlined below, options for reintroduction using only existing roads should be examined. In addition, if management of bears is deemed necessary post-release, access to bears in backcountry should be by foot or pack animals only--no continued use of helicopters for ground examination should be permitted. The EIS should state succinctly what human intervention would be deemed necessary for bear survival after bears have been released. Monitoring of bears can and should be accomplished without using motorized vehicles in wilderness areas.
- 4) The National Park Service and U.S. Forest Service should jointly embark on an intensive public education campaign to minimize potentially dangerous encounters between grizzlies and humans, both in local rural communities and in the backcountry. The local public, and recreationists using backcountry, should be fully informed of what measures to take to avoid grizzlies, and what to do if encountering a grizzly bear. In addition, the State of Washington should educate hunters (bear hunters or pursuers of other game animals) on how to distinguish a grizzly from a black bear. Killing a grizzly bear for any reason other than justifiable self-defense should be met with legal consequences under the Endangered Species Act to be enforced by the respective federal agencies.
- 5) The EIS should analyze the potential for grizzlies reintroduced in the North Cascades Ecosystem to migrate to other areas in Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, British Columbia, and Alberta so that an island population is not created. If natural mixing of separate existing populations seems unlikely, the EIS should state what measures would be needed to facilitate migration to diversify the gene pool, for example, road closures and habitat restoration between island populations. This consideration

should not preclude reintroduction if migration of bears is not likely, only to set the stage for expanding grizzly habitat.

6) Presently unprotected roadless areas within the reintroduction zone should ultimately be permanently protected to ensure activities like road construction and logging do not reduce the quality of undisturbed, secluded habitat grizzlies require. While this may seem to be outside the scope of the EIS analysis, it is not improper to recommend measures to Congress that will better protect grizzlies.

The EIS should endeavor to address the above concerns and principles by establishing a number of alternatives that would eliminate the perceived need for exceptions to existing law, and to facilitate release plans that are more "griz-friendly." I do not believe that two alternatives, as presently proposed, provides for the full range of reasonable options possible.

Some recommendations for reintroduction that would not require helicopter use in designated wilderness would be to release bears (either by helicopter or ground-based vehicle) along roads that separate wilderness areas. For example, roads end on the upper Twisp River Road; Slate Peak north of Hart's Pass; The end of Eightmile Creek Road south of the Pasayten Wilderness; the end of the road along the Chiwawa River near Trinity; and the end of the road at Cascade Pass. Releasing bears by helicopter as deep as possible into backcountry which is designated wilderness, does not reduce the potentials for bear/human contact. Once released, there's no guarantee the bears will remain deep in backcountry, they will presumably go where the habitat leads them to survival.

This concludes my comments. I am grateful for your consideration.

██████████
██████████
██████████

Correspondence ID: 1880Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,13 2023 17:44:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a Washington state resident, and an avid hiker and backpacker I think this is a horrible idea! Just last week a very experienced backpacking couple and their dog were brutally mauled to DEATH in Banff. By all reports they carried bear spray and had been doing this for many years. Why on earth would you CHOOSE to do this to the outdoor adventurerers in the Pacific Northwest.

I know you will say 'hey, we areonly going to introduce them in remote regions'. And what is your plan when that population breeds,gorws, and expands into regions where we recreate.

The bears in Yellowstone apparently didn't adhere to their required area when that young girl was slaughtered by a Grizzly in west Yellowstone. These are no archived stories. THEY JUST HAPPENED!

And if you do this, it will happen again. Maybe the next time it will be a family with young kids. And when it happens, those deaths are on YOU!!!!!!

Correspondence ID: 1881Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Addy, WA 99101
United States of America
Outside Organization: Stevens County Cattlemen's Association Non-Governmental(Official Rep.)
Received: Oct,13 2023 17:50:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The Stevens County Cattlemen's Association is writing in opposition to the proposed plan to re-introduce grizzlies into the Northern Cascades Region. In reviewing the Draft EIS not only does it ignore many critical details on the impact reintroduction will have, but also has no effective plan on how to manage these animals.

Under Alternative B in the Draft EIS, an estimated figure of 18 to 19 cattle and 3 to 4 sheep depredations per year is used. This estimate was reached by using figures from Montana and their bear population.

We believe this figure to be extremely low for the population goal of 200 bears. Montana is a far more remote state, limiting cattle interactions with predators and has a broader ungulate base to choose from.

Ungulate populations have been pushed to the brink by an ever-increasing apex predator population in our state. We also have seen this in northeast Washington with grey wolves - once ungulate populations become less abundant predators will turn to our livestock. Once livestock predation begins it will increase every year unless severe predator removal actions are taken.

In appendix D a proposed "Guideline for Grizzly Bear Control Action" would require three separate attacks by a grizzly bear on livestock before action would be taken. This is a similar method employed in our region for grey wolves and does not work. Attacks continue to happen every year and escalate in size and frequency. The Draft EIS not only minimizes the scope of possible attacks but proposes to use a failed policy for control of these animals.

Also lacking in the plan is any idea of how to manage the bear population after it reaches the goal of 200 bears and how to manage the population once they spread out of the North Cascade Region. Predators of any type not only reproduce, but over time they will spread. As this population grows, negative interactions with livestock, people or pets will grow and present itself as a larger problem. A plan with no idea or thought of how to control the population of grizzlies over 200 and outside the North Cascade Region will only end in failure and an out-of-control population.

Public safety is also a factor considered seemingly as an afterthought in this plan. Many people work, make their living and recreate in the forest, including ranchers. Oftentimes working alone in highly remote areas ranchers face a good deal of risk from injury or attack. With other apex predators such as wolves and cougars already existing in these areas, adding grizzly bears would only make it more dangerous. Grizzly Bears have proven multiple times that they can and will kill humans. Just a month ago a bear that had previously attacked two separate people and killed one had to be euthanized in West Yellowstone after breaking into someone's home.

As mentioned before, how will these interactions unfold as this population expands? As bears encounter more populated areas there will be more incidents of aggressive behavior and attacks. This can be seen in states with existing populations of grizzlies like Montana. Grizzly bears will get into populated areas and search for food. Several feedlots have had to take preventative measures against bears eating grain and killing cattle - these are workplaces where there is daily human presence and machinery being operated.

The Stevens County Cattlemen's Association strongly supports Alternative A in the Draft EIS which is to take no action. Reintroduction of the Grizzly Bear to the state of Washington provides no benefits to the economy, safety or ecosystem. Ranchers will bear the brunt of financial impact, public safety inside and outside the forest will be greatly affected and ungulate populations will suffer as a result. There is currently no good reason to restore the grizzly bear to the North Cascades, especially with a current plan that would utilize limited and ineffective management tools.

Regards,



SCCA President

Correspondence ID: 1882Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98105
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,13 2023 22:20:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello,

I am 71 yrs old and have been hiking and backpacking in the PNW for 50 yrs. I also contribute to many conservation and environmental groups. However, as the Grizzly bear population has disappeared in the North Cascades the number of people hiking and backpacking have Greatly increased. It has increased so much that when I hike I often feel like I am in a city park. A substantial amount of folks are also not very attuned to how to respect the land, plants and animals. As much as I have enjoyed hiking in AK where Grizzlies are in great number I think that we are too populated with people to coexist with the grizzlies in the North Cascades. Thank you for the opportunity to give input.

Peacefully

Correspondence ID: 1883Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Evens, WA 99126
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,13 2023 22:32:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Once again this has nothing to bears, it politics. I live in the N Cascades. We have grizzly bears. In Steven's County, Washington . 2 weeks ago WSDFW trapped a problem grizzly. This was 15 miles from my place. Now convince us in Steven's County we need more Grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 1884Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lodi, CA 95240
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,14 2023

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Love to any of our land being restored to its natural biodiversity. Hope this works out.

Correspondence ID: 1885Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wilsonville, OR 97070
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,14 2023

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think this is a good idea. We need the balance that was once there. I think if this were to happen that the most popular trails should be on a timed permit system to limit the amount of people from having possible interactions with people. Too many people is the problem not bring back grizzly bears. I hope this happens.

Correspondence ID: 1886Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Granite Falls, WA 98223
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,14 2023 08:46:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I've just read about 2 grizzlies in Idaho being shot by hunters in self defense. Hikers normally don't carry firearms for protection. I believe that option 1 'Do Nothing', is the best choice. Let Grizzlies return to the North Cascades on their own, if they are able.

Correspondence ID: 1887Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,14 2023 08:49:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support proposal C for restoration of grizzly populations in the North Cascade region. As a resident of the Methow Valley and frequent utilizer of the surrounding public land, I understand the concerns raised by some opposition parties but feel the long term benefits to restoring and sustaining healthy grizzly populations makes a convincing case.

Correspondence ID: 1888Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,14 2023 09:29:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Before commencing, NPS and WDFW should provide the public comprehensive longitudinal data regarding the history of the species (numbers, locations) in proposed effected areas

Correspondence ID: 1889Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Colbert, WA 99005
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,14 2023 10:48:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am fully in support of the augmentation of the few remaining grizzlies that may exist in the North Cascade National Park.
I have camped there. I just reviewed the geography of this area again seeing that the human population there is essentially very very low.
I did not see a town within miles and miles.
Human interactions with grizzlies around the North Cascades could be expected to be very very very rare.
This is perfect habitat for a sustainable population of grizzlies.

Being a native daughter of Washington State the courts must deem me to have full standing.

I plan on visiting this park again.

Correspondence ID: 1890Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Kenmore, WA 98028
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,14 2023 11:03:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: There are an average of 44 Grizzly Bear attacks each year. Why anyone would want to increase this number (which will happen with more Grizzlies added to areas that humans inhabit) is beyond comprehension. This will discourage people from hiking in these areas though we want people to utilize the outdoors more often. May as well try to repopulate the US coastal waters with deadly sharks, maybe we can bring the dinosaurs back, they were here before us, right? The vast majority of people do not support this restoration plan, listen to them!

Correspondence ID: 1891Project:112008Document:132104
Address: vancouver, WA 98664
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,14 2023 12:19:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please reintroduce Grizzly Bears into the North Cascades where they belong and have been absent from for far too long.

Correspondence ID: 1892Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98199
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,14 2023 13:07:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No grizzlies in the North Cascades park. Right now 10/14/23 there are two incidents in Boise of grizzly attacks. Grizzlies are vicious animals. We don't need them in Washington period. If you do allow them, you can expect lawsuits and protests when one of them first attacks someone. It will certainly happen. I love animals. Support several charities that support wild animals. Belong to the National Park Foundation. No! to grizzlies in the North Cascades Park.

Correspondence ID: 1893Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lake Stevens, WA 98258
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,14 2023 13:40:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: After reading the proposal, it is my opinion that option A is the best, do nothing and continue current preservation efforts. While the idea of introducing more bears may seem novel, there are some serious concerns to be addressed. First, increasing the number of grizzly bears will inevitably increase the number of human and bear encounters. As a person who actually recreates in the north cascades national park, any sunny weekend in the summer will bring large numbers of people all throughout the park wilderness. As someone who has spent a considerable amount of time in the wilderness, black bears and grizzly bears have extremely different temperaments, with grizzly's being much more aggressive toward humans. It's only a matter of time before the first person gets eaten. If the bears are there naturally on their own, it's easy to say that's just nature and the person took a risk going out there. But if you intentionally put those bears there, not ones native to the area, and an incident occurs, some of that responsibility now falls on you. Secondly, grizzly bears are apex predators that require large amounts of food. Consequently, introducing more of them will have unforeseen downstream effects on other animal populations. A similar thing occurred when wolves were reintroduced in Washington, and deer and elk populations have suffered as a result. Thirdly, being the bears are not native to the area and have not been raised by other bears that stay in the park, there is little way of knowing where these implant bears may migrate to and make home, possibly closer to human populations than intended. It's my opinion that often with preservation, when we try to step in and make a human introduced change, there are often downstream consequences that no one saw or thought about. More often than not, the best course of action is to let nature take care of itself and stay out of it.

Correspondence ID: 1894Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98118
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,14 2023 15:04:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to express my full support and delight at the prospect of returning grizzlies to the Cascades in Washington.

Correspondence ID: 1895Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Evaline, WA 98596
United States of America

Outside Organization: n/a Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,14 2023 15:46:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm a 70+ y/o lifelong lover and supporter of wildlife and conservation. I advocated for the restoration of wolf packs in WA and part of me wants to advocate for grizzly restoration. Apex predators belong in our remaining wildlands. The concern I have is that, this year in particular, it seems that bear activity in general has increased, recreators are being attacked and sometimes killed even when prepared. If bears and wolves take down livestock that's one thing and it's natural - but I don't think anyone wants to see humans become prey. So I would encourage moving forward with grizzly restoration very carefully and slowly if it's done at all, in the furthest, wildest reaches possible. Along with restoration must come widespread education regarding bear behavior and how humans can avoid encounters and protect themselves in the event that is needed. Thank you for the opportunity to comment, even if mine isn't a scientific observation.

Correspondence ID: 1896Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862-9190

United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,14 2023 15:50:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My purpose for filing my comments is to let it be known that I support the plan to restore grizzly bears to the North Cascades. As a resident of Winthrop, WA I live on the outskirts of the North Cascades National Park.

Grizzly bears are an endangered species that we must actively recover or risk losing. If man had not extirpated them they would still be here. It is man's responsibility to reintroduce them. I want to be able to pass down a wild landscape that includes all native species, including the grizzly to my grandchildren. Among other things grizzly bears provide an ecosystem service, spreading seeds and aerating alpine meadows.

There are few places left in the U.S. where grizzly bears can exist. The North Cascades ecosystem is one of those few protected places and I hope to see a grizzly bear in the North Cascades one day.

I believe the reintroduction of the grizzly bear is the right thing to do considering both environmental and human impacts. Further, I am in support of Alternative C as I believe it is the best way to ensure flexibility of the management of the grizzlies.

Please adopt Alternative C and move forward quickly with the plan to bring these bears back to the North Cascades.

Thank you for your consideration.

Correspondence ID: 1897Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98103

United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,14 2023 16:34:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the plan to rerun grizzlies to their traditional habitat in the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 1898Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Camano Island, WA 98282

United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,14 2023 17:34:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello my name is [REDACTED] I am a Elk hunter and have been for 40 plus years, I have a very special place where I go hunting, my son and I were hunting there one year up in the cascades and ran into a brown big ass Grizzly bear,

we were bow hunting and that was the time you were not allowed to have a firearm in possession, well we did not have a gun on us, this bear was 112 yards from us and it did not know we were there, It was standing up eating berries and reaching 9 foot high from the side of a hill side, he was on the down side and was about 8 to 9 feet tall, he got down on all 4s a few different times, we watched him for about 40 min, we finally came to the agreement that we should leave the hunting grounds we were at. we are now allowed to carry firearms while bow hunting. I for one am very nervous to go back to the same hunting grounds to this day, that was a big ass bear, so I have a big ass gun just for him, would hate to have to kill it but I would if I had to save my self or some one else. I have run into women on hiking trips up there with there kids and no gun, a lot of them! The black bear that Ive ran into while hunting have always took off running from me, I don't think that a Grizzly bear would, I would have to kill it and you guys would get all mad about that. We hunt in mid October and the bears are trying to fatten up for the winter, they are pretty determined about that from what I know about them. So if you people put them in harms way along with us we have no choice but to defend ourselves and any body else. So whats up with that, there are a lot of hikers and people in general going up there to this majestic place in the Cascade Mountains, it was no problem with out the Grizzly bears there and from what I understand our ancestors killed them out of the lower 48, and now you want to put them BACK...we've been fine without them. The wolfs in Idaho have eaten all the deer and all the Elk and are starting on the moose, I also hunt there, and have up close seen the devastation and the depletion of the game we use to have there, did not see one Elk last year but I did see and heard wolfs there, 32 dogs to a pack, LOOK OUT..now its 35 dollars for a tag not 5 hundred, and they want them out of Idaho, wait till the Grizzly comes down in to towns and kills some one ,how would you feel then?? Just leave it alone let them stay in Canada for god sake. A GRIZZLY BEAR IS A MAN KILLER, you know that and are wanting to put them there for some reason that don't make sense. I am a tax paying citizen and I disagree 100 percent to not put Grizzly bears in the Cascades they are already there. the black bears will be pushed out and have no place to go but down and into the city's, you guys are making a massive mistake that might cause a lot of trouble for everyone, I don't hunt wolfs or bears they're not good to eat, but I will if I have to. #1 APEX predator in the northern continent, PLEASE don't do it.

Correspondence ID: 1899Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spokane, WA 99209
United States of America
Outside Organization: Self Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,14 2023 18:23:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Alternative A is the only option required. I have lived/worked in the methow valley in Okanagan WA for 10 yrs of my life logging/surveying log roads for the US forest service & private boundary line surveying - I have actually spent several yrs living in the forest while doing so. The grizzlies are in no danger of becoming extinct on the north american continent, the north cascade ecosystem has no compelling need for grizzly reintroduction w/ the attendant risk of grizzly/human/livestock conflicts just because someone wants everything to be back to the way it was before humans moved in. We have YELLOWSTONE NAT'L PK FOR THAT!

Correspondence ID: 1900Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America
Outside Organization: Woodland Park Zoo Volunteer Conservation/Preservation
Received: Oct,14 2023 18:40:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Biodiversity is critical to every ecosystem, and restoring grizzly bears to the North Cascades would return their many contributions to this amazing wilderness area and the plants and animals that live there. It has been done successfully in other areas. Let's help make it happen in the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 1901Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Burien, WA 98166
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,14 2023 20:36:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Restoring ecological balance to the North Cascades through reintroduction of the apex predator grizzly is long overdue. The benefits are many. I support this plan.

Correspondence ID: 1902Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Burien, WA 98166
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,14 2023 20:38:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I would like to see the Grizzly Bears reinstated into the cascade. This would support a healthy eco system and respect the Native American culture. Humans are over using and demanding land just for themselves. We need to learn how to share. We can not keep taking over lands. We have to learn to make space for all beings in this planet. My grandparents were farmers and I know how hard this can be for ranchers. But there are ways. Educate the public and support businesses to look at this in a more creative way.

I support this plan.

Correspondence ID: 1903Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98226-9409
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,14 2023 20:45:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I DO NOT SUPPORT THIS!!!! I spend a lot of time up in the mountains in Eastern Whatcom County. We aren't even allowed to manage the predators we already have. We will never be allowed to manage grizzlies and they will lose all fear of humans. WHAT ARE THEY GOING TO EAT????? There aren't any deer left due to the over population of black bears and cougars. This is not a good idea

Correspondence ID: 1904Project:112008Document:132104

Address: mead, WA 99021
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,14 2023 21:22:15

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm all for restoring a viable population of grizzlies in the north cascades. This vast area of 550,000 acres along with the surrounding vast public forest lands can easily support a healthy population of grizzly bears.

Along with the wild lands to the north in Canada, my brother the bear should do well. I am a Crow Indian, my relatives have lived in this country for the last 35,000 years in harmony with the bear my brother.

Do not let Dan Newcome interfere with this

Correspondence ID: 1905Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,14 2023 21:27:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Like many people, I have mixed feelings about the reintroduction of grizzlies. It seems likely to be very expensive per bear introduced that survives, increases anti-environmental sentiment by ranchers and others who feel threatened by the project, but reinvigorates the notion of 'wild' in wilderness.

I only support the plan under the 10j rule, allowing for greater flexibility in management.

Correspondence ID: 1906Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98513
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,14 2023 21:49:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As an avid wildlife enthusiast, I know the important role that grizzly bears play in conservation. Their return to the North Cascades is long overdue, and if we don't act now it may be too late. Let's bring these amazing creatures back!

Correspondence ID: 1907Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: same Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,14 2023 22:39:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly Bear reintroduction into the North Cascades:

It's clear that the North Cascade Park, Fish and Wildlife, Environmental Organizations (i.e. Carnivore Conservation), and the Biden Administration have already picked Option C given their statement that it is the "preferred alternative". They're only going through public hearings, and EIS because the law requires them to. However, The PUBLIC is screaming to be heard.

During 2020 the effort to remove the grizzly bear from the "Threatened List" (by increasing population) in the lower 48 was a success, the mandate was removed, during which the North Cascades was not impacted. Why, because contrary to the NCP biologist the purported 5 bear population in the region could not be confirmed within a 2-year study/search, and furthermore that sightings in 1996 were subsequently disproven "not a grizzly". During the 2020 public gatherings a NFS biologist from Montana confirmed that there were no studies supporting reintroduction - as neither absence of grizzlies nor presence had been shown to have a positive impact to the biosphere. He declared that the desire to reintroduce the grizzly was purely emotional. The problem with our wilderness is human intervention - we think we're making it better, but it only gets worse. Just look at the recent failure of wolf reintroduction - within 3 years Fish and Wildlife was shooting wolves due to stock and domestic animal conflicts. It needs to be recognized that the grizzly has been gone from the North Cascades for 100 years and the biosphere has been balanced - doing just fine. If grizzlies cross the Canadian border on their own - ok, but whatever the case nobody wants to come face to face with a grizzly. Reintroduction will simply invite tragedies. Grizzly males wander and in time there's certainly going to be conflicts with the proliferating outdoor user, ranchers, town populations, etc. Today is not like 100 years ago. It makes no sense to facilitate chaos.

In addition, it's against State Law RCW 77.12.035

Under a Washington state law (RCW 77.12.035), the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) may not transplant or introduce grizzly bears into the state. The law only allows WDFW to use bears native to the state for management programs. However, the law does not prohibit WDFW from taking actions to protect grizzlies, support habitat improvement practices, protect human safety, and protect property once grizzly bears are translocated to the North Cascades. (THERE ARE NO GRIZZLIES IN THE NORTH CACADES)

Choose Alternative A and listen to the Public.

Correspondence ID: 1908Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spokane, WA 99205
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,15 2023 08:22:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I have read the EIS for restoring a sustainable population of grizzlies to the North Cascades National park.

I am strongly in support of this action. The ecosystem is not complete without all its original members. Using a map I see the enormous size of the native forest in this northern cascades region. Certainly man and bear can live in harmony in this location. I see very few if any towns or cities even close to this vast forest.

I do not approve of the grazing of cattle on our national forests. This is public land and even if allowed the grazing of cattle on this land should be at a true market rate not a pittance of the market rate.

The USFS should not be a branch of the agriculture department.

So in conclusion as a lifetime resident of Washington State fully endorse the reintroduction of grizzly bears into the North Cascade National park to establish a sustainable population of grizzlies.

thank you for your consideration.

Correspondence ID: 1909Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Hartselle, AL 35640
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,15 2023 09:23:08

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Totally opposed to the measure, what's the real benefit? I have been visiting the park for the last 10 years and year after year the amount of wildlife I have seen is so scarce that introducing an apex predators is stupid; not to mention that the safety of visitors and locals will be badly compromised. People will be forced to carry weapons for self defense, attacks and accidents will be inevitable and a series of trickle down effects will follow: investigations, fining people for killing the bears, destruction in private property, etc.

I just not see Any benefit at all, it seems to me another self imposed stupidity from the government.

Correspondence ID: 1910Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bothell, WA 98011
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,15 2023 09:59:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I agree with plan A: no action taken regarding the reintroduction of grizzly bears to Washington state. I find the need for action on this issue to be weak- simply introducing grizzly bears because they once lived here. Furthermore, I disagree with the potential benefits of tourist coming to "see grizzlies in their natural habit". I believe any potential visitor coming to see a grizzly in the wild will be offset by all the people not wanting to backpack now because they don't want to run into a grizzly bear. As someone who backpacked in Glacier national park, I did so for the beautiful mountains and lakes. All the while I was praying that I would NOT run into a grizzly bear, even when I had bear spray.

As a frequent backpacker in Washington state, especially the north cascades, I enjoy the fact that there are relatively few apex predators that I need to be concerned about. While I pack spray and have other safety measures, it's comforting to know that the worst possibility is only a black bear or cougar, or elk I suppose. And I know that grizzly bear attacks are relatively small, but they do happen and they are more likely to be deadly than a black bear. Just look at what happened to those unfortunate folks in Canada a few weeks ago. While I may be interested in seeing a grizzly, it would only be in the context of a zoo, not when I am in the unpredictability of the mountains.

Also, I can imagine that the idea of reintroducing grizzly bears sounds miserable to all the farmers with live stock. While I am not in that community myself, I can see the future conflicts, just like what happened with wolf reintroduction.

Lastly, as a tax payer there are a plethora of opportunities for my tax money to improve critical issues around Washington state, financing a plan to pay for approximately 144 helicopter rides and capturing bears sounds expensive and is not where I want my taxes to go.

Ultimately, I am in favor of option A because it aligns with my goals regarding outdoor recreation, promotes public safety, and is the most cost effective option.

Correspondence ID: 1911Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,15 2023 10:45:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of Grizzlies in the North Cascades. It was their originally home, and the north cascade ecosystem will be al the healthier for it.

Correspondence ID: 1912Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,15 2023 11:01:31

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I would like to voice my objection to the introduction of Grizzly bears into the North Cascades. The North Cascades have been virtually grizzly free for the last 100 years and the ecosystem has survived just fine. My concerns are:

Introducing grizzly bears could upset an already thriving ecosystem and cause a catastrophic impact on the existing wildlife.

Your plan to introduce a small amount of bears per year does not take into consideration that these bears will breed, thus possibly increasing that amount to an unpredictable amount.

The bears could penetrate onto ranch and grazing lands and kill livestock thus starting a major conflict between ranchers/property owners and the local and federal governments and interest groups dedicated to this cause. Case in point is the wolf pack near Lookout Mt near Twisp. Once the ranchers complained, DF&W systematically killed that wolf pack by helicopter, ignoring the current wolf plan passed by the Washington state Legislature.

Since the onslaught of posting on the Internet through social media posts, blogs and articles and post Covid 19, the wilderness has been crushed by a new wave of visitors who are ill prepared to be in the back country let alone know what to do when faced with an encounter with a bad tempered grizzly. As you are aware a couple and their dog were just killed in Banff by a grizzly by no fault of their own. My fear is that same encounters could happen in the North Cascades and beyond once the grizzlies become established.

It is against state law to introduce Grizzlies in Washington state.

This campaign is being made by interests groups that have this unrealistic fantasy that Grizzlies will complete a perfect world in the back country. When in fact it will create conflict with ranchers and property owners, subject hikers to possible risk of severe injury and or even death and possibility disrupt an already thriving ecosystem.

Obviously more study needs to be done that will PROVE that Grizzlies will enhance the ecosystem, not cause harm to stock and not impact humans who choose to venture into the backcountry. So far all I am seeing are environmental groups praising the proposal but not backing it up with scientific evidence that this is a worthwhile, safe endeavor for both the grizzlies and humans.

Thank you for your consideration to my concerns.

Correspondence ID: 1913Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,15 2023 11:03:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We should reintroduce grizzly bears to the North Cascades in order to foster a more balanced, sustainable ecosystem. Experts should decide the specifics.

Correspondence ID: 1914Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98178
United States of America
Outside Organization: 3616744145 Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,15 2023 12:11:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I think grizzlies (and wolves) should be reintroduced into their historical environments. They were here years before, and I think the environment will be healthier if they return. I have little sympathy with people who don't manage their animals or their own lifestyles to include these bears.

Correspondence ID: 1915Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Issaquah, WA 98029
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,15 2023 15:19:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I highly suggest we don't have the grizzly bear rehabilitation due to the fact that it would harm the ecosystem. An example being the native salmon population, which is already on the decline. If we add more grizzly bears they will harm native plants and eat and trampled the salmon and their eggs. We are already doing our best to protect the salmon, I would really hate to see our progression on salmon population dwindle to a lower state. Please consider this reasoning and look further into the ecology of this.

Correspondence ID: 1916Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,15 2023 15:22:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I live in Twisp, and day hike in areas nearby. As a community member within the recovery zone I fully support restoring grizzlies to the ecosystem that is their ancestral home.
I would like alternative C to be implemented because it will bring the grizzlies back within a carefully monitored process, and with flexibility in management actions.
These endangered animals have been part of indigenous people's lives for thousands of years, and have roamed long before human communities. As a Washington State citizen, and a member of a unique protected place in the US, I want to be part of restoration efforts so that our children's children will inherit a landscape that is bio diverse and as whole as we can make it. Grizzly bears contribute to spreading seeds and aerating alpine meadows.
Thank you for the opportunity to comment and for your work to bring these magnificent creatures back to lands when they belong.

Correspondence ID: 1917Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Marblemount, WA 98267
United States of America
Outside Organization: Self Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,15 2023 16:37:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I'm 70, retired, having worked for the National Park Service and US Forest Service most of my life.
Consider this comment a big NO, don't do it.

Releasing Grizzly Bears into North Cascades Park is foolish beyond belief. The required ecosystem is long gone. They will be nothing but a threat to people and domestic animals that use the park for recreation. This being a National Park, possession of fire arms is illegal. How many people will die before you realize that this is a bad idea. Wolves were bad enough but these bears will hunt people because they are easy and taste so good. The introduced Grizzly Bears will meet the same fate as the wolves as they stray outside the bounds of the Park and start to forage on someones private property.

Thanks for your consideration of my point of view.

Sincerely

Correspondence ID: 1918Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98118
United States of America
Outside Organization: taxpayer Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,15 2023 16:55:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I respectfully and urgently request that our government full restore Grizzly Bears to the North Cascades so that they can take another step towards re-inhabiting their historic range. I agree entirely with the Upper Skagit indigenous peoples, as quoted in the Seattle Times: "yes, they do have a right to exist," he said. "Our history proves that coexistence is possible, our ancestors respected these animals and they thrived up until the point they were driven out." Moreover, I urge my government to fully protect these bears, invoking all protections afforded under the Endangered Species Act. We know that humans are moving into their historic habitat -- and have removed them as a result. In restoring them, we must educate humans who live in their historic habitat that humans, not bears, must act responsibly and reduce bear-domestic animal-people conflicts -- if domestic animals are allowed to range free they are fair game for grizzlies. Likewise the Department of Wildlife must educate people who live in low population areas of the bear's historic range on how to conduct themselves so that bears are not attracted to their homes. We must NOT develop a plan that allows some "surplus" bears to be brought back to Washington to "see how it goes," and if these bears end up in conflicts with domestic livestock or pets we shoot them. Again, we must adopt a plan that gives them full protection under the ESA and educates the public that chooses to live in their habitat on proper conduct. We are at a point in the history of humankind where we must start learning to live with all the other species, who we are currently bringing to the brink of extinction. What kind of a future will the next generation have not knowing so many of the creatures we had the privilege of seeing? The time for action is now. I believe Option 1 is the strongest option -- protection and reintroduction. Nothing less is acceptable. Thank you for your work.

Correspondence ID: 1919Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lynnwood, WA 98087
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,15 2023 17:17:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I'm a parent and my kids and I find so much meaning in the PNW landscape. My son loves grizzly bears, and I want all of us to experience a healthy, thriving ecosystem in our beloved mountains.

Correspondence ID: 1920Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98274
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,15 2023 17:22:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: This is against the law. This will affect the local farmers, and cause more damage to current wildlife. This is a bad idea.

Correspondence ID: 1921Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,15 2023 17:48:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I say, Let them return to their original habitat.

Correspondence ID: 1922Project:112008Document:132104
Address: SNOHOMISH, WA 98290-7206
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,15 2023 18:17:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We do not need to bring in grizzly bears. They are already here. Spending money to bring in bears instead of letting them come in naturally is just not worth the effort.

Let's not cause ourselves problems, when the grizzle situation is already taking care of itself.

Correspondence ID: 1923Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Tacoma, WA 98405
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,15 2023 19:06:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do not bring grizzlies to the Cascades. We spend a significant amount of time in the Cascades hunting, hiking, and foraging for mushrooms, and the reintroduction of grizzlies would make it much less safer. I live in Washington now, but I am originally from Montana and know what it is like to live amongst the grizzlies. They do not need to be in the Cascades. There are already too many predators in the area, plus they already removed the spring black bear hunt.

Correspondence ID: 1924Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Tacoma, WA 98445
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,15 2023 20:15:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The recent incident in Stevens County, where a grizzly bear was captured, is a testament to the growing predator challenges in Washington. Allow the bears to migrate naturally as they already are. Our state is already grappling with managing wolves, cougars, black bears, and more. Considering the strain on our ungulate populations, I cannot support the idea of reintroducing grizzlies into the state.

Correspondence ID: 1925Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,15 2023 20:43:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I live in Twisp, and day hike in areas nearby.

As a community member within the recovery zone I fully support restoring grizzlies to the ecosystem that is their ancestral home.

I would like alternative C to be implemented because it will bring the grizzlies back within a carefully monitored process, and with flexibility in management actions. These endangered animals have been part of indigenous people's lives for thousands of years, and have roamed long before human communities. As a Washington State citizen, and a member of a unique protected place in the US, I want to be part of restoration efforts so that our children's children and their children will inherit a landscape that is rich in ecological diversity and as whole as we can make it. Grizzly bears contribute to this richness, by spreading seeds and aerating alpine meadows.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment and for your work to bring these magnificent creatures back to lands when they belong.

Correspondence ID: 1926Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Tacoma, WA 98445
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,16 2023
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I'm trying to get a refund. I bought this last evening and it screwed up my phone. So I don't want it.

Correspondence ID: 1927Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bothell, WA 98012
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,16 2023 01:28:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Don Striker and Supervisor Brad Thompson,

I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years.

I strongly support the agencies' proposal to bring grizzly bears into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade to establish a thriving population in their natural habitat.

The draft EIS's action alternatives provide the best opportunity for the survival of grizzly bears in the North Cascades and will also benefit people who live in and visit the North Cascades. The plans are modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Most importantly, the native peoples of this land also support restoring the grizzlies to their ancestral lands. To quote Scott Schuyler, Policy Representative for the Upper Skagit Tribe, whose territory lies within the recovery zone, urging people to accept that grizzlies belong in the North Cascades: "The Upper Skagit people coexisted with grizzly bears in the region for nearly 10,000 years pre-contact. The grizzly has profound cultural significance and its restoration will enrich our ancestral lands and help restore the foundations of our cultural practices. We thank Secretary Haaland for leading this effort and look forward to welcoming grizzlies back home."

Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in the action alternatives. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage. Thank you for all your efforts to keep our North Cascades wild!

Correspondence ID: 1928Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bothell, WA 98012
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,16 2023 01:40:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of Grizzly bears to their natural habitat. This has been their home for tens of thousands of years before we killed them, and they are important to the ecological health of the area. They are a keystone species for our environment.

Correspondence ID: 1929Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Spokane, WA 99218
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,16 2023 06:13:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hi,

We don't want to end up like this guy: <https://www.outdoorlife.com/survival/grizzly-attacks-man-tracking-deer-montana/>

I like hiking and camping without getting my jaw chewed off... so please do not dump any more grizzlies anywhere. The ecosystem is doing fine, just leave it alone.

Correspondence ID: 1930Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Huntingdon, TN 38344
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,16 2023 06:35:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzly's should be allowed to move into the area naturally on their own. If bears are already periodically moving in it is a waste of taxpayer money to transplant more into the area.

Correspondence ID: 1931Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Coulee City, WA 99115
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,16 2023 06:52:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzly bears will and are naturally migrating into Washington. If the habitat will support them they'll inhabit the area. Also public safety should be number one, the ranchers that border the North Cascades Wilderness area are very concerned with their families safety. Should grizzlies be released their children who are very big parts in the ranching day to day tasks could no longer be on their own or out there at all.

Correspondence ID: 1932Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mukilteo, WA 98275
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,16 2023 08:01:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My preference is to take no action and, instead, rely on natural recovery.

Correspondence ID: 1933Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mazama, WA 98833
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,16 2023 09:31:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I would like to go on record in supporting the NPS proposal for restoration and protection of grizzly bear populations in the North Cascades. As a frequent hiker of tree Pacific Crest Trail and other trails in the North cascades, I believe that the grizzly bear restoration program will benefit ecosystem balance in the region without undue threat to recreational users or to commercial interests in North Central Washington. After all, protection of the grizzly bear within Yellowstone NP has been ultimately successful for the environment and has promoted greater recreational use of the resources of Yellowstone along with greater economic revenue benefits to the surrounding commercial communities. Thank you for your consideration of my opinion.

Correspondence ID: 1934Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98118
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,16 2023 09:58:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do not reintroduce grizzly bears into the North Cascades. While it's true grizzly bears used to lived in the North Cascades, there are now people recreating, living, and making their livelihood farming in the area who could potentially be hurt/killed by grizzlies. Just in the last few months, people have been killed by grizzlies in Banff & Yellowstone National Parks. Plus, there have been others who were maimed by them. We can't make everyone vacate the North Cascades just because you want to introduce a deadly animal.

Correspondence ID: 1935Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Kalispell, MT 59001
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,16 2023 10:56:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Let them have them, my opinion is there's probably 100 to spare in Northwest Montana. Washington barely allows hunting anymore anyway so there should be too many elk hunters mauled. Maybe a few tourists I'm sure they'll be bummed out meeting Yogi in the woods.

Seriously though, this decision should be made by local communities only period end of story, Seattle and DC need to stay out of this . Ask the folks that live in and around North Cascades and let them decide they want griz in their back yard. Everyone else should shut up and listen to those impacted by the decision.

Correspondence ID: 1936Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Granite Falls, WA 98252
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,16 2023 11:33:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Humans were responsible for removing grizzlies from the North Cascades and it's our responsibility to bring them back home. Please restore grizzly bears back to the North Cascades and do not let people hunt or shoot them. The north cascades belong to the native animals too. A world with only humans is boring and unbalanced. We need the grizzlies back!

Correspondence ID: 1937Project:112008Document:132104

Address: E. Wenatchee, WA 98802
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,16 2023 13:01:55

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I agree that grizzly bears should be introduced to the North Cascades.

Good habitat is vanishing and we need to do this now, protecting both that environment of our state and all the critters that live there. Bears are part of a healthy environment.

Correspondence ID: 1938Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,16 2023 13:21:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly support the proposed reintroduction of the bears to the North Cascades in a way that gives state game managers the flexibility to manage the population as things progress.

Correspondence ID: 1939Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ferndale, WA 98248
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,16 2023 13:37:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not reintroduce Grizzly bears to the North Cascades. We do not need to waste anymore taxpayers dollars on a small group.

Correspondence ID: 1940Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98004
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,16 2023 14:14:45

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: NO ACTION! Do NOT bring Grizzly bears into WA. Period.

Correspondence ID: 1941Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,16 2023 15:13:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I live and recreate in the cascade mountains around leavenworth and north cascade region. I understand the desire to add brown bears into the wild, but currently we are failing to live with the black bears that reside in the area. I think adding brown bears at this stage would be a mistake and i am fundamentally opposed to the idea.

Please do not re-introduce brown bears into the north cascades at this time.

Correspondence ID: 1942Project:112008Document:132104
Address: kent, WA 98031
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,16 2023 15:25:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The quality of our beautiful outdoors is improved when it is as natural as it can be, which includes re-introducing grizzly bears to their natural habitat.

Correspondence ID: 1943Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98133
United States of America
Outside Organization: Woodland Park Zoological Society Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,16 2023 15:56:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The Anthropocene will be better with Grizzly bears in the North Cascades of Washington State.

Correspondence ID: 1944Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Golden, CO 80401-1748
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,16 2023 15:57:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The American Bear Foundation of Washington believes that introducing more grizzlies into the state is not in Washington's best interest. The challenges posed by the rising numbers of other predators in the state are evident. Introducing grizzlies would only add to these challenges, endangering both humans and wildlife. Washington states human population of 7 million plus is significantly greater than other western states where grizzly bear conflicts are on the rise. More grizzlies in Washington isn't fair to the bears or the humans.

Correspondence ID: 1945Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,16 2023 16:11:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Reintroduction of grizzly bears as part of natural heritage in NCE is desirable but the objective to reintroduce bears mainly for the enjoyment of people is highly objectionable, especially from the bear's perspective and leads to an undesirable habitat for the bear. Past generations of people's enjoyments have driven the bears out of NCE. I find it selfish of us to forcefully relocate the bears now for the enjoyment of current and future generations of people.

I do not think the EIS has adequately assessed the impact of increased and steadily increasing recreational impact in the NCE. The immense increase of visitors to the parks and forests in the last couple of years will continue with the expected population growth in Washington. Studies have shown that bears in highly frequented areas by people are underweight and suffer on nutrition. I cannot believe this would be a suitable environment for a bear.

Furthermore, I am highly concerned that the bears will be exposed to trophy hunting in the near future. The EIS has not addressed this likely possibility at all. In all three states, where grizzlies have had a successful recovery path, efforts are underway to take them off the Endangered Species Act to allow for hunting. When that happens in Washington the area for the bears will shrink to the National Park which represents 10% of your addressed area in the EIS. Does that mean we would

only have habitat available for 10% of your goal of 200 bears in the future? Is this still a viable population?

I strongly suggest taking into account my 2 major concerns of anticipated visitor pressures and the likelihood of hunting the bears to determine the impact and detriment of habitat quality for the bears. If it turns out as I expect, then I do not support the relocation of bears into the NCE. The energy and money required for this activity should be spent to ensure the bears strive in their current locations (4 recovery zones, Canada and Alaska). Maybe it would be worthwhile to concentrate in establishing corridors between the currently successful recovery areas.

The homing behavior leading to unsuccessful translocations of 25% to 70% as mentioned on page 66 of the EIS is highly concerning and raises the question if the action is worth the sufferings of the bears.

Correspondence ID: 1946Project:112008Document:132104

Address: SEATTLE, WA 98109
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,16 2023 16:12:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No.

Correspondence ID: 1947Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spanaway, WA 98387
United States of America

Outside Organization: Rocky Mountain Elk Foundaton Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,16 2023 16:33:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Re-introducing grizzly bears to the North Cascades National Park is an extremely bad idea. Restoring this dangerous carnivore into Washington State will not improve the eco-system. It will, however, endanger human life. Hikers and campers, inside and outside of the North Cascades National Park, will find their lives in peril when encountering these bears in the wild. Introducing the grizzly bear back to Washington State will create many unforeseen situations during interactions with citizens and visitors in the Pacific Northwest. Sportsmen, primarily licensed hunters, will be in a number of counties surrounding the national park. The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife issues permits for the hunting of deer, elk, cougar and black bear in game managment units bordering the North Cascades National Park. There certainly is no guarantee that grizzly bears will remain within the national park boundaries, once being introduced there. There is a reason why the genus & species classification of "Ursus arcos horribilis" was established for these gruesome bears. Naturalist George Ord formally classified it in 1815 as U. horribilis, for it's character. I strongly urge you to never bring the grizzly bear back into Washington State and primarily the North Cascades National Park.

Correspondence ID: 1948Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Marysville, WA 98271
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,16 2023 16:38:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Anything to get our wilderness back to how it used to be

Correspondence ID: 1949Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Marysville, WA 98271
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,16 2023 16:50:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears are an important part of the ecosystem of the North Cascade due to being a keystone species that provide a positive effect by regulating healthy populations of the animals they prey on, such as elk and moose, and keep forests healthy by dispersing seeds, berries and nutrition providers through their feces. As an endangered animal in the Cascades, we need to restore the grizzly bear population and must take an active role in aiding recovery of this magnificent animal to its native lands.

Correspondence ID: 1950Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Marysville, WA 98271
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,16 2023 17:06:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I believe the reestablishment of native species is critical to restore natural environments to balance. We continue to tip this balance more and more out of the natural ways, we all lose out over the long term.

Correspondence ID: 1951Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98136
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,16 2023 17:32:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The Pacific Crest Trail runs through the Northern Cascades, attracting thousands of thru hikers, day hikers and weekend backpackers every year. How will we keep Pacific Crest Trail hikers safe if we reintroduce Grizzly Bears to the area? Bear-human conflict is inevitable in the backcountry given the popularity of the Pacific Crest Trail.

Correspondence ID: 1952Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tacoma, WA 98448
United States of America

Outside Organization: NA Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,16 2023 17:40:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To Whom It May Concern:

I expressed support for a North Cascades grizzly reintroduction program with a letter in the spring of 2017, and I reiterated my support with a comment note in October 2019.

I continue to support the idea of reintroducing grizzly bears in the North Cascades for the sake of the species as well as the ecosystem. This includes their designation as a so-called "experimental population" if warranted.

I realize there's concern on the part of some that human-bear (and livestock) negative interactions will result. But I think if the introduced population can be monitored reasonably well, really serious problems can probably be avoided.

BTW, I once camped at Lake McDonald in Glacier Park some years ago. We had the experience of having a young male grizzly wander through the campground around lunchtime. While he certainly got everybody's attention (and made us keep our bear spray handy), the rangers monitored his movements until he was out of the area and there were no incidents. I think having more people who are experienced in the ways of grizzlies will help better inform the public and prevent some of those negative interactions.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment,



P.O. Box 44105
Tacoma, WA 98448

Correspondence ID: 1953Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Freeland, WA 98249
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,16 2023 18:42:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am in favor of returning a limited number of grizzly bears in areas where contact with humans will be minimal.

Correspondence ID: 1954Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,16 2023 18:51:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I live in the Methow Valley and enjoy the privilege of recreating in the Pasayten Wilderness, the North Cascades National Park, and surrounding wild lands.

I am in support of the restoration plan, alternative C, due to the isolated nature of this landscape, and the low likelihood that bears from other regions will migrate to the North Cascades. The 10j rule is critical to giving agencies the flexibility to manage bears and bear encounters.

I dream of living to see a grizzly bear in the wildlands of my back yard, and if not me, then I want this privilege for future generations. Grizzlies are native to this place and deserve to live here again.

Correspondence ID: 1955Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Winlock, WA 98596
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,16 2023 19:05:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: While I don't believe any aid should be given to the reintroduction of grizzly bears, the 'best' option being presented is option A. Of the options presented I strongly support action A (no action). I believe it is a terrible mistake to encourage the reintroduction of an animal that was extricated for good reason. One example of an impact on every day activities in a place with a fair grizzly population is in parts of Wyoming where you can't leave coolers in vehicles. These bears will destroy a vehicle to get at the food. Why would you want to create this situation and countless other dangerous situations. These are not soft cuddly teddy bears. As a person who enjoys spending time outdoors I find it hard to believe that anyone else who enjoys camping, hiking, etc. would be in support of any level of aiding reintroduction. While I'm sure this feedback won't change anything, that's my 2 cents as someone who recreates and works outdoors, and not someone who lives in an urban area that will never have any interaction with such animals. Consider the people this will effect, and give them an actual say in the outcome.

Correspondence ID: 1956Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Sedro Woolley, WA 98284
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,16 2023 19:22:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not re-release Grizzly Bears back into the North Cascade mountain range. I understand that we humans have historically encroached on animal's natural habitat but why change the bears' current location (Alaska, Montana). My family enjoys camping and hiking in the North Cascades and would prefer to keep our outdoor adventures as predator free as possible. I have a healthy respect for Grizzly Bear's existence in the wild but would prefer to not encounter them while on a hike with my dogs.

Correspondence ID: 1957Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Fife, WA 98424
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,16 2023 19:52:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The current bears, cougars, wolves are impacting our wildlife at an alarming rate, and with no use of hounds the problem is ever increasing. It would be so refreshing if the game commission would actually use true science instead of their political agenda.

We're against bringing grizzlies into our state! We're also against the elimination of black bear hunting!

Hope you actually consider both sides of these issues.

Correspondence ID: 1958Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Eagle River, AK 99577
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,16 2023 20:57:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Let nature take the course it wants to. Natural habitats will be filled if there is a void. Human interference tends to damage ecosystems more than help. Bringing an apex predator into a highly habituated human area is a recipe for disaster that will end up in bears being killed needlessly as a pest animal.

Correspondence ID: 1959Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bronx, NY 10469
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,16 2023 21:32:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I hope NPS and USFW will decide based on the EIS as well as scientific consensus. As much as I'd love to see these majestic animals back in the Cascade mountain range, I will gladly support the decision that goes through scientific scrutiny.

Correspondence ID: 1960Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,16 2023 21:37:37

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is long overdue. There is no reason that we cannot have a complete and healthy ecosystem again in our state. Our neighbors in British Columbia, Idaho, Montana and Wyoming live with grizzly bears why can't we? Any reasons that may be given as to why this cannot be done is just alarmist fear mongering.

Correspondence ID: 1961Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Gladstone, MI 49837
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,16 2023 21:48:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: While the Northern Cascade Region may be in the historical range of the Grizzly Bear, it is no longer suitable for them, anymore than the San Fransisco region. The Northern Cascade have been settled with families that have farms, cattle, horses, sheep, and dogs. All of the animals are targets for the Grizzly, as has been shown in the Greater Yellowstone area. Additionally, human recreation abounds in the region. This recreation is also at odds with the Grizzly bears presence, as has been evidenced by the numerous mauling and killing of humans that has occurred at the hands of the Grizzly Bear this summer. I urge you to choose the "No Action" option regarding the Grizzly Bear reintroduction.

Correspondence ID: 1962Project:112008Document:132104

Address: South Cle Elum, WA 98943
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,16 2023 21:51:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The old timers killed the grizzlies off for a reason.
They are apex predators and will kill everything they can...dogs, livestock, humans.

This land has long been altered by man's presence and decisions need to be made from our present reality.

Consider that perhaps Grizzlies would be more prone to livestock predation due to the fact that much of thier habitat has already been altered by man forcing them to seek alternative food sources and shelters.

I beleive that any reintroduction attempt is foolish and will prove to be harmful to the citizens of the state, as well as dangerous to visitors to the area.

I am hoping that the lives and livelihoods of Washington state citizens are found to be more important than this experiment. Please do nothing and do not conduct this experiment.

Thank you

Correspondence ID: 1963Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98107
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,16 2023 22:33:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am very much in favor of reintroducing grizzlies to the North Cascades. These glorious bears are key to the ecosystem, and should be protected and preserved as a national treasure!

Correspondence ID: 1964Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Shelton, WA 98584
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,16 2023 22:38:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I vote a BIG NO on grizzly introduction to the North Cascades.
I am a retired 32 year USFS employee I worked most of my career in the recreation dept.
The public does not need any more danger while visiting our National Park National forest.
The Bears WILL NOT stay in the park or Nat.Forest they will also find the easiest place to make a living like campgrounds, trail heads and back country camp sites.

They will prey on Elk, Deer and livestock both pack animals and cattle.
Ranching is hard enough without Grizzly Bears to worry about.
Thanks for your time .
Eric Fosse

Correspondence ID: 1965Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Nine mile falls, WA 99026
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,17 2023 05:52:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We should not have to deal with more bears simply because outlying areas can't manage there bear populations do to the government not allowing the people of those state to properly manage the numbers through hunting so instead there idea of management is to ship them off to neighboring states and when they do that like in Sulivan Lake area when there gets to be to many they shut the area down (public land) to the public do to too many bear conflicts it's always has been and will continue to be a negative impact to Washington residents unless they allow the people to correctly manage the numbers through hunting

Correspondence ID: 1966Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Cashmere, WA 98815
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,17 2023 06:56:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Opposition to Grizzly Reintroduction

Default (GPT-3.5)

User

Write me a letter to the Washington State department of fish and wildlife opposing the reintroduction of grizzly bears

ChatGPT

[Your Name]

[Your Address]

[City,

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed reintroduction of grizzly bears in Washington State. While I understand the importance of wildlife conservation and the efforts to restore the natural balance of ecosystems, I believe that the reintroduction of grizzly bears poses significant risks to both our environment and public safety.

First and foremost, grizzly bears are large, powerful predators that can pose a threat to human safety and livestock. The potential for dangerous encounters between grizzly bears and residents, hikers, and outdoor enthusiasts is a significant concern. These confrontations could lead to injuries or even fatalities, thereby jeopardizing public safety.

Additionally, the presence of grizzly bears could have a detrimental impact on local agriculture and livestock industries. Bear attacks on livestock can result in financial losses for farmers, which may not be adequately compensated through existing programs.

Furthermore, grizzly bears may have a detrimental impact on local wildlife populations, including endangered species. The reintroduction of a top predator like the grizzly bear can disrupt the existing ecological balance and potentially harm the populations of other species, which could have unintended and negative consequences for our ecosystems.

In light of these concerns, I urge the Washington State to reconsider the decision to reintroduce grizzly bears. While conservation efforts are important, it is crucial to prioritize the safety and well-being of the residents of Washington State and the sustainability of local industries.

I request that a thorough and transparent evaluation of the potential risks and benefits of grizzly bear reintroduction be conducted, and that the concerns of local communities and stakeholders be taken into account during the decision-making process. Alternatives to grizzly bear reintroduction should also be explored to achieve conservation goals without compromising public safety and livelihoods.

Thank you for considering my viewpoint on this matter. I hope that you will make decisions that prioritize the best interests of the people of Washington State and the delicate balance of our environment.

Sincerely,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 1967Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Cashmere, WA 98815
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,17 2023 06:57:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed reintroduction of grizzly bears in Washington State. While I understand the importance of wildlife conservation and the efforts to restore the natural balance of ecosystems, I believe that the reintroduction of grizzly bears poses significant risks to both our environment and public safety.

First and foremost, grizzly bears are large, powerful predators that can pose a threat to human safety and livestock. The potential for dangerous encounters between grizzly bears and residents, hikers, and outdoor enthusiasts is a significant concern. These confrontations could lead to injuries or even fatalities, thereby jeopardizing public safety.

Additionally, the presence of grizzly bears could have a detrimental impact on local agriculture and livestock industries. Bear attacks on livestock can result in financial losses for farmers, which may not be adequately compensated through existing programs.

Furthermore, grizzly bears may have a detrimental impact on local wildlife populations, including endangered species. The reintroduction of a top predator like the grizzly bear can disrupt the existing ecological balance and potentially harm the populations of other species, which could have unintended and negative consequences for our ecosystems.

In light of these concerns, I urge the Washington State to reconsider the decision to reintroduce grizzly bears. While conservation efforts are important, it is crucial to prioritize the safety and well-being of the residents of Washington State and the sustainability of local industries.

I request that a thorough and transparent evaluation of the potential risks and benefits of grizzly bear reintroduction be conducted, and that the concerns of local communities and stakeholders be taken into account during the decision-making process. Alternatives to grizzly bear reintroduction should also be explored to achieve conservation goals without compromising public safety and livelihoods.

Thank you for considering my viewpoint on this matter. I hope that you will make decisions that prioritize the best interests of the people of Washington State and the delicate balance of our environment.

Sincerely,

Correspondence ID: 1968Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Davenport, WA 99122
United States of America
Outside Organization: Concerned conservationist Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,17 2023 07:28:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To whom it may concern, I am NOT for the reintroduction of grizzlies. Not because I dislike them, but because I want to enjoy the outdoors without fearing for mine and my kids life. As the population of grizzly in Wyoming and Montana continue to grow, so have the number of attacks on people. I would like to be able to enjoy my outdoor experiences without the anxiety of wondering if a sow and cubs is around the corner or over the hill?? Not to mention grizzly are naturally more aggressive and larger than any carnivore in the lower 48. I have to ask myself, why are you guys considering putting your outdoor community in danger?! Along with rural communities. There are lots of grizzlies in Yellowstone, Wyoming and Montana. We can travel there to witness there beauty. Couple this with the lack of predator management for black bear, cougar and wolves. There soon won't be a sustainable ungulate population within this state, predators will turn to the next source of food. Humans! We have forever fragmented the habitats across this nation our animals need to survive. Urban development within wintering grounds, 4 to 6 lane freeways that are impossible to cross, fire and the increase of our population have taken a serious toll on animal populations. Let's put our time and effort into restoring habitat, creating highway crossing and controlling predator populations instead introducing another apex predator. I love the outdoors and the animals that call in home, ungulate populations are in trouble. Let's not compound the issue along with endangering people's lives.

Correspondence ID: 1969Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98273
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,17 2023 08:12:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a frequent visitor to NCNP, I support the effort to increase biodiversity and reintroduce grizzlies. Recreationalists have plenty of tools to keep ourselves safe while supporting wildlife's future.

Correspondence ID: 1970Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Cashmere, WA 98815-1057
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,17 2023 08:27:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I worked for the USFS, BLM, and USNPS in my 20's and 30's. I worked at Yellowstone when Wolves were being reintroduced. I understand the issue of balancing the ecosystem. I am now in my 60's. I live in North Central Washington and as a hiker and climber, I have traveled all over the North Cascades. I extensively use the North Cascades mountains.

I feel we have to be reasonable on what we do when "refurbishing" the ecosystem. Just like we cannot "burn the valleys" like the Native Americans did as they left their summer used lands because those same valleys now contain homes and structures, we cannot just state that the Grizzly Bear was present before and so needs to be brought back to "complete" the ecosystem. There is a good reason why top tier predators like the Grizzly Bear and the Wolves were fought and eventually exterminated. It is because as top tier predators, they are a threat to the health and safety to humans. Yes. Statistically it is rare such a top tier predator kills a human being. But they do. And it is not because someone is messing with their offspring or otherwise threatening their being. It is because as top tier predators, they (Grizzlies solo and Wolves only in packs) recognize their relative strength and dominance over humans.

I am sorry the present Washington State environment has become so human occupied that there is no room anymore for Grizzlies. But I adamantly DO NOT want to see Grizzlies reintroduced into Washington State.

Correspondence ID: 1971Project:112008Document:132104
Address: wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America
Outside Organization: none Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,17 2023 08:32:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Washington State has more than 8 million residents, it is not Montana or Idaho or Wyoming. The odds of a fatal encounter between a human and a bear will increase with the number of bears.

I favor Alternative A, the No Action Alternative. If the bears return, they should be protected similar to the protection of the wolves.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Larry.

Correspondence ID: 1972Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America
Outside Organization: Wenatchee Naturalist Program University/Professional Society(Official Rep.)
Received: Oct,17 2023 08:45:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the re-introduction of grizzly bears into the North Cascades Ecosystem. As a mother, biologist, science educator, and frequent visitor to the North Cascades, I am thrilled to know that the 26-year effort to restore the grizzly in the North Cascades may finally be completed. I grew up in western Montana where four generations of my family successfully co-existed with grizzlies, as we lived, worked, and recreated in shared habitat, rarely encountering one another. The restart of the grizzly restoration plan gives me hope that my husband and I, and our children and grandchildren will have the opportunity to see grizzlies in the North
This report:
The Climate Change Implications for Grizzly Bears (Ursus arctos) in the North Cascades Ecosystem
Natural Resource Report NPS/NOCA/NRR--2018/1814
Provides best available science guidance regarding the likely success that grizzly bears will thrive in future changed environments.

The 10(j) rule will provide maximum flexibility to land managers to a toolbox of options for dealing with human-bear conflicts that may arise. As a community, we need to implement bear-proofing behaviors to minimize black bear and human conflicts. These same conflict minimizing actions pertain to grizzly bears as well.

Thank you for this opportunity to express my support for grizzly bear re-introduction.

Correspondence ID: 1973Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Colville, WA 99114
United States of America
Outside Organization: USFS - Colville NF- Tonasket RD administration Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,17 2023 09:07:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Good day,

Table 5, the Colville NF administers the Tonasket RD and therefore a portion of the Pasayten Wilderness Area, like the Glacier Peak wilderness area is jointly managed by the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest / Colville National Forest.

(DEIS at 99). The Tonasket RD and the Colville administered lands end at the Tonasket / MVRD District line which lays a mile or so east of the Chewuch River. All the potential release area and the potential staging area west of Mazama lies on the Okanogan-Wenatchee NF administered lands.

I also want to mention briefly that in Appendix B, the discussion of NFMA as it applies to USFS lands in the NCE Grizzly Bear Restoration plan. If the additional NEPA that would be required for bears to be released on USFS lands, requires a plan amendment for any of the existing LMPs, then that amendment would be conducted under the 2012 Planning Rule, not the 1982 Planning Rule. The 2012 Planning Rule replaces the concept of MIS from NFMA (described at B-6) with the concept of focal species. See Federal Register Vol. 77 No 68 4/9/2012 at 21175 and 21233 Discussing challenges in monitoring for MIS and subsequent use of focal species.

If additional USFS NEPA planning involved a Forest Plan amendment to the Okanogan Plan the Colville National Forest, administering the Tonasket RD would like to be consulted on that action.

Amendments could affect various programs on the Ranger District that the Colville NF administers.

In looking at the DEIS it takes a bit of digging in my opinion to understand that bears will only be released on NPS land at NOCA. The map on page 29 showing potential release areas, on NPS NOCA, MBS USFS, and OKAWEN USFS, suggests that bears could be released on all that land. I was able to find the statement at page 33 that shows Grizzly bears would be released at multiple sites in remote areas on NPS land. Release sites on USFS lands could be included once USFS completes its own environmental compliance. My suggestion is to make this a bit clearer, maybe as a footnote to the map of release sites, or in the next FAQ document that's published?

Thanks for taking the time to consider comments, please feel free to reach out if there are follow up questions.

Correspondence ID: 1974Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Sweet Home, OR 97386
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,17 2023 09:16:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hello

I would like to advocate for the release of these bears to benefit the local ecosystem. I have one request, though. I would appreciate a greater emphasis on the education and outreach portions of the project.

People have so many fears and inaccurate information about large carnivores. Every hometown Facebook page is filled with carnivore sightings in and around communities, and the comments range from distasteful to dangerous. We need the general public to be educated about the presence of carnivores, their importance to our ecosystem, and how we can deter them from our homes and towns. There are so many wonderful resources to pull from, including Oregon and Washington's universities.

A more robust outreach and education plan would benefit not only the humans, it will save the bears from humans' gaze.

Thank you for your time.

Correspondence ID: 1975Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Beaverton, OR 97005
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,17 2023 10:43:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am opposed to reintroduction of grizzly bears in any capacity and support Alternative A (no action). Introduction of another apex predator in the NW will have negative consequences for ungulate populations, given plenty of wolves, cougars, and black bears already on the landscape. Eventually, conflicts with livestock and humans can be expected

resulting in the controversial response to euthanize offending animals. Historically, earlier pioneers were the victims of attacks by grizzlies which presented a terrifying situation when encountered unexpectedly. This same outcome has occurred in modern times in the Rockies with human lives lost-not something we need to duplicate with NW hikers, backpackers, and hunters.

Correspondence ID: 1976Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kirkland, WA 98033
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,17 2023 10:57:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am an avid hiker, but if I know there are grizzlies I will not go hiking. Even if I follow all the rules to stay safe, I could never relax and enjoy my hike. I have a degree in biology and environmental studies and a lifelong passion for ecosystems and animals. But I don't believe grizzlies have a place in the North Cascades. I don't trust humans to be able to manage them effectively. We are too fallible and we don't have the best track record for modifying ecosystems. Introducing grizzlies means disenfranchising humans. We need more recreation space for our collective mental health, not less.

Correspondence ID: 1977Project:112008Document:132104

Address: EAST WENATCHEE, WA 98802
United States of America

Outside Organization: AnovaWorks PLLC Business(Official Rep.)

Received: Oct,17 2023 11:04:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This plan only makes sense to urbanites and government officials sitting at their desks who believe they are forwarding some great ideal: "Restoring the grizzly bear to its natural habitat". Here is an alternative plan to that being "planned" by urbanites and government officials sitting at their desks. King and Thurston counties are woefully lacking any grizzly bear population, which is not true of northern Washington. Thus the first load of grizzly bears should be unloaded in those counties where a greater portion of the population could enjoy them. If grizzlies are not available, how about importing M13 gang members from Central America and their girlfriends. We could give them places to stay and food and make rules that no one could bother them. This is no more ridiculous than this NPS plan which is remarkably reckless to the folks who live, ranch, work and recreate in North Cascade Park regions. Your dream of "restoring grizzly bear habitat" is neglecting a fact: that habitat is now more highly populated by people. They don't want grizzly bears any more than they want violent gang members imported into their habitat. That fact is evidenced by a 1995 state law that states "grizzly bears should not be transplanted...into the state". Please give up this thoughtless idea that is highly resisted by the people who live here. Let's focus on the M13 idea in Washington DC first.

Correspondence ID: 1978Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Fall City, WA 98024
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,17 2023 11:09:48

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I wholeheartedly support the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 1979Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98119
United States of America

Outside Organization: Marketing Consultant Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,17 2023 11:27:24

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Global warming and impact to plants, animals and nature are real.

We need to bring the Grizzlies to WA. This is for our future generation
And for the good of this planet.

Correspondence ID: 1980Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Washougal, WA 98671
United States of America

Outside Organization: responding as an individual Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,17 2023 11:30:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am wholeheartedly in favor of pursuing option C for grizzly bear reintroduction in the NCE. I hiked the Washington Pacific Crest Trail in the summer of 2023 and am familiar with back-country. I am a biology professor and am familiar with the importance of maintaining ecological connections. Wherever possible, I prefer that ecological elements be maintained and or restored. Top consumers like grizzly bears are especially significant for an intact ecosystem.

I prefer option C with an introduction of 25 grizzlies in 5-10 years.

Correspondence ID: 1981Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Almira, WA 99103
United States of America

Outside Organization: private citizen Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,17 2023 12:19:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not introduce the grizzly bear into north central Washington, for it will jeopardize the safety of us citizens, including but not limited to recreational users, livestock producers, and forest and range managers and workers in our rural area.

Correspondence ID: 1982Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Edgewood, WA 98372
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,17 2023 12:27:45

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am opposed to reintroduction of Grizzly Bears in the North Cascade Ecosystem due to the high likelihood of bear-human confrontations. Outdoor experiences are vital elements of the quality of life for residents that would be constrained unacceptably out of fear for encountering grizzly bears along trails, at campsites, and along streams.

Correspondence ID: 1983Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98274
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,17 2023 12:44:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To whom it may concern,

I've been informed you are planning to release Grizzly bears in the Cascades. As a person/family who loves to hike, camp, and just generally be out in our beautiful country, this immediately causes me great anxiety. Grizzlies are one of the main reasons that my family and I would not live in Alaska or even do outdoor activities there either. I know that we're not the only ones who feel this way, so please consider your WA residents and others who come here to enjoy our beautiful country before following through with this.

And, considering that we already have black bears in the area, what could possibly be the incentive to drive this action?

Perhaps I don't completely understand all the dynamics, but that would be like releasing Great White sharks into the our Puget Sound to compete with our Orcas.

Please do not release Grizzlies into our state, and take away one of the main reasons we moved here.

Thank you for your time,

Correspondence ID: 1984Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Portland, OR 97211
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,17 2023 12:47:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To Whom It May Concern:

I am strongly in support of reintroducing grizzly bears to the North Cascades National Park. The protected areas in the park are in lands that were once prime grizzly bear habitat. These wild landscapes are part of the grizzly bear's natural range, and National Park staff have demonstrated at many other national parks that they are capable of managing public lands where grizzly bears live. The North Cascades is a very special national treasure; it offers unique opportunities for our nation to invest in supporting biodiversity and conservation in the face of accelerating climate change. Megafauna like the grizzly bear will need our support to continue to recover and thrive. There are few areas like the North Cascades that allow us to invest in their recovery.

As staff evaluate various alternative approaches for reintroducing grizzly bears to the North Cascades, I encourage and support the efforts to select an approach that accelerates the likelihood that bears will thrive and be able to grow their population in the North Cascades National Park as quickly as possible.

Thank you for your time and work on this effort!

Jared Kennedy

Correspondence ID: 1985Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Montesano, WA 98563
United States of America
Outside Organization: Resources coalition Non-Governmental
Received: Oct,17 2023 13:02:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We don't need anymore grizzly bears in Washington state! They are already there. No need to over populate the resident nears that are there. The wolves didn't work out well and bears won't either

Correspondence ID: 1986Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,17 2023 13:24:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do not agree to increase the population of Grizzlies in our local area. Our whole town is a adventurous town that leaves close proximity to hiking, biking, skiing, camping, fishing trails and the safety of our kids future and their ability to explore the lands of their parents and grandparents and great grandparents is super important. We already have cougars, wolves, and black bears that have attacked people bringing in Grizzlies is to say the least ridiculous as they are more powerful and known for attacking without cause.

Correspondence ID: 1987Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America
Outside Organization: Leavenworth Insurance Llc DbA Insurepro Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,17 2023 13:29:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As both a business owner in Leavenworth and an avid hiker in the wilderness areas, I am against having grizzly bears brought back in. There are just too many people using the mountain areas and it is simply too dangerous...

<https://www.cnn.com/2023/10/14/us/montana-grizzly-bear-attack-survivor/index.html>

<https://www.npr.org/2023/10/06/1203928437/couple-grizzly-bear-attack-banff-sent-message>

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_fatal_bear_attacks_in_North_America

Correspondence ID: 1988Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Portland, OR 97206
United States of America
Outside Organization: Self Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,17 2023 13:36:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Yes! Lets restore Grizzlies to the North Cascades. The ecosystem balance benefits greatly from these predators

Correspondence ID: 1989Project:112008Document:132104
Address: SPOKANE VALLEY, WA 99216
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,17 2023 14:49:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Alternative A is the best option.

Correspondence ID: 1990Project:112008Document:132104
Address: East Wenatchee, WA 98802
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,17 2023 15:16:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We dont need more bears here

Correspondence ID: 1991Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,17 2023 16:53:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Thanks for asking for public comment about grizzly bears in our area. Before commenting on this specific issue, some pertinent information will be provided. Our family lives in the wilderness on 55 acres off the White River road by Lake Wenatchee. It is commonplace for us to see bears, deer, elk, an occasional moose, bobcat and less commonly cougar and porcupine. We enjoy the wildlife and live in harmony with them. However, we oppose the

reinstitution of grizzly bears into the area for some sound reasons.

The major reason is a shortage of food.

Our rivers and lakes in the area used to be teeming with fish, one of the main food sources for grizzlies in the wild. The fish are much fewer now in both the rivers and lakes. The black bears in the area are much skinnier than in past years, and some have taken to dumpster diving to get at people's garbage. It is tragic when they have to be euthanized because of human's irresponsibility, but it occurs in our area.

My husband and I would be happy to provide additional feedback if necessary.

Kind Regards,

Correspondence ID: 1992Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mountlake Terrace, WA 98043
United States of America

Outside Organization: myself Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,17 2023 17:57:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As an environmentally aware, animal loving, nature person, I find it amazing and ironic that Washington Fish & Wildlife wants anything to do with releasing more grizzlies into the North Cascades. Only two years ago they were killing off black bears which they claimed were eating the bark of trees, and supposedly adversely affecting the profits of Big Timber. I know that if more bears are released into the Cascades it will only result in eventual "culling" programs similar to the black bear. The Cascades do not need more grizzly bears in order to maintain a balance in nature.

Correspondence ID: 1993Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Portland, OR 97203
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,17 2023 17:58:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: They are predators meaning they might kill cows, like the wolves you transplanted in Oregon. Then you'll have a reason to kill them too

Correspondence ID: 1994Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mountlake Terrace, WA 98043
United States of America

Outside Organization: none Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,17 2023 18:11:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: (This is my second "try", this library computer mangled up my first)...As an environmentalist and nature person I find it strange that Washington Fish & Game wants anything to do with reintroducing grizzlies into the North Cascades. Just two years ago they wanted to kill off excess black bears they claimed were eating the bark off trees, thus affecting the profits of Big Timber. I predict the same fate will happen to grizzlies, eventually. Another reason being what most hikers fear...who wants to hike or camp with grizzlies?

Correspondence ID: 1995Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Gardiner, MT 59030
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,17 2023 18:24:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support option 3 for grizzly reintroduction into the Cascades. I live in Grizzly country just outside Yellowstone National Park. I've had grizzlies in my yard, I hike in the GYE weekly. Only once have I encountered a grizzly that charged. We were prepared with bear spray. Bear ran away with no need to spray. Sure, there are things we must do to

avoid encouraging bears on our property: We harvest our apples immediately, we do not leave trash outside at all, our communities use bear proof trash containers. It is well worth the bit of extra effort we need to do in order to have grizzly bears in our ecosystem. At one time, there was plenty of non-human space where wild animals could roam. No more. We humans have invaded all lands, and now we MUST learn to share. we must, as a species, learn to allow other species space to roam. A world without grizzly bears would be a sad world indeed.

Correspondence ID: 1996Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Tacoma, WA 98409
United States of America
Outside Organization: Greater Yellowstone Coalition Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,17 2023 20:01:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a long time member of the Greater Yellowstone Coalition and an advocate for wild land and places, I believe the North Cascades would be a good place to restore the Grizzly Bear. I worked on this issue in the 80's to restore the Grizzly in the North Cascades, it's about time we do it now.
Thanks,
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 1997Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Oak Harbor, WA 98277
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,17 2023 20:44:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Very in favor! Would love to know that these glorious bears have been restored to a place they can thrive and grow. Bring back the bears!

Correspondence ID: 1998Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Stanwood, WA 98292
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,17 2023 20:55:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears were historically present in and have been long gone from the North Cascades Ecosystem for generations.

The process to restore a viable population of grizzly bears as required by the Endangered Species Act began way back in 1997 when federal scientists determined the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE) has sufficient quality habitat to support a grizzly bear population. Grizzly bears are an important keystone species for this ecosystem. Additionally, the NEC is the only designated recovery area on the entire west coast of the lower 48 states.

The preferred action alternative is "C"; which would release 3 to 7 bears annually over approximately 5-10 years into the six million acre NCE. This gradual and modest approach seeks to establish an initial population of 25 bears before switching to adaptive management strategies. A successful recovery program could establish a population of 200 bears over 60-100 years in the six million acre NCE.

The recovery and reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem should be accomplished without further delays and it would seem that alternative "C" is the best choice.

Sincerely,
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 1999Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Orlando, FL 32810
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,17 2023 21:29:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm thrilled to hear that there is a proposed plan for grizzly restoration to the Northern Cascades. This amazing mammal, once numbered in the tens of thousands, now has less than 2,000 animals in the lower 48, where they once roamed. As so many Americans suffer emotional issues in our world of concrete and lights, I really believe that our National Parks and wild spaces and wild denizens bring joy and awe, and can restore health to us. So many people enjoy getting out to the parks, and grizzly bears are THE major attraction in some regions of the west and Alaska. It will be great for the ecosystem, and I would imagine it would be great economically as well. Please do continue with a restoration, not only here, but in other areas where they once roamed. Humans need to share better than we have. We hunted so many animals to near extinction, and we need to fix that.

Correspondence ID: 2000Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,17 2023 21:51:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: 1) The Wildlife Crossovers Program, introduced by U.S. Transportation Secretary Pete Buttigieg in April 2023, needs to be implemented preceding, or at least in conjunction with, the re-introduction of the Grizzlies. Otherwise, the Grizzlies will be re-introduced into a high density area further endangering them instead of conserving them. There needs to be coordination amongst the Federal Government and local governments with the plan to re-introduce the Grizzlies and the Wildlife Crossings Program. However, my attempts at this have received nothing but the silent treatment from the City of Bellingham and Whatcom County. In April and May of 2023, and numerous times throughout the summer and fall, I have brought this matter of the Federal grants being available for wildlife crossovers, citing 'Biden-Harris Administration Launches First-Ever Program to Improve Safety on America's Roadways by Preventing Wildlife-Vehicle Collisions', etc., before Bellingham City and Whatcom County Council's during public comment and public hearings, as well as the City of Bellingham Transportation Committee (May of 2023). Unfortunately, neither Bellingham or Whatcom County are interested, nor as far as I can tell, has the State of Washington attempted to implement the Wildlife Crossings Program.

2) Bear Spray is not enough for a bear attack. I have addressed this in letters published in the Anchorage Daily News repeatedly over the years, also USA Today and Outdoors Magazine, etc. The late [REDACTED] and myself were attacked by a Brown Bear (Grizzly) on the Kenai Peninsula in Alaska 9/15/96. Please see Anchorage Daily News article regarding this attack: 'A Can of Spray and A lot of Luck'; 9/29/96; C. Medred. I used bear spray correctly in the attack but was knocked down by the bear with a side-arm swipe to my chest; the bear growling and snarling in my face as I sprayed the rest of the canister into its wide open mouth and throat, while it was, according to [REDACTED] swinging its paw threateningly at my head. It could have killed me then if it wanted to, but believe it simply wanted to assert domination. The bear was protecting the salmon it was eating when we came upon it, so it reacted like a dog protecting its dog bowl. But had it been in destruction mode, bear spray would not have stopped it from destroying myself and perhaps [REDACTED] as well. This message is reiterated by me over the years as a sort of public service announcement, but by far the message the public receives is for bear spray to be used for defense in a bear attack. And because it's the National Parks and wildlife officials advising that, it tends to carry more weight than me warning otherwise, particularly as I'm presently homeless.

Thank you...Sincerely, [REDACTED] P.S.: E-mail outdated but required field

Correspondence ID: 2001Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Redmond, WA 98052
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,17 2023 22:10:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Let me say that I am against reintroducing grizzlies to the north cascades here in Washington. There are already grizzlies here, we don't need any more to be forced in. If the population of bears wants to grow, it will grow organically.

How does relocating more grizzlies into the north cascades of Washington benefit the taxpayer? It doesn't, in fact, it puts hikers, campers and citizens of the surrounding populated areas at risk of injury or death.

Please put the health and well being of your taxpayers first instead of forcibly reintroducing an animal that can kill and eat humans and livestock to a region where so many people travel to enjoy the great outdoors.

Thank you,

██████

Correspondence ID: 2002Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Vashon, WA 98070
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,18 2023 08:57:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Bring back the bears! Then teach humans how to live with wildlife. We have intruded on THEIR habitat. We must restore the balance and put the responsibility for that where it belongs--on ourselves!

Correspondence ID: 2003Project:112008Document:132104

Address: East Wenatchee, WA 98802
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,18 2023 09:03:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a member of Backcountry Horsemen of Wenatchee, I strongly disagree with this program. This has been tried many times in the past and is still a bad idea today with all the increased usage in the back country. Why would you endanger incent families enjoying the wilderness? Keep the grizzlies in Canada where they have vas wilderness to roam and not endanger humans and livestock.

Correspondence ID: 2004Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Cashmere, WA 98815
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,18 2023 12:50:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan for the North Cascade National Park.

Correspondence ID: 2005Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98126
United States of America

Outside Organization: Evergreen Escapes Business(Official Rep.)

Received: Oct,18 2023 12:55:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in support of reintroducing Grizzlies into the NCNP. I believe that these bears will help the ecosystem, and overall are not a threat to humanity and do not limit my access to this beautiful park. I am afraid of these bears and do believe that I will not feel comfortable backpacking alone anymore in this. Beautiful park knowing that these bears may be reintroduced. I also believe that these bears would help the ecosystem and that they have been here and existed

with Native Americans in this area for thousands of years. I know that bears eat 80% of plants in their diet and that it is very rare to see them.

Correspondence ID: 2006Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98107
United States of America
Outside Organization: Woodland park zoo Conservation/Preservation(Official Rep.)
Received: Oct,18 2023 12:59:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please bring grizzlies back. They are so important to our ecosystem and deserve to be back to their home. This is our chance to help fight the extinction of our bears.

Correspondence ID: 2007Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Lynnwood, WA 98087
United States of America
Outside Organization: Woodland Park Zoo Conservation/Preservation
Received: Oct,18 2023 13:42:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzly Bears should be reintroduced to the North Cascade Ecosystem. They help to spread seeds. They are good diggers of bulbs and mammals. They regulate overpopulation of small mammals. They originally were a integral part of the ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 2008Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Olympia, WA 98513
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,18 2023 13:58:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My concerns are similar to those mentioned about public safety when recreating. I hunted the Selkirk Unit in NW Washington in 2008. Even then there were warning signs of Grizzley Bears in the area and to know the difference between Black and Grizzley Bear. The state has already introcued wolves which are taking a a toll on the ungulates (Deer Elk etc). Thus causing many hunters to leave the state to hunt elsewhere. Thus a loss in funding to the state, and to businesses that pay state taxes..

Thanks, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 2009Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Jonesboro, AR 72401
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,18 2023 14:43:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We have witnessed just how much the wolves being reintroduced into the wild has benefited entire ecosystems. We can extrapolate by the wolf reintroduction that reintroduction of the grizzly will equally benefit ecosystems. Humans have decimated habitats and we are feeling the repercussions of animal loss, extinction, and habitat loss. Please be part of the change to save our planet and save species. Reintroduce the grizzly and watch the habitat thrive.

Correspondence ID: 2010Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,18 2023 16:52:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We need more bears. They are vital to the ecosystem. Please give us more bears

Correspondence ID: 2011Project:112008Document:132104
Address: SALEM, OR 97301
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,18 2023 19:38:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To whom it may concern,

Thank you for taking my comment on the 2022 North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/Environmental Impact Statement. My name is [REDACTED], and I am an environmental professional with over thirteen years of professional environmental consulting experience. In addition to my professional experience, I have a Bachelor of Arts in Environmental Studies from the [REDACTED] and am currently in the process of earning my Master of Science in Environmental Policy and Management from the [REDACTED].

I would like to take this opportunity to provide support for the Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan. However, I would urge the National Park Service and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to support the plan with Alternative B as opposed to preferred Alternative C which designates grizzly bears as an experimental population as defined under section 10(j) of the Endangered Species Act (ESA). While I understand that this designation would help alleviate some local landowner concerns regarding protection of private property, including livestock, in my opinion this relaxation of the ESA goes against the goals of the restoration plan by not enhancing "the probability of long-term survival of grizzly bears." In effect, this designation could ultimately cause harm to the grizzly bear population that is relocated to the North Cascades by making it easier to "take" the grizzly bear and reducing the repercussions for doing so. This would be especially true with the "Unintentional" taking of a bear. In effect, the 10(j) designation could potentially result in two separate take events. The first when bears are relocated from other locations to North Cascades, and a second take when bears are relocated or euthanized for any reason outside the normal protections of the ESA.

While I commend the agencies for the desire to restore grizzly bears to their former habitat in the North Cascades, I disagree that the protection of personal property should be given priority over the protection of an endangered species. If the goal of this program is to restore these beings to their natural habitat and bring an integral part of the ecosystem back into the equation, I would urge the agencies to follow alternative B. Otherwise, the goals of the program should be revised to include an "except when local landowners and property disagree" to each of the goals stated in the plan.

I appreciate you taking the time to read this comment. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 2012Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98116
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,18 2023 19:48:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support re-introduction of grizzly bears in the North Cascades greater ecosystem. They are an iconic species that needs to be there, and I think we can find ways to live with them. People in the Rockies, particularly Yellowstone National Park have figured it out and that area has a lot more people with a lot more grizzlies in a small area. So it makes sense to introduce a small population up in the North Cascades.

I am an active hiker and know that with responsible awareness and food management, we can recreate safely where grizzly bears live. Most bears avoid humans and I believe the plan is to collar these bears, so they can be tracked. Any problem bears can be dealt with.

These are the last of the large mammals missing from the North Cascades. Environments are enriched when there is diversity of species. The grizzlies belongs there. It is good for us and them. The world will be enriched by them. Tourism and recreation bring dollars to communities, and the presence of bears is always a draw, even if the chance of seeing one is remote. So, it's good for humans and good for bears to have them back.

Correspondence ID: 2013Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Soap Lake, WA 98851
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,18 2023 20:23:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The same problem exists as did the last time you asked about this. The rules of engagement are that the bear can do whatever it wants up to the point where it's actually eating you.

A grizzly getting to my place is unlikely, but I do substantial back country camping up around the Methow valley. It is not my habit to carry a firearm on these trips, but if I'm going to be facing a grizzly that may have to change. You are correct in that black bears seldom attack, but it wasn't that long ago that a Grizzly killed and partially ate a ranger in Yellowstone. He certainly knew the bear protocols, but it didn't save him.

Just earlier this month a grizzly bear killed two people in Banff National Park. In the end it preferred to eat their dog.

I would suggest that rules of engagement be modified to; 1) If the bear in the wilderness area then it may be shot only for self preservation, including the horse you need to get back out. 2) any bear not in the wilderness area may be shot by anyone at any time, no particular reason needed.

This will still reduce the number of people going camping in the national forests, as not everyone has a firearm powerful enough to take down a grizzly, but at least it evens up the odds and you wouldn't have to worry about getting dragged to court if you are attacked.

One last point, if the people of Seattle and the other cities want the grizzlies, then they should have them. Release them in the San Juan Islands, Bainbridge island, Vashon Island, and the outskirts of Seattle. The Protected Class stuck rural folk with the cost of the timberwolves while they sit safe signaling their virtue. I don't want the situation repeated.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 2014Project:112008Document:132104

Address: St George, UT 84770
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,18 2023 20:24:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly support the reintroduction of grizzlies. They are currently extirpated from the vast majority of their historic range. They are apex predators and they contribute to ecosystem health. NPS lands are appropriate and would benefit from grizzly reintroduction. Please continue this essential conservation work. Thank you!

Correspondence ID: 2015Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,18 2023 20:37:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Don Striker and Supervisor Brad Thompson,

I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support the agencies' proposal to bring up to 25 non-problem grizzly bears into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade.

The draft EIS's action alternatives provide the best opportunity for the survival of grizzly bears in the North Cascades and will also benefit people who live in and visit the North Cascades. The plans are modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in the action alternatives. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Thank you for taking the time to keep our North Cascades wild!

Sincerely

██████████

Correspondence ID: 2016Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Charles Town, WV 25414
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,18 2023 20:53:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: While I can see why this may be beneficial to re-establishing grizzlies in the north cascades, would it not make more sense to focus efforts on bears in areas where they are already present?

What would the introduction look like for back country hiking folk who take precautions for black bears but not the added threat of grizzlies. I think that no action should be taken and that the bears rely on natural recovery in this national park. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 2017Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Moses Lake, WA 98837
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,18 2023 21:16:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is against state law. Not in favor.

RCW 77.12.035

Protection of grizzly bears--Limitation on transplantation or introduction--Negotiations with federal and state agencies. The commission shall protect grizzly bears and develop management programs on publicly owned lands that will encourage the natural regeneration of grizzly bears in areas with suitable habitat.

Grizzly bears shall not be transplanted or introduced into the state.

Only grizzly bears that are native to Washington state may be utilized by the department for management programs.

The department is directed to fully participate in all discussions and negotiations with federal and state agencies relating to grizzly bear management and shall fully communicate, support, and implement the policies of this section.

Correspondence ID: 2018Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98273-5656
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,18 2023 21:37:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello,

As a resident of Skagit County who also owns property in Okanogan County, I am in favor of reintroducing grizzly bears to the North Cascades. Driving across Hwy 20 between our properties, the beauty of the North Cascades is something I treasure. There are so few places left where grizzlies can be re-established in their historic territories, that I am humbled to realize the region I call home is a place where we can re-invite them to come home, as well. I've done a fair bit of hiking & backpacking in Glacier N.P., and I feel there can be a successfully managed relationship between human enjoyment of the backcountry with minimal negative human-bear interactions, and the bear density in that area is far greater than it's anticipated to become here. Please mark me down as "in favor" of reintroduction!

Thank you,

Correspondence ID: 2019Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bend, OR 97702
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,18 2023 22:05:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Perhaps we should reintroduce Polio, Small Pox and the Bubonic Plague also? Really, this is a very bad idea.

Correspondence ID: 2020Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mercer Island, WA 98040
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,18 2023 23:38:08

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Humans were responsible for removing grizzlies from the North Cascades and it's our responsibility to bring them back home.

Correspondence ID: 2021Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Philadelphia, PA 19348
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,19 2023 06:02:10

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hi,

Please reconsider spending your funds on other projects. My brother lives just outside the cascades and recreates there constantly. I spend time there when we visit. We already see wolverine and black bear regularly... you really don't need to dump any more large predators there.

Sincerely

Correspondence ID: 2022Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Corpus Christi, TX 78418
United States of America
Outside Organization: NA Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,19 2023 06:13:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hello,

I'm moving back to the area in a month, and I plan to spend every weekend in the cascade mountains. I've lived, hiked, camped, fished, and hunted in the area extensively. Why would you dump more grizzly bears in this area?!?! What's wrong with the ecosystem there?!?! You've gotta have better ideas than this (Ex. Fire prevention, invasive plant removal, Wilderness expansion, road maintenance... goodness, restore the elk before you think about bears!). I get it, bears are cool, but the idea of introducing extra bears is insane. It's time to stop meddling with the ecosystem. If more bears are supposed to be there, then they'll come. What's stopping them?!?! Nothing!

Thanks, and please seriously consider not putting grizzlies in the area.

Correspondence ID: 2023Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Quincy, WA 98848
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,19 2023 06:33:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please don't reintroduce grizzlies into the North Cascades!

I spend a great deal of time, along with my family, in the North Cascades and the local communities in the area each summer...camping, hiking, staying in hotels, eating at restaurants, gassing up vehicles, shopping, and enjoying family vacation time. It usually amounts to 10-20 days per year in total, spending a great deal of money between all of us.

With the threat of running running into a grizzly, we will go elsewhere with our money. I can't put myself and my extended family in danger like that. Grizzlies are aggressive predators. It's already bad enough with the packs of wolves out there that pose potential danger. This would be the final nail in the coffin.

I want my kids and grandkids to continue to learn about and enjoy our wonderful North Cascades and get outdoors. If grizzlies are reintroduced, we will take our money elsewhere (which unfortunately hurts many people outside of the National Park).

Correspondence ID: 2024Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Gilbert, AZ 85295
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,19 2023 08:20:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The plan to reintroduce as "nonessential experimental population" is the best plan that allows for study of how everything is effected by the reintroduction and how to best manage the population.

Correspondence ID: 2025Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Damascus, OR 97089
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,19 2023 09:35:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am a Pacific NW resident, an environmental advocate, and lover of nature. And I am against the reintroduction of grizzly bears in the NCE. I hope the NPS weighs heavily the public comments of the actual residents in and around North Cascades in Washington, as those are the US citizens you will most affect with this proposal.

The purported benefits are vague, unscientific and tug at the nostalgic heartstrings of nature lovers like myself. Saying it is a "recovery" plan, or it's "how it used to be" evokes positive feelings, but is devoid of concrete positive outcomes to the current ecosystem. Nostalgia is not a reason to spend valuable resources to bring an apex predator to an ecosystem.

The question should not be "how was it in the past", but rather "how will it be in the future if we proceed"? The answer is that grizzly bear reintroduction will displace current black bear populations and negatively affect residents, farmers, and recreators. As for concrete positive effects, There was not a single one enumerated in the entire text of this proposed rule, excepting "more grizzlies". Do we need more grizzlies? While considering individual NCEs/GBPUs in isolation can seem to raise alarm bells on grizzly bear sustainability, overall extant grizzly bear populations across US and Canada are proven abundant enough to be self-sustaining for the overall species.

A giveaway is in the proposed rule title itself: Nonessential. Let us spend our limited resources on more essential environmental projects.

"Recovery" and "restorative" is bad logic. We don't recover the grizzly population of San Francisco, though they once roamed the area. We don't try to restore of a mile-thick ice sheet on top of New York city, though it was there the last ice age.

Grizzly bears should not be forcibly reintroduced to NCE, via 10(j) designation or otherwise. Living in the past is the wrong way to develop good environmental plans for the future.

Correspondence ID: 2026Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Moses Lake, WA 98837
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,19 2023 10:00:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hello,

Please do not reintroduce Grizzly Bears to North Cascades. Although they are an amazing species they are also an apex predator. The North Cascades are not as remote as most people think they are. These bears will impact the safety of ranchers, small towns and tourists alike.

These bears have been missing from this area for decades and the ecosystem seems to be doing just fine.

Please DO NOT reintroduce Grizzly Bears to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 2027Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Deltona, FL 32738
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,19 2023 10:43:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: All animals should be Reintroduced to areas they once roamed free. Thank you for letting me speak my piece. 🕒❤️😄us🇺🇸

Correspondence ID: 2028Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tacoma, WA 98409
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,19 2023 10:52:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please help reintroduce these great animals back into what was their natural habitats.

Correspondence ID: 2029Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98122
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,19 2023 11:26:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I don't want forced reintroduction. Let them come back on their own if they want to come back.

Correspondence ID: 2030Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98125
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,19 2023 11:29:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I would like to express my support for Alternative C as the best option for the reintroduction of grizzly bears into the North Cascades, giving managers a range of options for the most success.

I strongly believe the reintroduction of grizzly bears would be a boon to the ecosystem of the region, and that any challenges can be mitigated for success.

Thank you for your efforts on this project.

Correspondence ID: 2031Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Newtown, PA 18940
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,19 2023 11:32:49
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We need the Grizzly, an apex predator, to be reintroduced to the Northwest Cascade ecosystem. Their numbers have been severely depleted and must return to balance out the ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 2032Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Sedro Woolley, WA 98284
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,19 2023 11:41:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We are fully supportive of reintroducing grizzly bears into North Cascade NP. They are magnificent creatures that need lots of room to roam, and this area was their home. We've had amazing encounters up close with grizzly bears and cubs, and it truly is something we never will forget!! We need to do the responsible thing and ensure that these wondrous mammals have a safe and secure existence in the back country. As Thoreau said, "In wildness, is the preservation of the world". And these bears are an important part of that. We love our national parks, and hope the right decision will be made to allow these grizzly bears to return to their rightful and deserving habitat.

Correspondence ID: 2033Project:112008Document:132104
Address: seattle, WA 98125
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,19 2023 12:16:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do not think grizzly/brown bears should be intentionally reintroduced to the North Cascades National Park area. If bears return to this area on their own, they should be left alone.

Correspondence ID: 2034Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Snohomish, WA 98296
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,19 2023 12:21:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I want to preface this by saying I am an avid bear lover and recognize that Grizzlies historically lived in the North Cascades and human activity has pushed them out. I am all for the bears and protecting them, however I do not believe relocating Grizzlies into the north Cascades is a good idea.
At this point in time, the Pacific Northwest has a high volume of people moving here, and the growth shows no sign of slowing down. The mountains and surrounding areas are continually being built or logged into, habitats for all animals becoming destroyed. This year more than ever, we see black bears moving lower, getting relocated or euthanized because they get habituated to food and people and have less and less space to roam. I feel like what is happening in Montana with the Grizzlies is a precursor to what will happen here. There are many more people who go into the mountains in this area, raising concern for more human-bear conflicts as well. At this point I don't believe the North Cascades are a big enough, undisturbed area to safely home Grizzlies without repercussions on human life and subsequently the bears will suffer for that. There are Grizzlies just over the border in Canada and Idaho, if the bears really wanted couldn't they just come down? If they are not, I feel as though there may be a reason. I just think it's too populated down here to make this plan successful without devastation and loss for bears.
Thank you for listening.

Correspondence ID: 2035Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Olympia, WA 98506
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,19 2023 12:51:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Regional diversity plays an important part in Grizzly bear health. I support the introduction of Grizzlies into the North Cascades ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 2036Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Sprague, WA 99032
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,19 2023 12:59:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Introducing another apex predator into Washington state is a huge mistake which would be detrimental to tourism, agriculture, and hunting/fishing. Grizzlies are not endangered and already exist in Washington state. I have personally had an encounter with a grizzly while archery hunting in Stevens County. Frankly, it is sheer luck I am alive. Even people who are bear aware have been injured and killed by these bears, unleashing them into a very popular tourism area will cause nothing but heartache. There are already trailheads closed for black bears who have learned humans equal a meal and stocking these same areas with grizzlies will result in more closures.
The national cow herd population is already at its lowest since the 1960s, why bring in yet another predator when ranchers

are already plagued by wolves? The same can be said for sheep ranchers. Wolves have progressively moved the dwindling elk and deer populations towards urban areas and grizzlies will only add to this problem.

The mammals and fish grizzlies eat are all facing their own challenges, none are overstocked, so they do not need to be "managed" by grizzlies. Bringing in the bears will only further stress deer, elk, salmon, etc.

This idea has been brought up several times. After biologists look into the effects and outcomes, they have decided against it time and time again. This time is no different, please do not bring any more grizzlies into Washington.

Correspondence ID: 2037Project:112008Document:132104

Address: PHILADELPHIA, PA 19146-1020
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,19 2023 13:45:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I live in Philadelphia, and may never have the pleasure of setting foot in the North Cascades. However I fully support the return of grizzlies to that ecosystem. I support using my federal tax dollars to do it.

Returning grizzlies to this isolated area is an excellent idea, it will have widespread ecosystem effects, and it will undergird our collective understanding of the wild American west s a place that supports this most American animal.

Correspondence ID: 2038Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellevue, WA 98005
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,19 2023 14:07:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I oppose grizzly bear re-introduction to North Cascades.

This proposal has been brought up multiple times during the last decade. Local counties opposed it. I don't see what changed since the last (failed) attempt - same reasons to NOT re-introduce grizzly bears are still relevant.

Don't do it.

Correspondence ID: 2039Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mukilteo, WA 98275
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,19 2023 14:34:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am a grand parent who cares about wildlife, and I want my grandchildren to experience grizzly bears as an important part of our regional culture.

Correspondence ID: 2040Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,19 2023 15:37:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I prefer the no action plan. I believe that there aren't any grizzlies in this area because over time the environment became inhospitable to them. Probably because they were killed due to human interaction and didn't find enough food. I question whether we as humans could now manage to bring them back.

My son owns forestry land in central Whatcom county and we would not want to see grizzlies anywhere near where we work and spend time. On reading the preferred proposal it sounds like quite a lot of expense (i.e. helicopter flights) and human

interference would be necessary if grizzlies are re-introduced. I believe nature is better served with less involvement and human contact rather than more. Thank you, sincerely [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 2041Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mukilteo, WA 98275
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,19 2023 15:47:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The Grizzlies belong in the PNW so let's not hurt our planet even more than we have. Bring them back!

Correspondence ID: 2042Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Federal Way, WA 98023
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,19 2023 15:47:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzly Bears were hunted to near extinction because of their position at the top of the food chain and the white settlers desire to "Tame" the land. The Bears are an important part of a healthy N Cascades Eco-System and pose far less danger to human beings than other human made factors. Potential loss of livestock as a defense against their return is an offense to all who love and enjoy the great outdoors. Is the existence of open range fed European Cows and or Sheep more important than animals that are trying to exist in their native habitat? I say No!
A far bigger concern to the harmony of the Cascade Wilderness is off leash dogs harassing and even killing native species. Dogs bite people every day yet there is no great fear and or condemnation of them.

I would love to have the Bears back in the North Cascades. Please do all possible to return them to this great park.

Correspondence ID: 2043Project:112008Document:132104
Address: DES MOINES, WA 98198-7805
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,19 2023 16:40:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am 100% in favor of Grizzly Bear restoration to the North Cascades. It is well past time to restore this population to enhance, restore, and protect the environment in our region. Restoring animal populations decimated by human activity is the right thing to do.

Correspondence ID: 2044Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,19 2023 17:42:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am a resident of the upper Methow Valley, living just outside the town of Winthrop and within the boundaries of the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE). I am writing to express my support for the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the NCE as proposed in Alternative C of the DEIS by the National Park Service and US Fish and Wildlife Service.

I am an active user of the public lands within the NCE, including hiking, bicycling, canoeing, skiing and snowshoeing in the North Cascades National Park Complex as well as adjacent wilderness areas, national forest, and state lands. Upon initially hearing about the plan to reintroduce grizzlies into this area, I was skeptical if not opposed, primarily due to my concern about negative bear-human interactions. However, I kept an open mind, attending meetings to learn about the plan and reading as much as I could--both pro and con--including the executive summary of the Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan /

Environmental Impact Statement. My position changed as a result, as I came to understand that the North Cascades is one of the few places left in our country with suitable habitat for grizzlies and to recognize that restoring grizzlies contributes to biodiversity and restores the grizzly bears' beneficial contributions to the ecosystem. We already live in an area that supports other predators such as cougars as well as black bears, and I believe that those of us living in the area proposed for reintroduction can also learn to live with and respect the rights of the grizzly bears to coexist with humans here.

I am also supportive of the designation of this population as a 10(j) nonessential population, as I believe the management tools afforded by this designation will reduce human-bear conflicts and increase the likelihood of successful establishment of a population.

Correspondence ID: 2045Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,19 2023 18:06:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am highly in favor of grizzly bears coming back to the North Cascades! If it wasn't for humankind's past mistakes, they would still be there now, and this is a great opportunity to right one of the wrongs of our history. I believe that these bears will improve the ecosystem, and make our natural parks that much more special for their presence. Please approve the reintroduction of grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 2046Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98108
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,19 2023 18:31:56

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Don Striker and Supervisor Brad Thompson,

As an avid camper, outdoorsman and hiker living in Washington State I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations. I know there are concerns over safety when it comes to Grizzly bears and I wanted to weigh in and say that the proposed restoration will not effect my feeling of personal safety while enjoying the Northern Cascades region.

I support the agencies' proposal to bring up to 25 non-problem grizzly bears into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade.

The draft EIS's action alternatives provide the best opportunity for the survival of grizzly bears in the North Cascades and will also benefit people who live in and visit the North Cascades. The plans are modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in the action alternatives. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Thank you for taking the time to keep our North Cascades wild!

Correspondence ID: 2047Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98108
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,19 2023 19:59:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I grew up on the edge of Olympic National Park and hiking in British Columbia. I understand rural attitudes towards predator species and the complexity of human-bear interactions. Washingtonians are ready to cohabitate with more bears.

Correspondence ID: 2048Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Palouse, WA 99161
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,19 2023 20:24:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: A big NO on reintroducing grizzly bears. Keep the status quo.

Correspondence ID: 2049Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Olympia, WA 98501
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,19 2023 20:36:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a biologist told me: "Mankind has spent the last 10,000 years trying to get rid of apex predators. Why would we want to bring them back?" The answer was "NO" in 2020 and it is "NO" now. Why bring this up again? Leave things as they are, take no action. As the population of Washington swells interactions with bears will only increase. I do not want you, me, or anyone else to get eaten by a grizzly.

Correspondence ID: 2050Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Rochester, WA 98579
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,19 2023 21:14:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: God has made this earth as he designed, we as humans are constantly destroying his design by constantly trying to change landscapes, build city's were forest once ruled. As we destroy we then try to rebuild our destruction, sometimes we get it right. However introducing grizzly bears to areas that already have dwindling deer and elk populations, is not getting it right. Some things are to far gone to restore without having more unwanted destruction. This plan of investing in an introduction of an invasive species in the current environment is not a good idea.

Correspondence ID: 2051Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Newton, MA 02465
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,19 2023 21:24:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Re: 2022 North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/ Environmental Impact Statement (Docket No. FWS-R1-ES-2023-0074)

Dear Mr. Striker,

I'd like to thank you and your team at the National Park Service for your thoughtful work preparing the draft Environmental

Impact Statement (EIS).

I am writing in strong support of alternative B of the EIS. Bears belong in the Northern Cascades, they should be reintroduced to their home range, and they should receive the full protections they deserve under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) when they are.

Grizzly bears were very recently extirpated in the Northern Cascades. They fill an ecological niche that has remained empty since the last bear was killed in 1996. The Northern Cascades ecosystem is considered one of the only nearly intact ecosystems in the United States. Grizzly bears will help complete the picture; they belong here.

Although I most strongly support alternative B, I recognize that section 10(j) of the ESA has been used to successfully reintroduce keystone predator species in the past. Alternative C is therefore acceptable, but will leave the new population unnecessarily vulnerable to human threats.

I am a wildlife enthusiast recreational nature photographer from Massachusetts. I have taken multiple trips to Yellowstone, Grand Teton, and the Katmai Peninsula to photograph grizzly bears. I have not visited North Cascades National Park, but I, and many, many others, will if grizzly bears are reintroduced. Every time I visit a park to see grizzlies, the rangers share that more and more people are coming every year just for the bears. Bears will help - not hurt - the tourism economy of Northern Washington. In bear country, people can live safely, the outdoors can be enjoyed safely, and the bears can even be viewed safely.

Our National Parks belong to all of us, and we have a shared responsibility to care for the ecosystems they protect. I urge that NPS do the right thing, and take the necessary steps to fully restore the North Cascades ecosystem. It is one of the last ecosystems in the lower 48 states that one day be able to call intact, but that requires the reintroduction of grizzly bears.

Thank you for taking my comments into consideration.

Best,

Correspondence ID: 2052Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98513
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,19 2023 22:48:01

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am all for the reintroducing of grizzlies in the North Cascades. I believe, as someone who is apart of the hiking community, that there is so much wilderness for these grizzlies to risk in that they will not pose a big threat causing human grizzly interactions. I think the biggest hurdle is going to be keeping climbers from unintentionally feeding the bears much like the black bears now.

Correspondence ID: 2053Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,20 2023

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am against grizzly bear reintroduction in the North Cascades. The North Cascades and the Pasayten Wilderness have had many fires over the last few years destroying habitat for many wildlife including bears. There are grizzly bears in Canada could relocate themselves here if they found the food source and habitat desirable. If the grizzly bears don't have the food sources they need, they will be down in the valley to close to our population. The grizzly bears will impact the declining deer population due to fires.

The Methow Valley has had a increase in population and an extreme increase in visitors to the North Cascades in hiking and backpacking. Too many people and grizzly bears are not compatible.
I do not support the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 2054Project:112008Document:132104

Address: North Bend, WA 98045
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,20 2023 02:22:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Not in favor of reintroducing grizzly. Look at the life's lost in Montana and Wyoming and the additional injuries these bears have caused in the lower 48. We have survived fine without them in WA. With the amount of hikes and back country folks in Wa it's asking introducing grizzly will result in human conflict we don't need

Correspondence ID: 2055Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Reardan, WA 99029
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,20 2023 07:25:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is a terrible idea and the cascades and just outside will end up much like a large chunk of yellowstone, where there is no longer any life. These bears will take out all animals then move to neighborhoods for food and then this "brilliant" idea will then get to a point on the state going in and just killing the bears to decrease the numbers.

If those bears migrate south, let them, but DO NOT give them a massive head start. Let nature actually do its job and quickly playing politics and nature.

Correspondence ID: 2056Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ferndale, WA, WA 98248
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,20 2023 07:57:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: While introducing a previously, nearly decimated, wildlife creature back into the environment might seem like a noble gesture, it should be understood why it was hunted to near extinction.

Read the journals of the Lewis and Clark expedition to understand how the backwoods savvy members of the expedition viewed Grizzlies. They were apex carnivores then and they are now.

Just recently a couple and their dog, who were experienced in wilderness camping, encountered a grizzly and all were killed. The authorities had to find the animal and kill it. Imagine if an inexperienced group of hikers encountered Grizzlies.

I believe if the Park service wants to introduce Grizzlies in the North Cascades it should be put on the ballot for the voters of Washington State to decide.

I see signs all over NC Park banning drones because they are dangerous to NP helicopters. The NPS wanting to create a much more dangerous Park experience is ironic. Please count me as vigorously opposed to Grizzlies.

Regards,


Ferndale, WA

Correspondence ID: 2057Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Moses Lake, WA 98837
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,20 2023 08:37:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Why? Seriously, what good can come from it? I get it, you're trying to give them their ecosystem back. No good can come from this. People at the park are going to think they're cute and fuzzy and try to take a picture with them. People who have animals and livestock and live in closest to NCE are going to now have to worry about grizzlies getting into their animals. What about those whose livestock is a means for their livelihood. How long until they stop fearing humans as much and someone gets mauled. The salmon population is going to be effected, and prey animals in general are going to be pressured out of the more secluded areas, which can drive them to hunters and they will be killed one way or another. What then? Will you reintroduce deer and elk to the NCE? You will never convince me that, being that close to BC, there are not already Grizzlies migrating back and forth into the NCE. Enough is enough. We don't need more apex predators in the US than are already there. Let nature take its course as it is. Please. Do not introduce more grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 2058Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,20 2023 09:23:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I would like to vote for the no action option A.

Correspondence ID: 2059Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,20 2023 10:31:08

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: There is a reason the bears were run out of here . Let's leave them in Montana and Idaho . PCT hikers don't need more than the black bears on the trails .

Correspondence ID: 2060Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98274
United States of America

Outside Organization: 55558658 Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,20 2023 10:34:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We already have black bears in the area. We have cougars in the area. I would prefer to be able to hike in the backcountry without worrying about another, bigger apex animal that doesn't currently reside here.

Correspondence ID: 2061Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America

Outside Organization: self and family Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,20 2023 11:25:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As 30-year cabin owners on property facing the Wenatchee National Forest, we must voice our grave concerns regarding the introduction of grizzly to the North Cascades. More families are moving to the area, many with very young children and pets. We share our forest properties with a growing population of black bear, deer, and the mostly-invisible-but-ever-present mountain lion. Human/black bear interactions reported among the neighbors noted a resurgence this year. These mostly safe bears are becoming more confident and disorderly around people. So what then of the unpredictable and more violent nature of the grizzly?

This summer there has been an alarming number of brutal and often fatal grizzly bear encounters in the Northwest and

Canada. And THESE from bears naturally residing on their home turf! To make matters worse, the defense strategies when confronted by these different species of bear are polar opposites. We oppose introduction of grizzly to the N. Cascades in any form. It is a case of doing the wrong thing for the right reason, and the likely repercussions to vulnerable families is unthinkable.

VOTE "NO"; re: the introduction of grizzly to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 2062Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,20 2023 11:53:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My name is [REDACTED]. My wife and I live at [REDACTED], Winthrop, WA. I am a registered voter in Okanogan County, Washington State. I DO NOT SUPPORT the Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Environmental Impact Statement, North Cascades Ecosystem that has been circulated by the National Park Service for Comment by November 13, 2023.

I have substantial experience in close proximity to Brown (Grizzly) Bears while fly fishing in Alaska over several years. While I do not fear these animals, they must be regarded as apex predators, and are fully capable of catching and killing the largest prey animals in North America. Accordingly, they must be treated with great respect by all persons who are located in the territory where they live. Being in their area brings with it the risk of injury and/or death related to an encounter that goes bad. They have no natural predators.

My wife and I live and recreate in Winthrop and the surrounding area, including in the North Cascades. I have hunted, fished, and camped in the North Cascades for many years. Our children and grandchildren enjoy visiting us in Winthrop, and they also enjoy recreating in the area in which we live.

It is my view that reintroducing Brown (Grizzly) Bears into the North Cascades will expose the residents of Okanogan County, and those who visit here, to unnecessary risks to personal safety. Less than a month ago two experienced campers and their dog were killed by a Brown Bear in Banff National Park in Alberta, Canada. Reportedly, they were killed at their campsite, and had done nothing wrong. The bear was found and euthanized. In early September a deer hunter was badly mauled by a Brown Bear in Montana. There are many other examples.

For these reasons, I am opposed to the risks to the public that bringing Brown (Grizzly) Bears into the North Cascades National Park poses.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Winthrop, WA 98862
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 2063Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tacoma, WA 98407
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,20 2023 12:01:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support no action (do not reintroduce grizzlies into NCNP) for safety reasons.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 2064Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Boulder, CO 80301
United States of America
Outside Organization: n/a Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,20 2023 12:02:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Alternative B would be my preferred option. Followed by Alternative C and then existing practices. Fully in support of this process.

Correspondence ID: 2065Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Saint Charles, MO 63304
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,20 2023 12:40:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Re-introducing grizzly bear populations in Alternative B and C will assuredly result in human deaths and severe injury as has been clearly demonstrated in other areas. The loss of even a single human life from grizzly bear interaction is far too great a price to pay for so called increased biodiversity.

Correspondence ID: 2066Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Olympia, WA 98506
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,20 2023 13:11:47
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: It will be a very bad idea to introduce grizzlies. People will be in danger of being attacked. A couple recently were killed by a grizzly and they had emptied 2 cans of bear spray at him.

Correspondence ID: 2067Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,20 2023 13:41:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I strongly support the reintroduction of the Grizzly Bear into the North Cascades National Park. The reestablishment of the natural wildlife within regions where they have been removed provides a balance to the environment. These proofs have been shown in Yellowstone with the reintroduction of wolves, the regulations to assist in population growth for otters on the Olympic Peninsula as well as understanding the suitability and support beavers provide to a habitat. Protective reintroduction regulations support the growth of our wildlife and natural resources. Balance between predator and prey provide support for a stronger natural ecosystem. I am in strong support of the plan and thank you for considering this and providing the public to comment.

Correspondence ID: 2068Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Inver Grove Heights, MN 55076
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,20 2023 14:02:47
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please bring back grizzly bears back to North Cascades National Park. With climate change, urban sprawl, more people moving to Idaho and Montana, these marvelous bears need all the pockets of habitat possible. They were eradicated and now need to come home. Please use all your power and common sense to bring grizzlies back to the north Cascades.

It needs to get done soon, please, as the wheels of change take so long.
Virginia Knapp

Correspondence ID: 2069Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Georgetown, TX 78628
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,20 2023 14:08:08

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I fully support reintroduction of grizzly bear in the North Cascades but want to include proper tools and mitigation resources for current communities and residents of the area

Correspondence ID: 2070Project:112008Document:132104

Address: State College, PA 16801
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,20 2023 15:21:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The North Cascades is one of the most pristine natural areas in the lower 48 states. I spent 40 years hiking, backpacking, snowshoeing, and doing trail maintenance in the North Cascades. The grizzly bears will provide an important part of the North Cascades natural environment. I've hiked and backpacked throughout Alaska, Canada, and American Rockies around grizzly bear populations without any issues. There is very little human habitation that would be effected. This needs to be approved. Thank you

Correspondence ID: 2071Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Missoula, MT 50807
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,20 2023 16:43:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am asking you to please reintroduce grizzlies to one of their original habitats - the North Cascades Ecosystem. I believe the efforts of FWP in Montana where I live could serve as a an example of how to successfully return these bears to a place they once lived. Humans and grizzlies can coexist. And to counter the argument that grizzlies will lay waste to stock on ranches, first it is an exaggerated claim, and second, should a grizzly kill a cow, the rancher gets compensated and the bear likely euthanized. I assume the same tools FWP has in Montana would also be available in Washington. At the very least, cows and grizzlies should be on equal footing. One shouldn't have priority over the other. To take the argument further, grizzlies inhabited the area first and I have read that ecosystem is healthier when it has apex predators like grizzlies in it. Please return the North Cascades Ecosystem closer to its natural state - please reintroduce grizzlies. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 2072Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98273
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,20 2023 17:06:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm a hunter, hiker, camper, and outdoor enthusiast. I appreciate efforts to conserve wildlife for all to see however the introduction of grizzlies is a horrible idea. With more and more of the growing population going out into the wilderness this will just increase the likelihood of bear encounters, they will get drawn to more populated areas where they will attracted by livestock. Please reconsider this and do not introduce more bears into Washington State.

Correspondence ID: 2073Project:112008Document:132104

Address: San Francisco, CA 94117
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,20 2023 17:42:01

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing in support of efforts to bring grizzlies back to their historic home in the mountains of northern Washington.

With over 9,000 square miles of quality habitat, the North Cascades Ecosystem is one of six designated recovery zones for grizzly bears. Grizzlies belong in the North Cascades, part of their historic range. With fires destroying habitat at ever-increasing intervals, development expanding into rural areas of Montana and Idaho, and rising temperatures causing food shortages, grizzlies need as many footholds as they can get in order to flourish in an uncertain future.

While there is understandable apprehension about living alongside such powerful creatures, local communities have been preparing for years for the possibility of grizzlies returning to the landscape once again. In the Rocky Mountain region, successful efforts to ensure coexistence have included spreading tools, information, and awareness across the shifting boundaries of grizzly country so that adaptation can be a privilege rather than a burden.

The natural heritage of the Northern Cascades region is an immense and unmeasurable gift. Though much of the continent's recent history has been marked by loss of wildlife, we can still shift the tide toward a future of abundance.

Correspondence ID: 2074Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lake Tapps, WA 98391
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,20 2023 17:57:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am against the grizzly bear reinstatement plan. What will happen to all the animals that have thrived as a result of the grizzlies not being here. Black bears for one, but I'm sure there are many others. I understand that they used to live here, but they haven't in a very long time, and the environment has changed a lot. Who's to say that it's "right" that they live here now. Just like the movement of the mountain goats out of the Olympics. Who's to say they wouldn't have eventually made it over there on their own. But instead we move them all and kill all the ones that we can't reach. Terrible.

Correspondence ID: 2075Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98106
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,20 2023 18:03:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support reintroducing grizzlies to the North Cascades. I have lived in Washington for most of my life, and have seen the gradual degradation of our beautiful and vibrant ecosystems due to development, capitalism, farming, and displacement and disenfranchisement of the native cultures that have maintained these ecosystems for centuries. Grizzlies are an important aspect of the ecosystem and deserve responsible conservation, management and reintroduction.

Correspondence ID: 2076Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,20 2023 18:04:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I would like to voice my support for Alternative C as the best plan for the north cascades ecosystem. I have hiked, backpacked and camped for over 50 years in bear country in Alaska, Canada and Montana, Wyoming and Idaho. The presence of bears, both Black and Brown, enhances the wilderness experience, sharpens the senses, and forces humans to respect the complete ecosystem. Reintroducing Grizzlies to their natural habitat of the north cascades is the right thing to do for the ecosystems health, the survival of Grizzlies, and also to enhance the wilderness experience for people.

Correspondence ID: 2077Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Port Orchard, WA 98367
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,20 2023 20:06:41

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am a wildlife photographer. I have been what many might consider frighteningly close to bears, wolves, venomous snakes, all size and variety of predator and prey, yet I remain unscathed. These animals are not hunting us. They are not seeking out humans for meals. They are simply surviving in the territories upon which we have infringed, and sometimes we cross paths. That shouldn't be seen as a cause to eradicate them. We must stop seeing projects such as this proposed reintroduction as "bringing in predators" and see them for what they are, which is bringing the equilibrium back to the environment.

In consideration for the planned reintroduction of Grizzly Bears to the North Cascades, I beseech the Parks Service, the Public, and all involved in the Planning Commission to consider the successes of the Yellowstone Wolf Project. The reintroduction of Wolves to the Yellowstone ecosystem caused immediate and healthy changes across the region. The riverbanks were stabilized and strengthened by the foliage that was able to grow in greater volume due to the balancing of the elk and deer populations, other species which had dwindled returned, such as beavers. The beaver dams allowed increased populations in native fish species by restoring spawning areas, scavengers thrived on kills and increased the population of small prey, which allowed increase in the populations of animals such as eagles and foxes. These are just a few of the many benefits the region has seen since.

The project had been met with hesitation and fear mongering, antiquated views of wolves as merciless killers still prevail today, even so, the wolves have grown in population. The land is healthy. The wildlife are thriving. Today, the only threat to the wolf is the same threat that decimated them decades ago; human ego, fear, and greed.

Bring back the bears. Not everyone will see eye to eye, some will be in support, some will fight it and ignorance will prevail just as it has alongside the Yellowstone wolves. But ignorance will not hinder the benefits that will come from reintroducing the bears.

We cannot let our arrogant and ignorant views of predators as competition for use of land and fear mongering determine whether or not a species deserves to live and thrive where it is native. If the consideration was for the reintroduction of a species of deer, or bird, or even otters, badgers, or beavers, it would not be controversial. People are choosing to see the bears as threats, as fearsome predators that are out to attack, as blood thirsty hiker hunters. They are neither. They are large omnivores that are necessary in the ecosystem. Their territory should be respected and humans should take necessary precautions when entering their territory in the Cascades just as they would in the Yukon, Yellowstone, or Teton.

We are at a crucial point where we either learn from past mistakes, and choose to respect the ecosystems which we survive within and protect the species that subsist in them, or, we ignore everything we have learned throughout history and choose to facilitate the decimation of ecosystems by eliminating species we feel threatened by. Enough of the planet is suffering. Returning the bears to the Cascades on the macro scale, is a small gesture. For the bears and the Cascades ecosystem, their reintroduction is a tremendous advance towards preserving the health of the land and to rebalancing native wildlife populations.

The Grizzly bears belong in the Cascades, we are responsible for their absence, we are responsible for returning them.

Correspondence ID: 2078Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America
Outside Organization: University of Denver University/Professional Society
Received: Oct,20 2023 20:43:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mr. Superintendent Don Striker,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan-Environmental Impact Assessment (EIS). I am currently a resident of Wenatchee, WA that lies just outside the Northern Cascades Ecosystem (NCE). I also have a background in Fish and Wildlife Management and have several concerns regarding the Draft EIS that I would like to bring to your attention.

My first concern is regarding Table 10 and the populations of gateway communities. Even though these communities are smaller than the greater urban areas of Seattle, it would seem an injustice to downplay these populations as the EIS does on page 134. Additionally, your information seems to be inconsistent, drawing on recent US Census information, yet using mapping information from Almack et al. (1993) and Gaines et al. (1994) to establish that 68% of the NCE is free of human activity, when in fact according to USA Facts, there has been a 46.6% increase in the population (USA Facts, 2023). Chelan County and Kittitas County, the two counties closest to the NCE according to Figure 14 of the NCE, have population increases of 40.7% and 55.7% since 1993 respectively (USA Facts, 2023). A re-evaluation of the area free of human activity seems warranted given the population increases and disparities in information.

Another concern is the potential economic impacts that seem to be lacking in the plan. Recently wolves have had economic impacts on ranchers and livestock owners. Under new regulations ranchers can be compensated up to \$1,500 per cow killed that is determined "probable" (WDFW, 2012). However, most ranchers claim that wolves have caused more damage than they are being compensated for, as a "probable" determination is only available if enough flesh from livestock remains from a kill (Jenkins, 2018). The plan addresses Grizzly Bear Depredation Compensation in Appendix C but lacks a funding source or a known amount of funding. Who will that burden fall upon? Also, in other Grizzly Bear populations there have been significant issues with livestock predation. In 2019, 46% of depredation claims in Wyoming were due to Grizzly Bears, resulting in \$646,168 in depredation payouts. The proposed implementation budget is only \$90,000 for this plan and additional action alternatives equate to a comparable cost. Also, the plan states that the cost for Livestock Damage Preventative Cooperative Measures will be shared with landowners. This seems to place an unfair burden on those property owners, many of whom will be subject to the greatest risk of bear interactions, to accrue additional annual costs due to a species that has extirpated naturally from the area.

Lastly, I think that the ecosystem and the bears ability to select these ecosystems is undervalued in this plan. I have had the privilege of working with Brown Bears in Alaska with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and their ranges are extremely impressive, as is their ability to move within these ranges at a rapid pace. According to the Yellowstone National Park, male Grizzly Bears have a lifetime range of 800-2000 square miles (NPS, 2023). According to the draft EIS on page 4, the NCE is only 9,800 square miles and surrounded by populated areas. I think the likelihood of these bears wandering into populated areas is high given the circumstances. Also, the proposed area has been affected by climate change. In 2018, there was a 45% increase in wildfires in Eastern Washington over the previous 10-year period (Results Washington, 2018). This could result in pushing wildlife into populated areas.

I believe the Department of Interior should take a cautious approach in reintroducing bears into this area. Given the bears' range, they have the opportunity to select the NCE as suitable habitat and have not over the past 40 years. I would support Alternative A, No Action, and let the natural attenuation of bear populations select their suitable habitat.

References:

Jenkins, Don. 2018. "Compensation to Ranchers Small Part of Washington's Wolf Budget". Capital Press. April 18, 2023. https://www.capitalpress.com/state/washington/compensation-to-ranchers-small-part-of-washington-s-wolf-budget/article_b45d3624-4683-5ce1-aca4-d2578d424500.html

Results Washington. 2018. Restoring Eastern Washington's Forests. <https://results.wa.gov/measuring-progress/outcome->

Correspondence ID: 2081Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mercer Island, WA 98040
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,20 2023 21:18:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a senior citizen who spends a lot of time hiking and backpacking in the North Cascades, the Grizzly bear restoration seems to be ill conceived. It is difficult to understand how the environment of this beautiful area has suffered from their absence. Some of the reasons given in the press (Seattle Times) in support of their restoration, such as aerating the soil with their long claws, seem almost laughable. Other reasons offered in the EIS, such as providing "Pacific Northwest residents and visitors with the opportunity to again experience grizzly bears in their native habitat", are actually frightening in light of very recent fatal human/grizzly encounters. If grizzlies return to the North Cascades on their own, then so be it. But proactive efforts to introduce them into the area would seem to have little purpose other than fulfilling gauzy romantic dreams about decolonizing the natural environment.

Correspondence ID: 2082Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,20 2023 22:31:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am totally against the man-made plan to "restore" grizzlies to this area. We have enough bear problems here now. Had a woman nearly killed here by a black bear in her yard last year. A few years ago while riding my horse in the hills above our place a large cinnamon-colored bear came out of the bushes, turned and saw us, and came running toward me and my horse. My horse was terrified and whirled around and ran, but after we rounded a switchback I saw that the bear was taking the shortcut and coming down the hill after us again. With my horse at a dead run and me screaming, we made it back to East Leavenworth Road and safety. There is so much recreational activity in these mountains and grizzlies would add an unwanted and unneeded danger to humans. If the grizzlies WANTED to be here, there is nothing stopping them from coming here. Have not heard of a fence at the Canadian border.

Correspondence ID: 2083Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Shoreline, WA 98133
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,20 2023 23:38:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My wife and I are in our 70's and every year we hike sections of the Pacific Crest Trail. Please do not reintroduce grizzly bears into the north Cascades. There are already enough dangerous issues involved with any camping & hiking in the region without adding an apex predator. I know enough people who have worked in Alaska, in the bush areas, who have had very dangerous encounters with grizzlies, and I have to ask myself, why are you trying to discourage people from hiking and camping in the area.

DO NOT REINTRODUCE GRIZZLY BEARS INTO THE NORTH CASCADES.

Correspondence ID: 2084Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98856
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,21 2023 09:39:24

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Don Striker and Supervisor Brad Thompson,

I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. The proposal would bring up to 25 non-problem grizzly bears into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade and manage them as an experimental population.

Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities. Furthermore, the 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and sometimes respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Thank you for taking the time to keep our North Cascades wild!

Sincerely,

Correspondence ID: 2085Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98116
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,21 2023 10:08:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Don Striker and Supervisor Brad Thompson,

I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. The proposal would bring up to 25 non-problem grizzly bears into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade and manage them as an experimental population.

Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities. Furthermore, the 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and sometimes respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Thank you for taking the time to keep our North Cascades wild!

Correspondence ID: 2086Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Lynnwood, WA 98036
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,21 2023 10:54:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I feel that grizzly bears are an important part of our eco system.

Correspondence ID: 2087Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Oak Harbor, WA 98277
United States of America
Outside Organization: Taxpayer Unaffiliated Individual(Official Rep.)
Received: Oct,21 2023 13:09:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: This idea is why WA state residents need their constitutional rights to arms - including the scary ones..

Here is one story from one back country guide. Re-introducing a highly predatory, highly aggressive animal into an area they have selectively removed their population from over time is an accident waiting to happen. Whoever is killed, their family will sue the national parks system - as they should.

I have been considering whether or not to post this issue we deal with as outdoorsman. I have decided to tell my experience and go over a few ways we can deal with the situation at the political level. Many of you know, I have been guiding in Wyoming for the last 6 years. This year, we have had more issues with grizzlies than any other year I've been in the back country. It's looking like many others are dealing with more grizzly issues as well in surrounding states like Montana and Idaho.

Keeping it short, on September 29th, we were charged by a grizzly while trying to recover a bull elk. Before we could lay eyes on the elk, we had a griz charge us. We first set eyes on the bear at about 20 yards and he was already charging. With little time to react, my hunter and I had to shoot the bear. With the hunters first shot out of his 45 hitting the bear in the head at about 15 yards. The bear kept on coming after three shots and getting bear sprayed. Because of the angle the bear came in, I had a broad side shot between a couple pines so I shot him in the shoulder three times passing through and through. After my shots were fired the bear slowed but continued to go after my clients. I stepped around the tree to intervene between the bear and my hunters while I continued to fire, hitting the bear in the neck and head. After the hunter and I shot the bear multiple times, the bear finally died about 5 feet from us. As this was going down everything was slow motion. Felt like a lifetime but according to a group that heard it all go down, it lasted about 5 seconds.

Being involved in an incident like this and hearing about multiple other bears being killed do to aggressive behavior, it is apparent that there is a greater issue that needs to be brought to the federal governments attention. It is on the federal level because these bears are still on the endangered species list and they need to be taken off. After this whole ordeal, I asked the warden doing the investigation if there was anything we could do as a community to get a season opened in these units where we have an abundance of bears. He said there was nothing we could do because of the bear enthusiasts. There are groups out there with a lot of funding that keep shutting us down. We have these people and groups controlling how we maintain our wildlife and control our predators. As I listen to a lot of hunting podcasts, the issue with game and fish being controlled by non-hunters is mentioned a lot. Most of us blame the state for hunting laws and seasons but at the end of the day, it is beyond them. Especially when it comes to wolves and grizzlies. Do to the pressure on our politicians by hunters, ranchers, and farmers, we were able to open a season on the over population of wolves. We need to stand up against these people and groups funding the protection of grizzlies and put a stop to it. If you have had a negative bear experience, write a story on it. Get a hold of Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation, Sportsmans Alliance, Mule Deer Foundation, and any other foundation that fights for our rights and safety in the outdoors, along with your local representatives. They do work for you. Tell them your story. The more people that reach out to share their experience, the more serious this issue is going to be taken. Contact you local and state legislation and give them your story along with your ideas about how we can go about this. They can all ignore an army of one. They can't look past an army of many. Let's be the army of many and make a change.

On a side note, make sure you do your research on ammunition and weapon caliber before you venture into grizzly country. The hunter firing with me was shooting a self defense +P hollow point. The first shot that hit the bear between the eyes, didn't even scratch the skull. Atleast two other shots of his didn't pass through the fat. I was shooting the Buffalo Bore Dangerous

Game 190 grain mono-metal rounds which passed through with every shot besides the shots to the skull which went through, but did not exit. I wont bash on revolvers and limited rounds but I will say that I am super thankful we each had 15 round mags. Don't disregard anything when researching your caliber and ammo. Look into all pros and cons to choose the right weapon for you. Don't just pick a weapon and go with it. PRACTICE!!

Correspondence ID: 2088Project:112008Document:132104

Address: STANWOOD, WA 98292
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,21 2023 14:03:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: These animals are one of the most dangerous creatures on the planet. Washington state is no longer a "wilderness". Many Innocent ignorant people wander the trails and mountains of our region like never before. Our mountains and forests are now a playground. Some will be victims in the most horrible way. The almost constant press about new tragedies pouring in to the media from grizzly populated states is heart wrenching. Please do not pretend that a creature like this that populates other more remote states naturally and in large numbers with fewer people that are killed regularly needs to do so here again simply because someone has a romantic notion that it should because it once did. I understand that they had a natural function here. Small reward for the many souls who will watch one of these killers eat them alive. URSES ARCTOS HORRIBILIS SAYS IT ALL.

I see there are EST. 60,000 of these in North America. Only 1500 in the 48 states and yet that is enough to create constant tragedy.

Hunters, Wolves Black Bear and lion have filled their nich quite nicely if perhaps not as perfectly.

This not the 1800's anymore. Millions of people now enjoy the wilderness in carefree fashion. You can't change it back.

Correspondence ID: 2089Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Omak, WA 98841-9573
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,21 2023 14:39:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in favor of Grizzly Bear restoration and monitoring in the Okanogan National Forest. I am also in favor of cattle people keeping their cows out of the forest in early spring when cattle are calving.

Correspondence ID: 2090Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Stanwood, WA 98292
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,21 2023 14:39:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please DO NOT reintroduce grizzlies back into Washington State. We know somebody who was killed by a grizzly in another state. Grizzlies are too dangerous to humans. I am a hiker and I know Washington State have a lot of people who enjoy the out of doors. Please please do not reintroduce grizzlies to Washington State!

Correspondence ID: 2091Project:112008Document:132104

Address: ISSAQUAH, WA 98027
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,21 2023 14:49:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support reintroducing grizzly bears to the cascades. They lived there for a millenia until settlers came and wiped them out.

Correspondence ID: 2092Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Everett, WA 98203
United States of America
Outside Organization: n/a Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,21 2023 15:21:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please...We have more than enough bears in Western Washington...Black Bears are now rather common in suburbs and semi-rural areas. Grizzlies are just too large/aggressive an animal to have interspersed in areas where hiking and rural lifestyles are proliferating. No "petting zoo"environments are needed. Grizzlies are where they naturally should be...they do not need any help!

Correspondence ID: 2093Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sammamish, WA 98029
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,21 2023 15:49:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Give us dah bears!

Correspondence ID: 2094Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,21 2023 16:06:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Alternative A

Correspondence ID: 2095Project:112008Document:132104

Address: WINTHROP, WA 98862
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,21 2023 16:34:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As an avid hiker in the North Cascades, I am very opposed to adding grizzly bears to the area. The black bears are scary enough let alone having grizzlies. I understand the need for them to have habitat to live and prosper, but why choose a national park known for the best hiking and backpacking areas in the PNW? Maybe the idea is to keep people out of the National Park instead of having people there to enjoy it.

I've lived in Winthrop for 23 years and have seen my share of black bears. Many are not afraid of people having been around us for so long. Often they don't move off the trail, come repeatedly to our homes, and, at times, have to be removed because they are too "friendly." Imagine the terror of hikers in the mountains and residents in their valley homes when a grizzly approaches. Please, please don't introduce grizzlies. It will ruin the magical and peaceful place that is our backyard ... and the reason many of us moved to the Methow Valley to begin with.

Correspondence ID: 2096Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Asbury Park, NJ 07712
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,21 2023 16:39:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Bring back the grizzly bear, a symbol of our beautiful country. Over 6 million square acres of untouched land in Washington is more than enough space for a grizzly bear population. Grizzly bears are made out to be villains when in reality they rarely ever bother humans. They are a keystone species, they need to be reintroduced to bring back the natural balance to the ecosystem. They will control the deer population, they will keep the wolves in check, they will fish the salmon out of the streams like they once did. Tourism will help the state knowing you gave the grizzly bear a second chance. The grizzly bear is what I think of when I picture this country, they deserve respect and a second chance. We wiped them out years ago, why not attempt to bring them back? Let the experts do their job, we've seen countless success stories with other animals such as the wolf, wood bison, and cougar. Don't let the grizzly bear disappear. Let's teach this country that America is still wild, let the grizzly bear come back to his home in Washington. Let's right the wrongs of our past, let's rewild America! Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 2097Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,21 2023 17:07:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a hiker, outdoor enthusiasts and conservationists, it's time to bring the grizzlies back. Restoring them returns an important umbrella species to the north cascades.

Thanks
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 2098Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Stanwood, AK 98292
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,21 2023 17:25:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is fantastic. I would love to see Grizzly bears reintroduced to the area!

Correspondence ID: 2099Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98144
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,21 2023 17:25:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please bring grizzlies back to the North Cascades. This vast, beautiful area is missing a key stone species that once thrived here. It is important for this bear's recovery to include Washington ensure a strong and healthy future and population.

Correspondence ID: 2100Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellevue, WA 98008
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,21 2023 17:29:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The North Cascades is my absolute favorite National Park in the country. The first time I ever hike there was a long hike in tamarack season. We hiked, picked blueberries and saw a bear! It's remained one of the most valuable experiences of my life and I can't wait to show my children the same wonders of nature in their backyard.

Correspondence ID: 2101Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Redmond, WA 98052
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,21 2023 18:10:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Alternative B would be the preferred choice. As the report said the natural habitat of the grizzly bears extended in large swathes across Washington. Let the grizzly bears find a habitat of their own with any situation requiring them to be relocated to be handled by the Park and the Forest department themselves. Leaving them to local jurisdictions severely impairs their chances of survival even as they may briefly transgress into areas with human interface.

Correspondence ID: 2102Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Princeton, NJ 08540
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,21 2023 18:31:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Evidence has shown in other similar parks and ecosystems that the return of apex predators, like the grizzlie, hugely benefits the entire system. Additionally, the moral and symbolic importance of having grizzlies back in this part of America is hard to overstate. The return, as is planned, should be gradual, to give community time to educate their neighbors and eventual park visitors, plan appropriately to minimize any effects to surrounding farms and livestock, and learn how to live seamlessly with the bears.

Correspondence ID: 2103Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Auburn, WA 98092
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,21 2023 18:32:24

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears should be reintroduced to the North cascades area. Apex predators like the Grizzly serve important ecological functions that are essential to a healthy, functioning biome. There is more than enough room in the North cascades for grizzlies and humans to coexist.

Correspondence ID: 2104Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tacoma, WA 98404
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,21 2023 19:10:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I fully support the reintroduction of grizzly bears into the NCE as described in the two action alternatives as described in the draft EIS. I would prefer management of the population as Threatened under the Endangered Species Act with a more strict allowance for take in only certain situations. That being said I realize that wildlife politics are sensitive and human wildlife conflicts can occur. I would support reintroduction under either of the described action alternative options.

What I do not support is a continuation of the no action option or status quo. I have lived in Washington State for the majority of my 37 years of life and Grizzly bears are sorely missing piece of our states ecosystem. I am an avid outdoorsman backpacker, hunter and camper who gets into the woods every chance I get. I am aware of the risks and would appreciate recreating in and living in a state where this keystone species is a part of the environment in which I live. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 2105Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Cody, WY 82414
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,21 2023 19:25:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the plan to restore the grizzly bear to the North Cascades only AFTER the grizzly has been successfully restored to the Selway-Salmon-Bitterroot Ecosystem of central Idaho.

Until there is a viable population in central Idaho keep this North Cascades plan on th shelf.

Correspondence ID: 2106Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,21 2023 20:30:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Humans were responsible for removing grizzlies from the North Cascades and it's our responsibility to bring them back. As a hiker and wildlife photographer, I feel strongly that we need to protect and restore this key predator to our region.

Correspondence ID: 2107Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Everett, WA 98201
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,21 2023 21:06:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am very much for the restoration of grizzlies in the north Cascades, and very excited to see this happen. My husband and I have mountain property and we are very much in favor of restoring this important predator to its rightful habitat.

Correspondence ID: 2108Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Swattle, WA 98126
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,22 2023 01:07:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzly bears belong in the Cascades. I believe the wilder our parks are, the better. Reintroducing wolves in parks revitalized and helped preserve the complex ecosystem; reintroducing grizzleys will help heal the Cascades. Please prioritize the wild environment over fears.

Correspondence ID: 2109Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98109
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,22 2023 01:46:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a graduate in wildlife health and conservation I know the importance of reintroducing a keystone species such as Grizzly Bears. Their reintroduction would be beneficial for the North Cascades ecosystem. I am also an avid hiker and feel confident that the hiking community of the northwest can work alongside these animals.

Correspondence ID: 2110Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Sun City, AZ 85351
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,22 2023 07:47:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Let the grizzlies come back to North Cascades of Washington on their own from Canada. Do not re introduce them.

Correspondence ID: 2111Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,22 2023 08:32:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I live in Leavenworth, Washington and recreate in the NCE and I support Grizzly bear reintroduction and action alternative C. I would like more information on where the actual reintroductions would take place. I would also like to know whether the reintroduction will be accompanied by federal resources to help make communities on the edge of zone 1 more bearwise? Within our community we have had ongoing conflicts with black bears and such resources could help to mitigate conflict with both black bears and a recovering grizzly bear population going forward.

Correspondence ID: 2112Project:112008Document:132104
Address: washington dc, DC 20009
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,22 2023 09:31:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am strongly in favor of the restoration of a viable populations of grizzlies to the North Cascades. However, the federal and state authorities need to ensure that the concerns of ranchers and herders are addressed by pledging to swiftly and efficiently compensate for livestock losses due to the bears.

Correspondence ID: 2113Project:112008Document:132104
Address: TEMPE, AZ 85281
United States of America
Outside Organization: Redfield Writing Co Business(Official Rep.)
Received: Oct,22 2023 10:15:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We need top predators returned to their range.

Correspondence ID: 2114Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,22 2023 10:33:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: No action alternative. I don't want grizzlies in my backyard. It's hard enough having to cope with black bears.

Correspondence ID: 2115Project:112008Document:132104
Address: PORTLAND, OR 97212
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,22 2023 11:29:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello,

I am completely in favor of restoring Grizzly bears to the North Cascades. This is a wider area that the bears once called home and thrived in until white settlers came to the area and changed that. It is clear that the ecosystem is currently out of balance due to the bears not being present. I also believe the plan does well to minimize the risk of human to bear interactions. I see this because of the size of the area the bears are to be introduced into and the rural nature of the surrounding populace. Coming back to the ecosystems being out of balance. We can take lessons from Yellowstone and the surrounding area. How introduction of once decimated species, see bears and wolves, can help restore balance to an ecosystem. Also how humans can be part of the ecosystem in responsible ways versus looking to dominate the ecosystem. I encourage you to adopt the plan as is without the 10(j) designation. Do not be swayed by a small yet vocal minority crying out about their way of life. Humans can change and adapt. We have been doing it for thousands of years.

Correspondence ID: 2116Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mazama, WA 98833-9726
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,22 2023 12:08:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 2117Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Carlton, WA 98814
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,22 2023 13:08:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We do not need an aggressive and dangerous apex predator introduced into North Central Washington. Every year, hikers, campers, hunters and outdoor enthusiasts are attacked and killed or maimed by *Ursus arctos horribilis*. Most recently a couple in Banff National Park, Canada were killed in their tent, despite "doing everything right." Each year in Montana hunters are attacked and mauled. There was a recent attack on the Colville Reservation. I fished and hiked on the Kenai Peninsula of Alaska, owning a house in the town of Sterling. Encountering Brown Bears was a regular occurrence. It is much more enjoyable recreating, without the constant thought of the risk of a grizzly around the next corner of the trail or bend of the river. Since reintroduction of the European Brown Bear to the Alps, human ursine encounters are increasing. In Tyrol and Trentino areas of the alps 3-5% of the bear population, are what's known as 'problematic'. Keep Grizzly Bears out of the North Cascades. We do not need, or desire them in our back yard. Please listen to the residents of the effected area.

Correspondence ID: 2118Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,22 2023 13:11:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To National Park Service

I am a parent, educator, hiker, zoo volunteer, conservationist and gardener. I fully support repairing the North Cascades ecosystem by reintroducing the grizzly bear.

Grizzlies were the apex predator in this eco-system until their removal by rampant hunting. They provide many benefits to the landscape such as seed distribution and meadow aeration. They feed opportunistically and remove dead elk and other animals in the spring thaw.

When I saw a grizzly bear for the first time in the 70's, I was overwhelmed with their majestic beauty, and grace. I want future generations to be able to experience that feeling.

There is room for grizzlies in our North Cascades landscape; smart precaution and following reasonable rules when hiking or foraging can protect people and grizzlies from each other.

Please make the wisest decision to follow the controlled reintroduction o Grizzly Bears to the North Cascades.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Correspondence ID: 2119Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Monroe, WA 98272
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,22 2023 13:23:42

Correspondence Type:Web Form

Correspondence: I vote yes

Correspondence ID: 2120Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Newcastle, WA 98055
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,22 2023 13:29:01

Correspondence Type:Web Form

Correspondence: Speaking up for grizzly bears

Correspondence ID: 2121Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Anacortes, WA 98221
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,22 2023 13:59:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am against bringing Grizzly Bears into North Cascades. We already have enough bears & problems with attacks in Winthrop, & near Leavenworth, & Mt Baker area in WA
Please leave Grizzly bears in the current habitat.

I live in Anacortes, but hang out on some property I have in the Okanogan area near Winthrop . There are plenty of bears in the Cascades & coming into the populated areas of people now. One does NOT need to add more Grizzlies to the area in any of the Cascades...

NO on GRIZZLIES

I also want to comment on some aggressive Mt Goats that Wildlife brought to the Methow area from the Peninsula. The population was getting too great there & literally attacking hikers on Peninsula trails. Why on earth would you bring aggressive goats to the Okanogan County area??

Correspondence ID: 2122Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,22 2023 14:18:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do NOT reintroduce grizzlies back into the North Cascades. 2 people were just killed in Canada by bears while in the outdoors. <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/10/01/world/canada/bear-attack-banff-national-park-canada.html>

I really want to be able to hike and camp with the Cascades in relative peace without having to worry about bears. We already have enough headaches with cougars.

Correspondence ID: 2123Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Tulsa, OK 74120
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,22 2023 14:19:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I would love to work at a National Park one day and seeing conservation efforts like this really excite me! I support this movement wholeheartedly because I think bears are important not just for the natural ecosystem but also because they inspire humans and connect us with the environment. And bears have cute ears!

Correspondence ID: 2124Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98102
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,22 2023 14:37:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: What gorgeous creatures and there is plenty of space for everyone in the wilderness. Nothing deserves to be extinct. Bring them back!

Correspondence ID: 2125Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Chelan, WA 98816
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,22 2023 15:37:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We are opposed to the introduction of grizzly bears into North Cascades. It is our understanding that there have not been any officially documented sighting / encounters with grizzly bears in the North Cascades ecosystem for over 50 years. Additionally, grizzly bears are present not too far from North Cascades and can migrate toward the NC ecosystem without human interference. The plan does not properly mitigate the risks to park users. Those who want grizzly bears introduced are not users of the ecosystem. This is not an effective use of the limited budget made available from taxpayer dollars and not representative of stakeholders' desires.

Correspondence ID: 2126Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Felton, CA 95018
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,22 2023 15:53:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear NPS:

I am in COMPLETE *SUPPORT* of the reintroduction of grizzly bears to North Cascades.

The bears belong there; it was their home at least tens of thousands of years before the destructive European colonials showed up. The indigenous peoples who came and populated the land revered and lived in harmony with the grizzlies. Ranchers around Yellowstone, where a reasonably healthier population of grizzlies has recovered, state no problem with the big bears. Some have even commented that they lose FAR more cattle to rattlesnakes. One rancher even woke up one morning to find a big grizzly next to his cattle with its head in the grain trough munching away.

The population of grizzlies in the North Cascades used to number in the tens of thousands; now there are sadly MAYBE 20-25. They deserve their home land back. They have had a very bad rep from the press and peoples' ignorance. You are far more likely to be hit by lightning or an automobile collision than a grizzly.

Please bring them home again!

Thank you for your time and, i hope, positive consideration.

Correspondence ID: 2127Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Macomb, MI 48044
United States of America

Outside Organization: University of Denver University/Professional Society

Received: Oct,22 2023 16:00:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Reader,

In this comment, I will explore the intriguing topic of grizzly bear reintroduction in the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE) with a particular focus on Alternative Action C. As a graduate student deeply passionate about environmental and climate change issues, my research led me to the conclusion that Alternative Action C, which leverages section 10(j) of the Endangered Species Act (ESA), presents the most viable approach for grizzly bear reintroductions in the NCE.

My journey into this subject matter was not merely academic; it was driven by personal interest and a desire to contribute meaningfully to the ongoing conversation surrounding wildlife conservation. Having previously examined other reintroduction programs, I was drawn to the complexity of decisions revolving around the size of the bear population and the methods of their reintroduction. The NCE, an area I aspire to explore and potentially reside near, became a focal point for my research endeavors.

Utilizing resources like Google Scholar and local newspapers, I delved into the depths of information available on this topic. Surprisingly, I stumbled upon a newspaper article that cited a study I had previously uncovered, highlighting the interconnectedness of research efforts and the importance of multidisciplinary perspectives in wildlife management. The study focused on the exact issue at hand and had an interesting quote that may or may not sway the outcome of the NPS's decision on alternatives, "The potential carrying capacity for grizzly bears in the NCE has been estimated as approximately 274 bears (Mowat et al. 2013) and 250-300 bears (Lyons et al. 2018) using different methods" (Ransom et al. 2023). According to Ransom et al. 2023, their study suggests that the NCE has the potential to start with a larger grizzly bear population than the NPS is suggesting in this current EIS plan. Therefore, the population can grow at a much faster rate. An important thing to consider as well is that, as I suggest later, Yellowstone National Park, started with a similarly small population (about 136 in 1975) and more recently, has just over a thousand as of 2021, showing that conservation management plans have had some success with the reintroduction of grizzly bears over the same amount of time that this current management plan in question has, which is about 60-80 years (NPS 2023).

One of the pivotal aspects of this debate lies in determining the appropriate size of the grizzly bear population and devising a strategic plan for their reintroduction. Alternative Action C, operating under section 10(j) of the ESA, offers a solution that grants federal agencies enhanced control over the management plan. A good example of this can be found in a Fish and Wildlife Service paper on section 10(j) of the ESA. The paper includes valuable information regarding rule 10(j) which allows the FWS to have more flexible regulations regarding take prohibitions and consultation requirements associated with following the Endangered Species Act (Fraser & USFWS 2018). Despite the relatively minor impact on private landowners, given that only 7% of the suggested habitat is privately owned, this approach proves to be effective ("Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan", 4). Yellowstone National Park, with its similar beginnings and subsequent growth in the grizzly bear population, stands as a testament to the success of conservation management strategies over several decades. By designating the NCE grizzly bear population as an "experimental population," federal agencies, particularly the Fish and Wildlife Service, can relocate bears from the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem to suitable natural habitats outside

the species' current range. The vast expanse of untouched land in the NCE, where the last confirmed sighting of a grizzly bear occurred in 1996, further supports the feasibility of this endeavor. With careful planning and consideration, grizzly bear reintroduction can occur successfully in this region, reinvigorating the ecosystem and contributing to the broader conversation on wildlife conservation.

In summary, my research leads me to advocate for Alternative Action C in the grizzly bear reintroduction plan for the North Cascades Ecosystem. Through section 10(j) of the ESA, we have an opportunity to shape a sustainable future for grizzly bears in this region. I am hopeful that this paper will spark further discussions, encouraging stakeholders to work collaboratively towards the preservation of our natural heritage.

Sincerely,

References

Fraser, Kimberly, and Usfws. 2018. "Species Recovery." [https://www.fws.gov/sites/default/files/documents/ESA-section10\(j\)-fact-sheet.pdf](https://www.fws.gov/sites/default/files/documents/ESA-section10(j)-fact-sheet.pdf).
"Grizzly Bears & the Endangered Species Act." National Parks Service. U.S. Department of the Interior, 2023. Last modified 2023. Accessed October 18, 2023. <https://www.nps.gov/yell/learn/nature/bearesa.htm#:~:text=Grizzlies have made a remarkable recovery. The growth,2019 using a population estimate model called Chao2.>
"ParkPlanning - Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Environmental Impact Statement, North Cascades Ecosystem." n.d. Parkplanning.nps.gov.
<https://parkplanning.nps.gov/document.cfm?parkID=327&projectID=112008&documentID=132104>.
Ransom, J. I., Lyons, A. L., Hegewisch, K. C., & Krosby, M. (2023). An integrated modeling approach for considering wildlife reintroduction in the face of climate uncertainty: A case for the North Cascades grizzly bear. *Biological Conservation*, 279, 109947. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2023.109947>

Correspondence ID: 2128Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tallahassee, FL 32312
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,22 2023 16:52:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I follow the grizzly bear population that inhabits the Brooks river in Katmai National Park. I have learned of the environmental benefits that grizzly bears provide to their habitat and think that this native species needs to be returned to the Cascades as nature intended. Lack of information and bygone prejudices created their human caused extinction in their native area. We know better now, its time to return them to their intended environment to support the health of the ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 2129Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Shoreline, WA 98133
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,22 2023 17:10:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly support the reintroduction of grizzly bears! Predators are important for a healthy ecosystem, and the successful reintroduction of wolves has proven this is not only possible but makes good sense environmentally and economically.

Correspondence ID: 2130Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98122
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,22 2023 17:12:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not transform a relaxing and peaceful activity (hiking) into One where I'm terrified of being attacked by apex predators!

Correspondence ID: 2131Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wenatchee, WA 98802
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,22 2023 17:12:58

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: About 4 or 5 years ago, the USDOJ determined that the grizzly bear (*Ursus arctos horribilis*: I have noticed some document writers omit "horribilis"; attempting to deceptively soften the GB's image) population had recovered in the USA. Has their population actually declined that much between then & now? Is it CRITICALLY necessary to restore them in the NCE? How many times must decision-makers, according to NEPA regulations, make decisions about GB's status and reintroduction plans? The EIS Alternatives B & C provide no convincing arguments to move forward with reintroduction; it only mentions fuzzy spiritual or otherwise intangible benefits, such as "Seek to support Tribal cultural and spiritual values related to the grizzly bear," and "restoration of biodiversity of the ecosystem to build ecological resilience and for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations of people." These are subjective and can never be definitively measured or demonstrated.

I agree with those who are not persuaded of the need for grizzly bears to be reintroduced to the NCE simply because this area is suitable habitat and that they used to live in it. Should malaria also be reintroduced to the USA? Mention is made of "Provid(ing) Pacific Northwest residents and visitors with the opportunity to again experience grizzly bears in their native habitat." So ALL visitors to this area will be educated and therefor enjoy GB? Will "ecological resilience" be gauged strictly by GB populations alone? Is there some demonstrable deficiency in the NCE or is there harm that is occurring to this ecosystem that can be directly traced to their absence? Is there valid proof that this ecosystem benefited or was in better condition as a direct result of their presence prior to their population decline? Has there been any tangible harm or significant departure from historical variability in the NCE that can be unquestionably traced ONLY to the bear's population decline? (other than the bear's population decline itself?) Have other species declined concurrently with the GB? Has the lack of GB in the NCE caused harm to the resident human population?

These newly released bears will undoubtedly stray from the federal or other public lands in the NCE which will inevitably result in confrontations with people. The results of these confrontations will almost always be detrimental to these bears. This is eerily similar to the reintroduction of wolves in Idaho in 1993 which has since resulted in more than one "take"; primarily due to their interference with livestock range activities. If Alternative B or C is implemented, are we morally and ethically OK with the inevitable "takes" of these artificially and reluctantly reintroduced grizzly bears that were non-existent in the NCE from the time of their decline until this plan? Apparently so, according to Alternative B, "This rule allows grizzly bears to be taken under specific circumstances, as long as such take is reported promptly to the FWS. These circumstances include defense of life; federal, state, or Tribal scientific or research activities; or removal of grizzly bears involved in conflicts by authorized federal, state, or Tribal authorities." No GB have been killed in Washington because there haven't been any to "trigger" a self-defense reaction. However, some of these reintroduced bears or their offspring will be killed because of self defense or protection in and around the NCE as a DIRECT result of this proposed reintroduction. Why introduce an aggressive species, that has no value to hunters, knowing that an unknown number will be killed in acts of self defense or protection? As stated in the "Background" section: "As human population density increases, the frequency of encounters between humans and grizzly bears also increases, resulting in more human-caused grizzly bear mor(t)alities because of a perceived or real threat to human life or property." Are we also OK with accepting human casualties or injuries from unexpected surprise encounters? Casualties that would NOT occur if Alternative A is implemented?

Have cumulative effects been considered? Some parts within and many areas around the NCE are populated (with people) and well used. A percentage of these GB are likely to stray from the NCE into these lands. Most, if not all, animal species that are native to Washington flee when they detect people (outside of their mating seasons): grizzly bears generally do not. Doesn't this place both GB and people in danger of one another? Is this "collateral damage" worth it? As stated earlier, it's as if some of these bears are going to be sent to their deaths as a result of Alternatives B or C.

Grizzly bears are plentiful in Alaska, Montana, and western Canada where they have always resided, even though government agencies consider them to be threatened or endangered. People who grew up in or have chosen to live in these areas see or encounter them with regularity and have learned to (more or less) live with them. Reintroducing a notoriously ornery apex predator to an area (NCE) whose culture has changed considerably since they were last seen or detected centuries ago will be an unnecessarily brutal upheaval. While injuries to and, God forbid, deaths of people who inadvertently startle or suddenly encounter a GB in the NCE, where there used to be none, will take place, an equal or greater toll on these newly introduced GB will also take place. To reiterate a little differently, releasing GB into the NCE is an UNNECESSARY plan for their deaths, for human tragedies, and for renewed conflicts in an ecosystem (that includes people) which never lamented the absence of GB.

I don't pretend to speak for Tribal Members in and near the NCE (their opinions of this subject are diverse). I have worked with a number of tribal members for the better part of the past 20 to 40 years. Most of the individuals whom I have met during this span are avid outdoorsmen who take advantage of their "Treaty Rights." Not one of these individuals have expressed a desire to see GB "reintroduced" into Washington State. Some have claimed to witness this species here in Washington and discussed "what I would do" if encountered. What these individuals "would do" would not benefit the GB.

Has any thought been given to other reasons why GB are not extant in this area these days? Other than they "have been functionally extirpated"? Perhaps they do not inhabit the NCE for other reasons? (EIS p. 6: "Therefore, it is unlikely that grizzly bears from areas within British Columbia would naturally emigrate to the NCE.") Will the people who attend their releases into the NCE be armed just in case? Will these bears eventually migrate north across the border to the better habitat? Perhaps extensive use by people in the NCE who hike, gather food, hunt, drive, ski, fish, use ORVs, snowshoe, snowmobile, ride horses, swim, camp, climb mountains, use watercraft, river raft, etc. might just drive them away again over the years? Not to mention higher road densities and human habitation than when they were last there? The Alaskan and British Columbia GB "habitats," which effectively extend into Montana, are incomparably larger and do not experience the relatively heavy concentration of use that the smaller NCE does. Are there any barriers between the NCE and BC GB habitat that have effectively prevented them under their own cognition from moving back in since their "extirpation"? Will the GB that are reintroduced into the NCE just ignore whatever factors that have prevented them from migrating south into the NCE and carry on with their proliferation because Alternatives B & C said that they are supposed to? Or are the proponents of Alternatives B & C counting on recreation (and human habitation) in the NCE to nosedive after news of the GB reintroduction becomes widespread?

I work outside in eastern Washington forests year-round. My "bias" against Alternatives B & C are well supported by the points made above. I know that an EIS analyzes a proposal and reports its impacts on the environment of the project area and its surroundings (cumulative effects). It is supposed to be objective and science based. To me, the actual facts presented in the 100+ pages of this EIS, and NOT the unproven speculation, support Alternative A. The majority of the US population do NOT venture into American forests every day. In eastern Washington, cougars, bobcats, rattlesnakes, moose in the north, hornets from August until the snow flies, and even black bears during the spring and fall (and, to a lesser extent, badgers and wolverines) already make these forests an unsettling environment. However, these species have always been there and we therefore know what we are dealing with. When I stumble upon a black bear, or when they detect me and feel threatened, they may hiss, stand on their hind legs, and sometimes charge, BUT their charges are a brief warning which eventually ceases (this typically occurs during their "rutting" seasons) if they notice me walking away from them. I have heard enough true stories and seen enough videos to conclude that GB do NOT cease or back off. While those wildlife biologists who are in favor of this reintroduction desperately try to persuade the American public that the many unpleasant accounts of aggressive GB encounters are not to be believed, those of us who make our living "in the land" know better (many from personal experiences) than to be misled by these advocates of Alternatives B & C.

PLEASE select Alternative A (no action) to protect both the people AND the GB! Thank you for reading these comments.

Correspondence ID:

2132Project:112008Document:132104

Address:

Chicago, IL 60626
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,22 2023 17:24:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a conservationist, I know grizzly bears provide important ecological services, like distributing seeds and aerating alpine meadow. Humans are responsible for the disappearance of grizzlies and it is our responsibility to bring them back. They are an umbrella species. If we do right by them, we do right by so many other species. I work at Brookfield Zoo and the story of how our grizzly bear brothers came to be at the zoo resonates with people. They want to see these bears thriving in the wild. Grizzlies are magnificent and such a special part of our eco system. Reintroducing them to the Cascades is a must. We need to realize that there are wild areas where wildlife can thrive without the threat of human destruction. This is an amazing opportunity to educate folks on grizzly bears and help the world to understand why conservation efforts like these are crucial to the betterment of our wild spaces.

Correspondence ID: 2133Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Niles, MI 49120
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,22 2023 17:38:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of grizzly bears. They belong in this environment and should be reintroduced to their territory.

Correspondence ID: 2134Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Redmond, WA 98052
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,22 2023 19:04:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a Civil and Environmental Engineer, I believe that it is incredibly important for our current generation to continue to strive to restore and repair negative impacts to the environment that ours and previous generations have caused. I whole-heartedly endorse the reintroduction of Grizzly bears to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 2135Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98133
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,22 2023 19:30:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I oppose the trapping of Grizzly bears and releasing them in the North Cascades. The only option in the EIS that I support is option A, which does not involve the trapping and releasing bears. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 2136Project:112008Document:132104

Address: El Cerrito, CA 94530
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,22 2023 19:31:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in support of the necessary re-introduction of Grizzlies into the North Cascades. Please note this is a re-introduction. Grizzlies were in this prime habitat space to begin with until humans eradicated them. Grizzlies are necessary for the health of our ecosystems and the overall health of this planet that is declining swiftly. Please do take immediate action to re-introduce grizzlies to the northern Cascades in hopes that their natural territory will continue to expand, similar to the re-introduction of gray wolves into northern states.

Correspondence ID: 2137Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Denver, CO 80218
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,22 2023 21:57:03

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello, I am [REDACTED], a graduate student at the University of Denver. I wholeheartedly endorse the reintroduction of animals, particularly carnivores, to their native habitats in the contiguous United States. The North Cascades is an area of immense significance, and it's essential to recognize that national parks serve not only as destinations for tourism and sightseeing but also as vital arenas for the restoration and proliferation of native species.

In light of this project, certain valid concerns arise, drawing valuable lessons from past reintroduction efforts, such as the reintroduction of wolves into Yellowstone National Park in the mid-1990s. It's imperative for agencies to exercise caution, particularly regarding the impact on ranchers around national parks and the enhancement of safety measures for tourists visiting the North Cascades National Park.

I firmly believe that the presence of an apex predator like grizzly bears in the North Cascades will contribute significantly to the restoration of ecological balance, particularly in relation to the elk and deer populations. Nonetheless, I hold concerns about the potential risks associated with increased tourism within the National Park system. While I acknowledge that the project plan anticipates an influx of tourists due to the bears, it also brings with it an increased risk of dangerous encounters from human negligence regarding wildlife in these national parks. The last thing that should occur is the removal of a bear due to a negative encounter brought about by human neglect. Therefore, we must carefully consider if this project is worth the associated risks and potential consequences.

I understand that only three to seven bears will be released per year over a span of five to ten years. However, it is important to inquire if the findings of the study will be made available to the public, explaining how the bears contribute to the ecosystem within the park. Moreover, there is a pressing need for a method, such as educational initiatives or stricter fines, to dissuade people from approaching wildlife in these parks, as the current system appears inadequate in discouraging such behavior.

My final concern pertains to the need for a delicate balance between conservation and tourism. It is crucial that people are educated about the importance and the potential dangers associated with these animals as they are reintroduced into the area. In conclusion, I am a strong proponent of the potential success of grizzly bear restoration in the National Park. However, it is vital to emphasize the importance of controlling the bear population, garnering local support, and establishing clear future goals for their conservation. The project's merits should be carefully weighed against the challenges it presents, with a strong emphasis on the responsible management of both wildlife and visitor experiences.

Correspondence ID: 2138Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Vashon, WA 98070-4304
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,22 2023 22:29:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: National Parks Service Decision Makers,

I am a lifelong Washington resident who grew up in Skagit County, and I strongly support the reintroduction of grizzlies to the North Cascades.

Thank you for the effort put into the proposal.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 2139Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lake Wenatchee, WA 98826
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,23 2023 02:24:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: <https://app.leg.wa.gov/rcw/default.aspx?cite=77.12.035>

It's against state law to introduce grizzly bears.

I do not support this and the park service should not introduce grizzly bears into the cascades.

Correspondence ID: 2140Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98126
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,23 2023 05:36:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I would like to lend my voice in support for reintroducing Grizzly bears to the North Cascades region. I think we owe this opportunity to the specie considering our treatment, as humans, of this great animal historically. If reintroducing this animal also means lending a hand to one of the last remaining wild open, natural spaces in the USA, then I think we ought to do so, too. I would absolutely support my tax dollars being spent on this potential project.

Correspondence ID: 2141Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Cashmere, WA 98815
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,23 2023 09:30:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am neither for nor against the reintroduction of grizzly bears in the north Cascades, but offer some considerations if this proposal goes through.

While the legal requirements of the ESA are clear and the North Cascades is unlikely to establish a population of grizzly bears on its own, the sociopolitical backlash against a reintroduction effort should be considered before moving on. Wolves were reintroduced 30 years ago, and residents of the intermountain west are still reeling over the government's 'intrusion'. Not only would this impact the reintroduction itself, but also hinder state and federal wildlife management agencies relationship with the public. Including as much public input as possible in any plan should be considered.

Prior to reintroduction, USFWS/NPS should ensure bear-human conflict potential is reduced and should provide funding to other agencies as well as local governments. While the Mt Baker-Snoqualmie NF has moved forward with bear conflict reduction measures, the Okanogan-Wenatchee NF has not. Current amount of bear proof garbage dumpsters are not adequate and consistent black bear-human conflict continues. Additional measures related to hunting carcasses, food storage, etc. need to also be implemented.

While Ransom 2023 suggests that climate change will improve grizzly bear habitat, current research/observations from black bears suggests otherwise. Summer drought can cause significant food failures as occurred in 2022. That year black bears from all over the eastern north cascades made their way into towns and outlying areas to search for human provided foods. This is a very commonly observed phenomenon with bear populations and is likely to cause grizzly bears to move into human occupied areas. Data from GPS collared bears in the Leavenworth area shows bear moving up to 20 miles to human development and orchards in the fall prior to hibernation and there is no reason to suspect that grizzlies would be any different. Human-bear conflict measures need to be taken in the surrounding communities prior to reintroduction to ensure bears are not killed in conflict.

I understand that bears have been moved in similar scenarios, but moving bears in traps and helicopters during the peak of summer seems irresponsible. Culvert traps get very hot and can easily kill bears if inside too long. All planning should ensure that stringent animal safety measures are taken, including forgoing trapping and transfer if temperatures are too high.

Correspondence ID: 2142Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Carlton, WA 98814
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,23 2023 09:48:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: "Those who live in grizzly country tend to take precautions against adverse encounters, and some live in a constant or frequent state of increased vigilance."

"Although the benefits of having large carnivores on the landscape accrue to society at large, these are often disproportionately borne by a small number of people whose livelihoods may be negatively affected by these animals."

"Attacks are rare, and fatalities from attacks are even rarer, but grizzly bears do occasionally injure or kill people. In recent decades, grizzlies in North America have been responsible for an average of 11 attacks and one to two fatalities per year (Bombieri 2019; Herrero and Fleck 1990; Herrero 1970). We can thus describe the risk of living with grizzlies as small but real: harms to people (as well as to bears and other beings) will result from reintroduction efforts."

These statements are taken from "The Ethics of Reintroducing Large Carnivores: The Case of the California Grizzly". They precisely represent my thoughts. We do not want, or need Grizzly Bears (*Ursus arctos horribilis*) introduced into our environment. We the residents of North Central Washington will bear the repercussions of this action, not the "environmentalists" who live in large metropolitan megalopolises.

Correspondence ID: 2143Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America
Outside Organization: Anne G. Peck Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,23 2023 09:56:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I oppose the Grizzly Bear Project, primarily because it is not necessary to preserve the species. DNA tests have shown that the Canadian Grizzly population is increasing despite climate change and its effect on the grizzlies' food sources. A major factor in grizzly bear mortality is motor vehicle collisions, not lack of environment. Grizzlies are at the top of the food chain and therefore can move into any area they choose. Since they're attracted to the same environments as humans, that means that they'll soon inhabit areas populated by humans. Additionally, there is a cost to the taxpayers associated with introduction of grizzlies. I might add that I have not seen any hard evidence that grizzlies ever inhabited the Cascades region proposed.

Correspondence ID: 2144Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,23 2023 10:36:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am opposed to reintroducing grizzly bears to the North Cascades.

It is a waste of time and money that fails to address any of the many serious environmental dilemmas facing our planet.

The proposal is merely a "feel good" for a small number of activists.

Correspondence ID: 2145Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Anacortes, WA 98221
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,23 2023 11:13:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in favor of the reintroduction and recovery of grizzly bears within the NCE and provide the prohibitions and exceptions under the Act necessary and appropriate to conserve the species within a defined NEP area."

Redesignation of the species in the North Cascades as an experimental population will allow land managers to prevent conflict before it happens and address it when it happens. Reducing and addressing conflict will help bears bounce back and help people accept them on the landscape.

The 10(j) map imagines future expansion of grizzly bear populations into Zone #2. This expansion could contribute to the conservation of the species as a whole, and potentially create connectivity between populations if more habitat is protected and corridors are developed.

The 10(j) is responsive to local community concerns and requests for more management certainty, as the 10(j) clearly defines what kinds of management actions can take place in and around Washington state. This is critical!

The agencies have defined an active restoration and grizzly population augmentation effort as part and parcel of a 10(j) rule. The 10(j) provides a clear and intentional management plan in the event that Canadian bears wander into Zones 1, 2, or 3 from British Columbia.

Suggestions to improve the 10(j):

I oppose the use of written time-limited conditional take permits for private landowners to kill bears. People are already allowed to kill bears in self-defense. Livestock and other property loss can and should be compensated through a variety of existing government and NGO programs.

Bears that continue to damage livestock and other property, and bears that become habituated should be dealt with by professional agency staff. Professionals will ensure the right bear is targeted and, when necessary, humanely euthanized.

I worry about private landowners injuring bears and that injured bear becoming a safety hazard. If landowners kill the wrong bear, the conflict will continue.

The agencies should clarify that Selkirk and BC bears will be managed under 10(j) if they wander into Zone 1, 2, or 3.

Correspondence ID: 2146Project:112008Document:132104

Address: La Conner, WA 98257
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,23 2023 11:21:47
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Don Striker and Supervisor Brad Thompson,

My family and I strongly support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades. Wherever grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations. Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades.

We also strongly support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. The proposal would bring up to 25 non-problem grizzly bears into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade and manage them as an experimental population.

Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. My family and I often do, and believe it is the most beautiful area in the US. The plan is modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities. Also, the 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and sometimes respond to human-bear conflict. The 10(j) rule will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. It is our moral obligation to restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Thank you for taking the time to keep our North Cascades wild!

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
La Conner, Washington

Correspondence ID: 2147Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Chelan, WA 98816
United States of America
Outside Organization: resident Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,23 2023 12:29:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: First, thank you for receiving my comment and making this forum available for concerned residents like myself.

Over the last thirty years I have observed the human visitors to the No. Cascades and adjoining public lands increase tremendously. Of particular note is that a large percentage are very unskilled and naive to nature's ways. I suspect their vulnerability exposes this population to high risk if the Grizzly Bear is introduced.

I ask that this bear species NOT be reintroduced. I have not hear a viable reason for this other than that it is believed this bear species once inhabited this area.

As was referenced, once introduced the Grizzly Bear will have protective rights, even though the land will become more used by the public. Extrapolate the involvement of humans over the next decade and, please, make decisions based on this current and future perspective.

Correspondence ID: 2148Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98826
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,23 2023 12:34:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear NPS,
I write to express my full support of grizzly bear restoration in the North Cascades Ecosystem. As one who has enjoyed the beauty and wildness of the North Cascades for over 20 years, I am excited about the prospect of grizzly bears returning to this region. The North Cascades has long been a conservation victory for wilderness and the grizzly bear would fulfill its status as a truly wild area. The reintroduction would also reestablish the bears' vital role in the North Cascades ecosystem. Thank you,

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 2149Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Chelan, WA 98816
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,23 2023 13:02:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As landowners in Lake Chelan area - 22 miles uplake from The town of Chelan, we are highly concerned about this issue.

Please make note we are strongly against bringing in any grizzly bears to the North Cascades. We work, recreate and live in this area, as do our family members, neighbors, and grand children. Please do not make a mistake which will result in human or domestic animals/farm animals' injury or death. We struggle enough with the predators that are already here, and the wolves that are now just above us.

Thank you for considering our input.

Correspondence ID: 2150Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Arcata, CA 95521
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,23 2023 13:10:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please put those bears back. Bring em in. They were there first we outta bring em back

Correspondence ID: 2151Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America
Outside Organization: Retired Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,23 2023 13:17:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: All I had to do was see this report from October 2nd a few weeks ago to realize what an unsafe idea this is to introduce an aggressive animal to a very peaceful and quiet wilderness area can produce.

Come on, don't be ridiculous.

Grizzly Bear Kills Couple and their dog in Canada
<https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-66985549#>

"If it ain't broke, don't fix it" holds true one more time.

Correspondence ID: 2152Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Chelan, WA 98816
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,23 2023 13:17:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Not a comment, but a question. The research clearly shows that grizzlies existed in the area, is there research showing what positive impacts reintroduction will have on the ecosystem?

Correspondence ID: 2153Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Edmonds, WA 98026
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,23 2023 14:36:47
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: It is extremely important to preserve ecosystems in as natural a state as possible, and grizzly bears represent a distinct keystone predator species that were hunted to extinction in our region. It is our duty and responsibility to restore the natural species' and food chains present in Washington to as original and unobstructed as possible. We were responsible for removing grizzly bears from our environment, it is our responsibility to return them to their rightful habitat. We are not better than the nature around us, and we owe these species a debt from what we've done to them and the land they reside on.

Correspondence ID: 2154Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Edmonds, WA 98026
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,23 2023 14:42:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hi,

As a volunteer at Woodland Park Zoo I am learning about the importance of reintroducing grizzly bears back in to the North Cascades. I love Washington state for it's beauty and landscape and all of the creatures that inhabit it. I want grizzly bears to be a part of that wildness again. There is plenty of space for both of us. Humans were responsible for removing grizzlies from the North Cascades and it's our responsibility to bring them back home. I am also a parent and want my child to grow up knowing that grizzlies have been returned back into their natural environment. I want him to have that experience. Also, I know grizzly bears provide important ecological services, like distributing seeds and aerating alpine meadows. They are critical to our area. If we don't take action now, we risk losing grizzly bears from the North Cascades forever.

Thank you for your time.

Correspondence ID: 2155Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ellensburg, WA 98926
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,23 2023 15:39:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am a hunter and lover of wild spaces. I would love to see the Grizzly bear restored to much of its former range across the west both as a means of ecosystem restoration and for the possibility of someday being able to hunt these beautiful creatures. For this reason I support Alternative C. I like the option and possibility of having state wildlife officials determine policy. This majestic creatures belong in our wilderness areas and the North Cascades ecosystem would benefit from the presence. Thank you

Correspondence ID: 2156Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Quincy, WA 98848
United States of America
Outside Organization: Company Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,23 2023 15:40:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: There is NO need to "Introduce" a species that is already known to be in the state. They will find they're way in naturally as the wolves have in Colorado. Nothing like wasting tax payer money on an introduction that happened naturally before it was even approved. These LARGE predators will NEVER be managed properly look at the greater yellow stone grizzly's! they need to be hunted to learn to fear and respect humans which is not happening and grizzly's conflicts from exponentially annually because of it.

Correspondence ID: 2157Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Battle Ground, WA 98604
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,23 2023 16:02:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing about the recent proposal to reintroduce Grizzly Bears into the North Cascades Park and surrounding areas. Grizzlies historically ranged in the North Cascades; however, very few sitings have been confirmed

recently. The North Cascades and surrounding areas have over 9,000 square miles of prime Grizzly habitat. This prime ecosystem includes steep, remote mountainsides, deep winter snowpack, lush meadows, vegetation and open canopies. Grizzlies are habitat generalists and have an ability to adapt to various habitats. As the environment warms with climate change, the bears seek cooler temperatures by increasing their range by moving up in elevation. These habitat adaptations also bring the bears further away from urban areas, reducing the risks for conflicts with humans or livestock.

Grizzly bears are a characteristic of a healthy ecosystem. It is time we assist with Grizzly reintroduction to this area where they historically ranged. We also need to connect these wildlife communities with more corridors in which Grizzlies may travel. Other states such as Montana, Idaho, and Wyoming have proven to be models for how people can work together to restore Grizzly populations. It is time for Washington state to do the same.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Correspondence ID: 2158Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,23 2023 16:24:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I don't know what idiot thought this was a great idea. The ecosystem has adapted to not having grizzly bears. There is an entire domino effect of introducing these animals that no one can possibly anticipate. I'm personally convinced the government is intentionally making the wilderness somewhere we cannot visit and enjoy any longer and wants to keep us corralled in larger cities. There are many ranchers that allow their cattle to graze on public lands. Their cattle will be decimated by this idiotic plan. Part of what is really special about Washington state is that we don't have a lot of scary animals, reptiles, dangerous insects, and natural disasters like most other states do. Leave our beautiful state alone!! Allow the citizens YOU SERVE to enjoy the wilderness unmolested by the stupidity you public serpents introduce.

Correspondence ID: 2159Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,23 2023 17:02:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am a Chelan County resident and outdoor enthusiast. I support grizzly bear reintroduction in the North Cascades Ecosystem.

Thank you for your work on this topic.

Correspondence ID: 2160Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Northville, MI 48168
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,23 2023 17:06:12

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support alternative C regarding the reintroduction of Grizzly Bears in the North Cascades Ecosystem. Grizzly Bears are an important species in the North Cascades and the restoration of them in the area will benefit the system as a whole by returning it to a more natural state. Alternative C is preferred over B because more management flexibility will limit the amount of human-bear conflicts, therefore maintaining a good public opinion on the bear reintroduction.

Correspondence ID: 2161Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Renton, WA 98058
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,23 2023 17:50:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I applaud your efforts to undo some of the damage humans have done over the years by reintroducing grizzlies into the nation parks. Grizzlies and other bears are part of the circle of life and do not usually go after livestock.

Correspondence ID: 2162Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,23 2023 17:58:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: When the grizzly bears where roaming PNW there were few people hiking and camping up in the mountains. It's a recipe for disaster. And then people will have to kill grizzly bears again.

Correspondence ID: 2163Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Lynden, WA 98264
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,23 2023 18:14:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support grizzly bear restoration in the North Cascades. This species has played a major part in the ecosystem of the North Cascades for thousands of years and should be there still. I would prefer Alternative 2 with Endangered Species Act protection, but would also support Alternative 3, which would provide more flexibility in managing bears that come into conflict with humans. I believe there needs to be a vigorous program to educate people on how to live with grizzlies in the area so that conflicts can be kept to a minimum.

Correspondence ID: 2164Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Walla Walla, WA 99362
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,23 2023 18:17:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do not support the re-introduction of grizzlies to the North Cascades. The North Cascades area is one of my favorite destinations for backpacking and hiking. I love the rugged terrain.

I recognize that grizzly were once a part of this ecosystem, but that doesn't mean they should be reintroduced. There's nothing stopping grizzly from arriving on their own from Canada, and when that happens, we should let it. However, we have already modified the ecosystem by removing grizzly. Leave it be! Adding grizzly back in modifies an ecosystem that is already going through changes due to climate change. This area is continuously adapting, and we need to stop trying to control it.

I would be dishonest if I didn't also add that having an increased population of grizzly would make me nervous. Unlike the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem, there's not an obvious ranger station where people are required to check in and rent bear-proof canisters for backpacking. There are so many tourists from Seattle that hike in the N Cascades, and it will take some serious education to adapt practices to those compatible with the reintroduction of an apex predator. I'm not a fan of backpacking in areas with grizzlies and stupid people because even if I store my food as advised, others may habituate bears to people/food.

Let's spend our government money on thinning projects to deal with our wildfire problem, NOT reintroducing a species that will certainly arrive on its own in due time.

Respectfully,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 2165Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Anacortes, WA 98221
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,23 2023 18:31:31

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support any/all options to reintroduce the grizzly bear to the North Cascades. This is a key apex organism native to this ecosystem and it's absence affects the integrity of the cabin ecosystem including the health and well being of a range of plant and animal species. The ecosystem has never fully recovered from the loss of the grizzly bear and it will take many years to recover once they are reintroduced - but it's time to get started!

Correspondence ID: 2166Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Puyallup, WA 98375
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,23 2023 19:13:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We already have natural apex predators in the state of Washington i.e. black bears, cougars and wolves. We do not need the introduction of another apex predator to mess with our current eco system. NPS has problems with wolves moving down into areas in Washington from other areas such as as Canada .. killing livestock and entire packs having to be eradicated. Now you want to purposely add another apex predator a Grizzly Bear.. that does not and there is no proof it ever has lived in Washington? We do not need the addition of Grizzly Bears.. they will kill livestock, damage orchards and agriculture and endanger people living in any areas you introduce them too. I don't see how you can feel right about supporting this as a vast majority of people have already made it clear that live in the areas you want to introduce them to that they don't want them.

Correspondence ID: 2167Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,23 2023 19:54:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I oppose activate re-introduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades National Park (NOCA). It's a bad idea for multiple reasons. The human population of Washington is growing. Public lands are being surrounded by increasing development. Visitation, even in remote backcountry will increase or remain steady even with the park's restrictive backcountry permit system. If the reintroduction is successful, there will be conflicts between grizzly bears and hikers and climbers. Having grizzly bears in NOCA isn't worth one hiker or bushwhacking climber getting attacked, wounded, maimed or killed (even if rare). I believe this having spent 2 summers in Glacier National Park and backpacking vacations in Banff and Jasper and other areas with grizzlies.

There's a reason grizzlies don't migrate in from Canada naturally. Some claim otherwise but the North Cascades is poor grizzly habitat since much lowland habitat is developed. The salmon runs in Skagit and Nooksack watersheds are a tiny fraction of the 1800s and early 1900s. Rocky Mountain grizzlies have access to carcasses and live animals in large big game herds. NOCA does not have that many deer or elk. One shouldn't conclude just because NOCA is wild that it's good grizzly habitat. I suspect most transplanted grizzlies will leave the park or die. This is cruel to the bear especially after having been anesthetized and dumped in an unfamiliar area. So, I oppose re-introduction on animal welfare grounds as well.

Re-introducing grizzlies to NOCA is unsafe, expensive and cruel to the bears. It also doesn't improve my wilderness experience or appreciation if the park.

Correspondence ID: 2168Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Burlington, WA 98233
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,23 2023 20:23:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I 100% support grizzly bear restoration in the North Cascades. With the grizzly bear being a keystone species we are long overdue to protect and restore numbers to more than we can count on 2 hands.

Thank you!

Correspondence ID: 2169Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,23 2023 20:28:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: In regards to the re entry of Grizzlies Bears into the Cascades, I'm for it People have mentioned that they haven't been there before which is bull .We as people put them out of the mountains by killing them off, if not for that they would still be in there home in the cascades . People are stating that they will interfere with recreation and threaten people, hamper there development, etc. Well to that I say stay out of there home . Have they not realized that all of this land in the U.S. was once there's and we continue to take more and more. People complain about bear, cougars, coyotes, wolf's and yet this was there natural land . The more and more we push to develop and push into there home ranges the more we are going to have more and more encounters in there home ranges. So the answer is stay out of there home, stop development in there home and stop the empedment in there, recreation and development! Let them come back to there home . People think that wildlife is the problem and to that I say hell no, stay out !!!!

Correspondence ID: 2170Project:112008Document:132104

Address: PESHASTIN, WA 98847
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,23 2023 20:31:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: While most of the time'm in favor of reintroduction or protection of endangered species, I have to say that I am totally opposed to the reintroduction of Grizzzlies. There are just far too many people living and recreating in the North Cascades and the bears are simply not compatible. Almost no one would be prepared to meet up with a grizzly in the woods, myself included, even though I'm an outdoors person. Grizzlies will just result in far more human deaths which will ultimately result in deaths of the bears as well.

Correspondence ID: 2171Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kalispell, MT 59901
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,23 2023 21:15:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am in favor option A.

Correspondence ID: 2172Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ferndale, WA 98248
United States of America
Outside Organization: Sierra Club Conservation/Preservation
Received: Oct,23 2023 22:18:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I welcome the introduction of Grizzly Bears to the Cascades. My only concern is will they end up like so many of the Grey Wolves after their intro from the brink only to be shot, trapped and poisoned. And, bears & wolves being carnivores will take advantage of irresponsible ranchers allowing their cattle to graze on public land with no supervision, that goes day and night.

This is my concern, if someone has an answer, please let me know as to alleviate my fears of this.

Thank You

Correspondence ID: 2173Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98126
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,23 2023 23:06:24

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We need grizzlies in the cascades!

Correspondence ID: 2174Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98107
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,23 2023 23:13:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please proceed with reintroduction. I lived in Alaska (a long time ago) and we knew how to live with them around. The North cascades is a perfect ecosystem for this project.

Thanks for your work.

Correspondence ID: 4036Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Anacortes, WA 98221
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,24 2023 09:38:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The thought of reintroducing grizzly bears into the ecosystem from which they have either been removed or removed themselves troubles me. First, just because we once had Grizzly Bear in this area, does that mean it is a good idea to bring them back? Is it being considered just because we can? The implications need to be considered, particularly from the viewpoints of fairness and kindness to the animals themselves. Will this be successful or are we considering an experiment with the potential for really negative consequences?

If we consider that, we ought to consider the idea that bears left this landscape for a reason. Yes, attitudes toward wildlife were different in the past, but the question remains why they left - negative human interactions, range constriction, and habitat loss - and what is different now?

Second, though the North Cascades is thought a large enough habitat I worry they are not large enough. We know bears can traverse immense swaths of landscape. Unless they stay in a secluded pocket, and that is not the nature of bears I have interacted with, there are a great many areas where a bear disturbed and pushed out by negative human interaction will relocate only to find themselves in another area with significant human interactions. Roads, hiking routes, industrial uses, climbing routes, and off trail traverses criss cross the North Cascades. I fear that this will initiate a cycle of negative interactions that will then beg action to remove the "troubled bear" that we produced by introducing them in the first place.

Third, bears have a remarkable ability to adapt, particularly to easy food. If the risk of human bear interaction is significant, the natural risk is that bears will position themselves to easy food sources - hiker and climber camps, edges of habitat with forays into easy food sources. Since the habitat is not vast, there will be numerous situations - unfairly caused by humans - that will habituate and make dangerous bears.

I am not in favor of introducing Grizzly Bears unnaturally. If bears choose to migrate in because the habitat suits them, that I support. I consider introducing Grizzly Bears an experiment that, at its core, appears motivated from the viewpoint of "because we can" rather than carefully considering why bears left and what the habitat is now. I consider this unfair to the animals themselves.

Finally, if the NPS does reintroduce, I strongly suggest managing the "Grizzly Reintroduction Experiment" as an experimental population so that they have flexibility in managing the population in the ways that are most fair to wildlife (bears) and meets the NPS mandates and mission.

I oppose introducing Grizzly Bears into the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 4037Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,24 2023 09:39:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to you in support of bringing back Grizzly bears to the North Cascades National Park and the surrounding wilderness areas. What is a wilderness without its wild animals? Grizzly bears were previous inhabitants here. Studies have shown that this area should be able to support a healthy Grizzly bear population. I am in favor of alternative B for the introduction of Grizzlies. I think that this option gives more flexibility in the administering of this process.

I also believe that this proposal should not include the Alpine Lakes Wilderness Area, which lies south of Stevens Pass. This area is a heavily used and less regulated recreation area, which increases the risks of human / bear interactions. I would like to see the early bear movements to be centered in the North Cascades National Park. The Park Service is better equipped to provide the necessary education and regulations for safe human activity.

Correspondence ID: 4038Project:112008Document:132104

Address: San Antonio, TX 78230
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,24 2023 09:59:10

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The importance of re-introducing a resident population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Wilderness cannot be overstated. Please allow the re-introduction of these magnificent animals so that they may find a permanent home in the North Cascades Wilderness area. Thank you for your consideration.

Correspondence ID: 4039Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tacoma, WA 98407
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,24 2023 10:18:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Would like to express my support for the reintroduction of the grizzly into North Cascades per the recommendations of this restoration plan.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 4040Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Boise, ID 83706
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,24 2023 12:49:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Do not introduce grizzlies to the Northern Cascades. Let nature take its course and let these bears expand naturally as their numbers increase and they are delisted. Washington state is not ready for these predators to expand relatively near one of the largest population centers. To some degree, the potential human, wildlife, and livestock conflicts will be negative for these animals. In a state where a legitimate argument can be made that its regulatory game agency does not prioritize the interests of its primary stakeholders and removes opportunities for hunting and fishing for (apparently) social reasons and not population based management, hunters and anglers need all the help they can get to protect their right to pursue game and to do this, game species' populations need protected and closely managed, and introducing more predatory species to the landscape will be counterproductive to some degree.

Correspondence ID: 4041Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,24 2023 13:31:56

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to protest the introduction of grizzly bears in the North Cascades region. How are people supposed to protect themselves if they are not allowed to shoot the bears? Are we supposed to wait until the bear attacks us or our animals? Too late. Remove the protected status and fines if you are going to load us up with Apex predators. We will all need to carry heavy arms to protect ourselves. The bears will be attracted to the residential areas with plenty of pets, hobby farms, orchards and garbage to dine on. I will be afraid to walk my dog on any of the local trails. Hikers will be severely impacted in the Enchantments area. Forget the salmon run - it will be gone forever. Grizzly bears are not endangered in North America!

Correspondence ID: 4042Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Omak, WA 98841-9575
United States of America

Outside Organization: N/A Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,24 2023 13:51:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I write as a resident of Okanogan County and the Okanogan Valley to express my strong support for grizzly bear restoration in the North Cascades Ecosystem. I regularly hike, ski, camp, and hunt in the Pasayten Wilderness area and grizzly bear restoration would greatly enhance my backcountry experience.

Grizzly bears once thrived in the North Cascades and are vital to maintaining a complete, ecologically-functional ecosystem. As the American ecologist Aldo Leopold once remarked, "the first precept of intelligent tinkering is to keep all the pieces." I believe that the United States acting by and through its administrative agencies has a moral obligation to restore grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem.

Grizzly bear range in the contiguous U.S. has been reduced by 98 percent. Restoring grizzly bears to the North Cascades will help to maintain the animal's distribution on the West Coast (the only Grizzly Bear Recovery Zone outside of the Rocky Mountains). We know that people and grizzly bears can and do coexist in other areas where the bears are much more abundant, and local economies are supported by tourism, backcountry

recreation, and ranching, among other activities.

Grizzly bears won't recover on their own because the North Cascades is isolated from larger, more well-connected grizzly bear populations in the U.S. and Canada. In the decades since the grizzly was protected by the Endangered Species Act, grizzlies have not recovered in the North Cascades.

I also support the designation of North Cascades Ecosystem grizzly bears as a non-essential experimental population under ESA section 10(j). So doing could give the NPS, USFWS, USFS, and other wildlife and land management agencies management flexibility through the promulgation and application of ESA section 4(d) protective regulations thereby increasing the success and social acceptance of the grizzly bear reintroduction effort.

I encourage you to support efforts to bring back this native species and restore an important species in the North Cascades Ecosystem and part of our regional culture and natural heritage.

Thank you,

Correspondence ID: 4043Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ashburn, VA 20147
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,24 2023 13:54:33

Correspondence Type:Web Form

Correspondence: body content

Correspondence ID: 4044Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Chelan, WA 98816
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,24 2023 15:09:30

Correspondence Type:Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration plan.

Correspondence ID: 4045Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98274
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,24 2023 15:32:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is a terrible idea. We already have Grizzly bears coming from BC and Idaho in Washington. Just because a species inhabited an area in the past does not mean we need to reintroduce them. We have enough predators in this state already. Our Ungulate and small game populations are suffering and on the decline and do not need to add another predator to that. I also have family that hikes in the North cascades and are anti gun. I feel there safety will dramatically decrease with another apex predator located near the trails they hike. There was just a couple of hikers killed in Banff by a grizzly bear. They unloaded a whole can of bear spray, that did not deter the bear. Please reconsider.

Thank you

Correspondence ID: 4046Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bow, WA 98232
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,24 2023 15:48:08

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: It is my opinion that if we had appropriate habitat for grizzly bears they would've come on their own. Also, I think we only need to look at the wolf recovery plan. The wolves behaving as they do eating other creatures, become the target for marksmen in helicopters. So the taxpayer pays for the successful recovery and then the marksmen that kill them.

Correspondence ID: 4047Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Menifee, CA 92584
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,24 2023 16:21:12

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly support alternative 2 for grizzly restoration.

Correspondence ID: 4048Project:112008Document:132104

Address: San Francisco, CA 94110
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,24 2023 16:31:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is long overdue. There is no reason that we cannot have a complete and healthy ecosystem again in our state. Our neighbors in British Columbia, Idaho, Montana and Wyoming live with grizzly bears why can't we? Any reasons that may be given as to why this cannot be done is just alarmist fear mongering.

Correspondence ID: 4049Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Union, WA 98592
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,24 2023 16:37:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I whole heartedly agree that grizzlie's are the orca's of the land and believe that they be allowed to benefit from protection until their numbers can be stabilized.

Thank you for considering comments in support of this unique creature.

Correspondence ID: 4050Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,24 2023 16:53:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Don Striker and Supervisor Brad Thompson,
I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years.

Where grizzly bears thrive, ecosystems thrive. These bears regulate populations of the animals upon which they prey and keep forests healthy by dispersing seeds and berries. In addition, they are expert diggers and their massive claws help aerate

soils to facilitate wildflower growth. As grizzlies churn soils, they create seed beds for flowering plants and grasses and prevent conifer encroachment on both alpine and subalpine meadows.

I live in Wenatchee and use the North Cascade to hike and backcountry ski. For this reason, I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. The proposal would bring up to 25 non-problem grizzly bears into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade and manage them as an experimental population. Thank you for consideration of this request.

██████████
Wenatchee, Washington

Correspondence ID: 4051Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,24 2023 17:13:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzlies in the North Cascades ecosystem....NO thank you!

These mountains are our playground hikers, bikers, skiers, hunters, etc. We have bears here already. We do not need more bears. There is not currently an abundance of food to support grizzlies.

No!

Correspondence ID: 4052Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Sedro Woolley, WA 98284
United States of America
Outside Organization: - Select - Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,24 2023 18:24:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am writing to express my opinion that Alternative C will provide the best path forward for both people and grizzlies in our region. As an avid hiker and wildlife protector, I would like to see the grizzly bears come back to the North Cascades and keep the wild, wild.
After more than two centuries of a war on predators, including grizzly bears, black bears, cougars, wolves, coyotes, eagles, and hawks, we have learned that ecosystems function better and wildlife populations are healthier when predators are a part of the system.
In addition, areas that are big enough and wild enough to support grizzlies will benefit human communities by providing clean air, clean water, and other resources we depend on.
Most importantly, grizzly bears are an important part of our cultural and natural heritage. I want my children and grandchildren to have a chance to see grizzlies, black bears, cougars, wolverines, and other wildlife in the North Cascades. Unfortunately, grizzlies will not be able to repopulate the North Cascades on their own. There are no grizzly populations in the United States or Canada that are large enough or close enough to serve as a source to naturally repopulate the North Cascades.
Today people are coexisting with grizzly bears in Montana and Canada, and we can do the same here. In fact, one of the primary reasons people go to Yellowstone National Park and Glacier National Park is to see grizzly bears and this has given local communities a huge economic boost.
I am confident this effort will succeed and will be one of the greatest wildlife conservation efforts in the history of this region. We exterminated grizzly bears in the North Cascades, and now we have an opportunity and a well-crafted plan to bring them back.
Thank you for your consideration in this important matter.

Correspondence ID: 4053Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lake Stevens, WA 98258
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,24 2023 18:35:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello,

I think it is critical to restore grizzlies to the PNW. They will the completion of a full and healthy ecosystem. The ecosystem is not healthy without them. I believe the area is large enough to support their reintroduction without people being harmed. Please restore them.

Correspondence ID: 4054Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Burien, WA 98146
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,24 2023 20:54:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please bring back the Grizzlies.

They are an important part of our environment and the North Cascades is remote enough that the people entering it know what they are doing in bear territory.

Correspondence ID: 4055Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Dresden, ME 04342
United States of America
Outside Organization: Librarian Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,25 2023 07:55:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Greetings from New England,

As I live outside the proposed territory, I realize my comments will likely have less weight (correctly) - but as a fellow occupant of the planet, I really do hope that Grizzlies are brought back into the Cascades. It would be so astounding to see the ecosystem rebalance with these massive, impressive bears as a part of it.

My one hesitation would be that the folks who live there agree. Not because I think our opinions ought to determine the animals, but because we are the ones with guns and opposable thumbs so if the end result is going to be bears shot by angry locals, let's not. But if we can do this without endangering the animals - how thrilling!

Correspondence ID: 4056Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Oro Valley, AZ 85755
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,25 2023 08:01:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: NA

Correspondence ID: 4057Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Chelan, WA 98816
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,25 2023 08:16:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Let nature take its course. If grizzly migrate into the area on their own that is one thing, and acceptable. Introduction of an ace predator. is another. I vote no!

Correspondence ID: 4058Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sedro-Woolley, WA 98284
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,25 2023 09:27:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: If the western part of the park were truly that desirable for grizzlies, why wouldn't they be back there now? I hunt black bear outside the park and the bears that are in that region travel great distances and are often found down in the areas where many visitors hike and camp. I have real concern that grizzlies would begin to move down into the lower valleys (in Yellowstone, 1/3 of all elk calves are eaten by grizzlies in the spring before food is out) where more interactions with people and livestock will occur. I don't want to see any grizzlies shot because they are following their food source nor do I want our hiking trails closed for weeks on end due to "bear activity". Let them move back into these areas naturally. If they don't then clearly there isn't enough there to entice them to stay.

Correspondence ID: 4059Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Washougal, WA 98671
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,25 2023 10:10:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzlies are an iconic feature of a healthy ecosystem here in the PNW. Please bring them back to as wide an area as possible and with as many protections as possible. They were here first and their health and stability is an indicator for the entire region. Our communities will be best served by doing everything possible to enhance, improve and protect our environment.

Correspondence ID: 4060Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Edmonds, WA 98026
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,25 2023 10:16:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Humans have pushed Grizzly bears from their natural habitat in the North Cascade and we should take action to bring them back. There is plenty of room for us to coexist.

Correspondence ID: 4061Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,25 2023 10:16:56

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzlies belong in the Cascades. As a hiker and a user of these forests, I want to see a healthy ecosystem, which requires grizzly bears. As a parent, I want my children and theirs to be able to experience healthy, natural environments, which requires grizzly bears. We can safely coexist with grizzlies. Restore them to the Cascades!

Correspondence ID: 4062Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Portland, OR 97206
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,25 2023 10:57:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Brown bears were extirpated from their historic ranges by humans. They did not leave the Pacific Northwest of their own volition. Bears are an important part of our ecosystems. They are valuable from an ecological, and cultural perspective. They also hold their own intrinsic value, and deserve to be here.

Correspondence ID: 4063Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Nicktown, PA 15762-8216
United States of America
Outside Organization: Saint Francis University Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,25 2023 11:00:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This project initiative is great news to hear. I would love to see bears returned to their natural habitat, helping to restore a long-lost natural balance to the region. I believe restoring these magnificent animals to their rightful home is an investment in the long-term well-being of our environment and shows our commitment to the limited areas of wilderness we have left. Just wanted to share my opinion of support for this initiative that has sparked some hope in people like me.

Correspondence ID: 4064Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Saint George, UT 84790
United States of America
Outside Organization: Retired Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,25 2023 11:24:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I greatly appreciate this very thorough, comprehensive, and professional DEIS. Kudos to the NPS staff who prepared it.

In reviewing the options, I vigorously support Alternative C, the NPS preferred alternative. I believe that the greater management flexibility with an ESA Section 10(j) designation will help to advance successful grizzly reintroduction.

Grizzlies are a key species that are important for maintaining ecological health and biological diversity. They were once abundant in this North Cascades Ecosystem. They deserve and need to be returned to this ecosystem.

I commend NPS for this significant conservation work and I wish NPS every success in this work

Thank you very much for your kind consideration of my comments.

Correspondence ID: 4065Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Ferndale, WA 98248
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,25 2023 11:42:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly re-introduction is not a good idea.

1. Prey animals are under populated already with wolf and cougar populations exploding.
2. Having a apex predator like grizzly bear in the Cascade mountains will cause a safety concern for all who enjoy recreation in our public spaces. It has everywhere else, it will here too.
3. The public sector is plenty large currently and managing a grizzly reintro will only require more useless overhead competing for state budget resources better used elsewhere.
4. Just like the wolf and cougar, it won't take long for the grizzly to figure out that it's much easier living just off the valleys and not deep in the cascades. They will learn that livestock are easier to kill and taste better than wild game.
5. Just like the wolf reintro, at first the damage these predators caused were compensated by the state. Now it's up to the landowner to ensure that the wolf does not get to his livestock.

No to grizzlies in the Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 4066Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Granite Falls, WA 98252
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,25 2023 12:41:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support reintroducing Grizzly Bears. This will help restore the natural balance in the ecosystem and improve the environment for the plants, animals and people.

Correspondence ID: 4067Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,25 2023 13:04:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To Whom It May Concern:

As a long-time member of the Pacific NW and NC Washington I am adamantly against reintroducing grizzly bears to the US portion of the NCE.

I haven't read anything that states the US portion of the NCE is suffering from lack of grizzly bears. The only reason this seems to be important is because of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and it's amendments.

Population and trail use has increased in such a way that negative encounters will be immanent. Outcomes will be deadly as these are not black bears!

I for one do not want to have to hike with a riffle for fear of grizzly bears! You said it yourself in the report I read, grizzly bears are opportunistic omnivores!

Sincerely,


A tax paying, voting member of Chlan County and Washington State

Correspondence ID: 4068Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Sequim, WA 98382
United States of America
Outside Organization: N/A Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,25 2023 13:15:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Restore the habitat of Grizzlies. Reintroduce them. Reduce bottlenecks and create wildlife corridors. Reduce human activity in back country areas. Give up more National land, federal land for wildlife exclusive areas

Correspondence ID: 4069Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Ellensburg, WA 98926-3538
United States of America
Outside Organization: none Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,25 2023 14:05:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm fortunate that I get to go to an area of Montana frequently. I've been going there for over 20 years. Grizzly bears have moved into the area. It is not as enjoyable as our early days there. As of a month ago there were 2 bears for sure and possibly 3 in area of the cabins, one is a mature grizzly with the silver back. In spring there are more bears when the calving season is in progress. I have hunted in the Bob Marshall and Skape Goat areas, I had a grizzly bear come to my "shot" at an elk and then lost an elk to a grizzly bear. I quit hunting in Montana because of grizzlies. There are just too many in the Northern Rockies. That is what I fear will happen here in WA. WA. is the smallest western state, but has the most people, many who use the back country. If the bear population isn't controlled much of the North Cascades will see very limited people use. I'm also concerned about the funding, WDGf doesn't have enough funding now. In Wyoming hunters have spent over \$4 million of license money on grizzly bear management, WDGf can't afford that. There have been 3 grizzly attacks in Montana and Idaho this year since Sept. I'm 81, bears in WA. won't affect me, I'm worried about other people. I'm sure you know about the lady that was killed by a grizzly in Orvando, MT. that is general area I visit.

Correspondence ID: 4070Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mill Creek, WA 98012
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,25 2023 14:07:15

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I highly support the reintroduction of grizzlies into WA. It is so important to keep much of the state wild and as natural as it can be. Grizzlies are critically important animals and need space to roam and protections in place for them. Thank you for your consideration.

Correspondence ID: 4071Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,25 2023 14:37:58

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please help to return grizzly bear population to Northern Cascades. We would love to repeat success of programs in Montana and Yellowstone. We are so lucky to still have some habitat to restore bear population, please help to bring them back! As Washingtonians we support nature conservation and eco-conscious recreation.

Correspondence ID: 4072Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98125
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,25 2023 14:45:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Restoring ecosystems is critical to the health of the region. Grizzly bears in the Yellowstone ecosystem are a great example of humans and nature coexisting. Please bring back the bears and do anything you can to restore wolf populations. Big animals bring tourists to the area so this should be a win for the community.

Correspondence ID: 4073Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,25 2023 15:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I value the wildness of the North Cascades. I want grizzly bears to be a part of that wildness again. There is plenty of space for both of us. I know grizzly bears provide important ecological services, like distributing seeds and aerating alpine meadows. Since humans were responsible for removing grizzlies from the North Cascades and it's our responsibility to bring them back home.

Correspondence ID: 4074Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lake Stevens, WA 98258
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,25 2023 15:04:58

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am an parent, Camp Fire Club leader. We love hiking and enjoying the outdoors as a family, and with the youth we teach. Grizzly Bears are a vital part of the ecosystem, spreading seeds and nutrients in their environment. As humans, we have destroyed so many ecosystems and annihilated so many species. It is our duty now to do whatever we can to undo the damage that has been done and to protect what we have left.

Correspondence ID: 4075Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Reno, NV 89502
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,25 2023 16:08:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Very good idea to restoration grizzly and anyone else that we need out there. As long as they have been trained to live there. I'm sure that you all know how to take care of them. I do hope there is a way to keep a eye on them, making sure they are ok. Grew up going to Woodland Park Zoo they went from bad (cages and being indoors) to the best viewing and outdoor habitats. It is the next best place for the animals if they are not able to be trained for restoration. Good luck!

Correspondence ID: 4076Project:112008Document:132104

Address: seattle, WA 98103
United States of America

Outside Organization: sometimes Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,25 2023 18:11:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: WE invaded THEIR territory. They used to range all the way to CA, that's why it's in their flag. Give them back their land.

Correspondence ID: 4077Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bend, OR 97701
United States of America

Outside Organization: [REDACTED] Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,25 2023 18:23:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: After reading through the North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Draft Environmental Impact Statement, I strongly support the National Park Service's preferred Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation. While I would prefer Alternative B, which would provide the greatest chances of success in reintroducing a viable long-term population of grizzlies with full Endangered Species protection, I am also pragmatic enough to understand the advantages of a more flexible experimental population.

Given grizzlies have been effectively extirpated from this region for several decades, reintroduction must be done carefully and with the best available science and understanding of possible impacts on surrounding communities. Alternative C will both effectively restore grizzly bears in North Cascades National Park and give people the tools they need to thrive in and around grizzly bear country. Grizzlies are a key stone species of the American West, including the North Cascades, as they will enhance the park's overall ecological integrity, maintain crucial predator prey dynamics, increase more and contribute to the areas essential wilderness characteristics. Grizzly bears play a vital role in maintaining ecosystem balance, cycling nutrients, dispersing seeds, and changing the behavior of species around them through the so-called "landscape of

“As one of the last remaining in-tact landscapes of sufficient size to host a viable population of these animals, restoring them would benefit the park, the people who use it, and confer long-term population stability for grizzlies in the United States.

Given the general decline of large wildlife nation wide and increased interest from citizens in using public lands, a restored population of grizzlies will boost the park's appeal and attract nature enthusiasts, scientists, and tourists from around the world. This would provide economic benefits to local communities and support the park's mission to protect park resources in perpetuity.

Alternative C, with the 10(j) rule, provides managers flexibility to address community concerns while protecting the grizzly population. Modern understanding of wildlife conservation science has gradually understood that cohabitation with neighboring populations is key to maintaining sustainable wildlife populations. The 10(j) rules helps ensure coexistence between humans and grizzlies.

With an understanding that Alternative B may not be practical given conflicting interests in the area, please consider the positive ecological and economic benefits and support Alternative C. Restoring grizzly bears will secure the park's natural heritage and conserve an iconic species for current and future generations.

Correspondence ID: 4078Project:112008Document:132104
Address: VANCOUVER, WA 98683
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,25 2023 20:19:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please help bring back grizzly bears to the Pacific Northwest !!!

Correspondence ID: 4079Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,25 2023 22:11:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do not believe Grizzlies should be re instated in the north cascades. The Eco system has changed such they would not thrive and population has increased so much it would be dangerous. We have a declining deer population which they are already shutting down recreation areas in the winter to help. Salmon population is down, elk population is not thriving. The amount of people who live and recreate in the established zone area has increased to the point where someone will for sure be hurt or killed in a matter of time. Recreation areas will be shut down if a bear is in the area. The argument that they were here is not enough for me.... What if it actually hinders the new eco system then helps? It will also take more money and man/women power to manage, which we do not have. Please No for grizzlies!

Correspondence ID: 4080Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Edmonds, WA, USA, WA 98026-7226
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,25 2023 22:21:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: It's time to bring the Grizzlies back. Let's restore our ecosystem!!
Diane,. Sierra, and Kai

Correspondence ID: 4082Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98144
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,25 2023 23:14:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I oppose reintroduction of the grizzly in Washington state's North Cascades National Park.

Reintroduction will mean an enhanced conflict between humans and bears. National Parks are not created to emulate pre-human conditions, but rather as a place set aside for humans to gain exposure to natural places. They are to bring us closer to the the land and grow an appreciation of natural places. By reintroducing grizzlies, we will undermine that premise. Instead of appreciating natural landscapes, we will grow to fear them. There will be an uptick in fear-driven sensational media when humans and grizzlies interact. People will visit less frequently, driven by this frenzied sensationalism. Visitors will arm themselves out of fear for their safety. The net result will be fewer public support for our national parks and growing pressure to carry arms in National Parks. I would prefer to continue experiencing the North Cascades as they are. I cannot help but think the North Cascades with grizzlies are no longer for humans to enjoy and recreate in... and that would undermine my support for the National Park System generally.

Correspondence ID: 4083Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Port Angeles, WA 98362
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,26 2023 07:30:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzly bears should NOT be reintroduced in Washington's North Cascades for following reasons:

1) During the past year Washington's population increased by 250,000 people and is closing in on 8 million. Many North Cascades visitors come from greater Vancouver BC which is experiencing similar population growth. I have been recreating in the Cascades and Olympics for nearly 40 years and have observed exponential growth in the number of people on roads and trails with each passing year. The grizzly/human interaction track record of the past 180 years unequivocally confirms that sans human population growth measures, introducing grizzlies in populated areas creates far more problems than it solves.

2) Historically, throughout the West, grizzlies lived in the lower elevations. Those lower elevation locations were the first places settled as the non-indigenous population moved west, driving the grizzlies out of existence (by 1924 in California), or into the higher elevations where they have survived with varying degrees of success. Grizzlies driven to the higher elevations in the Cascades appear to have experienced a much lower degree of success than they have in the ranges that compromise the Rocky Mountains. Decades of stats confirm that grizzlies don't want to be in the Cascades.

For the sake of humans AND grizzlies, please abandon the effort to reintroduce grizzlies in the Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 4084Project:112008Document:132104
Address: SPOKANE, WA 99223
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,26 2023 07:50:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: this state already has a serious predator problem. The deer and elk herds are getting hammered by the over abundance of wolves, cougars and bears. Since WDFW refuses to properly manage our existing predators and herds, the last thing we need is another apex predator.

also going to add a serious risk to the recreational users of the north cascades NP, pasayten and mount baker wilderness. when you add more starving predators to an ecosystem with inadequate food resources you are going to drive them into more contact with humans.

Plenty of bears already north of this area in BC, if they wanted to inhabit the north cascades then they are/will be there. They

do not need our interference in spreading their range. The only animals that need our help are the ungulate herds which have cratered in numbers over the past decade.

NO GRIZZLIES, NO MORE PREDATOR PROTECTIONS! go back to the proven North American model of wildlife conservation. It was the best system in the world before anti-hunting commissioners ended up in WDFW.

Correspondence ID: 4085Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bothell, WA 98012
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,26 2023 09:05:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We should introduce the grizzly bears and leave them alone, however ban hunting/hurting on the bears. We also need to educate the public on grizzly bears and how to safely interact with them and how to not get hurt while seeing them.

Correspondence ID: 4086Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lynnwood, WA 98037
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,26 2023 09:07:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: my personal comment is that grizzly bears should be reintroduced into the northern cascade greater area to naturally repopulate over many years. As an LHS student, I have never personally seen a grizzly, and one day would like to see one in the wild. Thank you for reading this.

Correspondence ID: 4087Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lynnwood, WA 98012
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,26 2023 09:59:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: It's a good idea, we have seen good results in the past like in the reintroduction of wolves to Yellowstone so I do agree with the idea. My only concern would be if the bears wandered into neighborhoods and other places where people would be

Correspondence ID: 4088Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bothell, WA 98012
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,26 2023 10:01:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: If we decide to go forward with the Grizzly Bear Reintroduction we should go in with power. Considering the bears a nonessential population would likely be the safest option for our environment and those living in and around the North Cascades Grizzly reintroduction zone. This should come with some rules though. If something were to come up where the bears needed to be moved or eradicated from the reintroduction area, killing would not be permitted but the movement or change of location of the bears would be permitted. Also, if the government and organizers of this reintroduction decide to go forward with the plan, free classes to improve our knowledge of bear safety should be organized and improved animal control facilities should be put in place if the need to control a bear or bears should arise.

Correspondence ID: 4089Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ashburn, VA 20147
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,26 2023 11:44:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: body content

Correspondence ID: 4090Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ashburn, VA 20147
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,26 2023 11:46:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: body content

Correspondence ID: 4091Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mill Creek, WA 98012
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,26 2023 12:58:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am for re-introduction of Grizzlies. They belong there just as much, if not more so, as us. We have learned over and over that a balanced ecosystem is healthier than tolerating imbalance.

Correspondence ID: 4093Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Baton Rouge, LA 70819
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,26 2023 15:30:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please return Grizzly Bears to the North Cascade Ecosystem to help them fight against extinction. The area seems remote, however, there will need to be plenty of food (fruits, berries, roots, native grasses, forbs, salmon and other fish, native rodents, moose, elk, caribou, deer) available so that they don't wander into areas where they could get into trouble. Any ranching in the area needs to be addressed and hopefully they won't encounter losses, but if they do, then perhaps compensation can occur. Issues might need to be addressed to contain the bears to certain boundaries. Please find a way to make it safe for grizzly bears and any people that might be in the area.

Thank you!

Correspondence ID: 4094Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Baton Rouge, LA 70819
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,26 2023 15:49:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please return Grizzly Bears to the North Cascade Ecosystem to help them fight against extinction. The area seems remote, however, there will need to be plenty of food (fruits, berries, roots, native grasses, forbs, salmon and other fish, native rodents, moose, elk, caribou, deer) available so that they don't wander into areas where they could get into trouble. Any ranching in the area needs to be addressed and hopefully they won't encounter losses, but if they do, then perhaps compensation can occur. Issues might need to be addressed to contain the bears to certain boundaries. Please find a way to make it safe for grizzly bears and any people that might be in the area.

Thank you!

Correspondence ID: 4095Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,26 2023 15:53:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am strongly in favor of returning grizzly bears to the land where they belong. They are a critical part of the web of life in the north Cascades

Correspondence ID: 4096Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,26 2023 15:56:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am strongly in favor of returning Grizzly Bears to where they belong.

Correspondence ID: 4097Project:112008Document:132104
Address: SEATTLE, WA 98199
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,26 2023 15:58:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please reintroduce the grizzlies to the ecosystem. Thank you!

Correspondence ID: 4098Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Everett, WA 98204
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,26 2023 17:18:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I really think that we should work to restore the habitat of the grizzlies as well as restoring the grizzly bears to our area. The work being done to bring animals back into the areas they were in previously really helps the ecosystem and with cooperation from the human inhabitants can improve the lives of all.

Correspondence ID: 4099Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Carlton, WA 98814
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,26 2023 19:06:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades/Pasayten Wilderness. I am excited by the idea of a complete ecosystem including all the apex predators. People have coexisted for thousands of years.

Correspondence ID: 4100Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,26 2023 20:45:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft EIS. I'm writing in support of Alternative C and action to reintroduce grizzly bears into the North Cascades Ecosystem. I strongly believe the grizzly bear belongs in this area and deserves to be reintroduced and expand its range. I also believe the ecosystem itself deserves to be restored closer to its original condition, and that the desires of regional tribes should be of utmost importance and consideration. That said, as an avid hiker backpacker, having grizzlies in our area will instill a healthy dose of fear in me. Nonetheless, I feel the intrinsic health and integrity of the ecosystem is critically important. We humans can learn to coexist. Thank you for considering this reintroduction.

Correspondence ID: 4101Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Auburn, WA 98092
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,26 2023 20:56:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzlies are too dangerous and create an unnecessary risk to the public use of the wilderness and forest lands.

Look at the recent incident in Banff where hikers did all the correct things to protect themselves during a grizzly encounter, but both were killed. With the population in Washington and demand for outdoor activity a choice needs to be made on whether the land is for grizzlies and wolves or human use.

Correspondence ID: 4102Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,26 2023 22:02:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I live in Wenatchee and am a [REDACTED] Surgeon (one of only two in central Washington)

One of the major reasons we moved to the area is the outdoor activities including hiking, backpacking, and mountain biking.

I have two young boys 9 and 11. We have 3 dogs that frequently spend time with us out in the woods.

I do not agree with introducing Grizzly bears to this area. I would no longer feel comfortable doing many of these activities. I am aware of our current risk and carry bear spray due to the amount of black bear and cougar sightings and attacks around Levanworth where we frequent.

Grizzly bears are a different story. These bears need even more space and are not afraid of humans.

There are hundreds of bikers in this area. It is easy to turn around a corner and suppose a bear. I have spoken to locals in Glacier national park and other areas of Montana, Alaska, and northern Idaho (Preist lake) and would not mountain bike in these areas. I would also be leary of hiking and especially backpacking.

I am absolutely not in favor of this nor are the locals here in Wenatchee who love to go outside without fearing a Grizzly bear encounter.

Correspondence ID: 4103Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,26 2023 23:19:37

Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please don't add more bears to this popular hiking area. There are already enough bears in the north cascades

Correspondence ID: 4104Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98125
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,26 2023 23:24:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please let the animals have their natural homes. Grizzlies belong in their own home.

Correspondence ID: 4105Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Salem, OR 97302-3533
United States of America
Outside Organization: none Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,27 2023
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The population of grizzly bears in the North Cascades was decimated through "direct killing," with the last sighting in 1996, according to the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service and the National Park Service.

As part of their plan, approximately three to seven captured grizzly bears would be released into the North Cascades yearly over a five- to 10-year period. I support grizzly bear reintroduction into the North Cascades. The bears might be able to gain a foothold there, in spite of the misplaced opposition. Repeatedly, it has been shown that the removal of a species from an area has negative consequences for the balance of nature, and the health of the environment.

Correspondence ID: 4106Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Colfax, WA 99111
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,27 2023 08:19:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzly bears are already present and making their way into this area. The only thing that the introduction will accomplish is more human to bear encounters. The state's eco system is already has too many predators that are taking their toll on Washington's ungulates. Please do not add to this problem. There is nothing to gain by reintroducing grizzly bears into Washington. Please use these funds to help the wildlife that is already in this region.

Correspondence ID: 4107Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Portland, OR 97219
United States of America
Outside Organization: Veterinarian Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,27 2023 08:29:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To whom it may concern,

I'm writing in support of reintroduction of the grizzly bear to the North Cascades ecosystem. It is a keystone species and it's absence leaves a vacuum in the heart of the Pacific North West. I think introduction as an experimental population strikes a suitable compromise given the stakeholder conflict over the issue. With a mass extinction now occurring due to human activity on our planet (particularly large mammals), it seems we all need to reserve part of our world for wilderness and the species that rely on it. No species in North America epitomizes and needs wilderness more than the grizzly.

Frankly, we need a space in the world for wildness more than we need cattle ranching on public land. A suitable compensation scheme is adequate for ameliorating any predation that may occur. To step into a forest knowing that something like a grizzly is out there somewhere is a primal feeling. It makes one alert and respectful of one's environment knowing that something more powerful and larger than ourselves walks the woods. As a hiker, backpacker and fisherman, I'm aware of how people will need to change their behavior around resource usage once the bears are back. If they are collared, then GPS should help prevent though not totally eliminate conflicts that may occur in heavily used areas of the National Park.

As a resident of "Cascadia" return of the bears will represent an important part of our ecosystem's restoration and bring a sense of wholeness to this part of our world, just as the return of the Condor and Sea Otter will too.

Thanks for your consideration,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 4108Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Snoqualmie, WA 98065
United States of America
Outside Organization: Outdoor improver Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,27 2023 08:59:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As an outdoor enthusiast and someone who is active hiking and biking I whole heartedly support the re-introduction of this majestic animal into the North Cascades. I am tingling with excitement to read more about this project and it's successful conclusion

Thank you

Correspondence ID: 4109Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98101
United States of America
Outside Organization: US EPA Region 10 Federal Government(Official Rep.)
Received: Oct,27 2023 09:00:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: *Text from letter copied and pasted below. Signed PDF of letter emailed to don_striker@nps.gov and nce_grizzly@nps.gov on 10/27/2023. Thank you.

Don Striker, Superintendent
North Cascades National Park Service Complex
810 State Route 20
Sedro-Woolley, Washington 98284

Dear Don Striker:

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has reviewed the National Park Service's September 2023 Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan (EPA Project Number 22-0058-NPS). EPA has conducted its review pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act and our review authority under Section 309 of the Clean Air Act. The CAA Section 309 role is unique to EPA and requires EPA to review and comment publicly on any proposed federal action subject to NEPA's environmental impact statement requirement.

The DEIS assesses the environmental impacts of restoring grizzly bears to the North Cascade Ecosystem. Co-lead agencies, NPS and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, along with cooperating agency Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, are proposing to restore the grizzly bear to the North Cascades Ecosystem, a portion of their historic range from which they are

currently functionally extirpated. NPS anticipates releasing approximately 3-6 grizzly bears into the ecosystem over the next 5-10 years, with an end goal of approximately 200 grizzly bears inhabiting the area within 60-100 years.

EPA does not have significant concerns to be addressed in the Final EIS. EPA appreciates the thorough analysis provided in the DEIS, including addressing EPA concerns in our December 2022 letter on the Notice of Intent. EPA supports the greater management flexibility in the Preferred Alternative should conflict situations arise.

Given the high public interest in this project, EPA recommends the FEIS include a summary table or narrative of all substantive (i.e., non-editorial) changes made from the DEIS to the FEIS. This summary will help the public understand what proposed project changes have been made to the document after considering DEIS public comments. Including a summary of changes to the FEIS alleviates the public's burden to review all individual responses to comments. EO 14096 Revitalizing Our Nation's Commitment to Environmental Justice for All highlights the importance of meaningful public involvement and ensures that the public has adequate access to information.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments for this project. If you have questions about this review, please contact Caitlin Roesler of my staff at (206) 553-6518 and roesler.caitlin@epa.gov, or me, at (206) 553-1774 or at chu.rebecca@epa.gov.

Sincerely,
Rebecca Chu, Chief
Policy and Environmental Review Branch

Correspondence ID: 4110Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellvue, CO 805125920
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,27 2023 09:13:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I encourage you to allow the grizzlies to be restored to this native habitat and to thereby make this region more fully complete/healed. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 4111Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America
Outside Organization: none Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,27 2023 09:35:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a professional ecologist, a hiker and a camper, I support restoring grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem. This ecosystem has a huge amount of wilderness where bears can live with minimal human encounters. To be healthy, ecosystems need the full suite of species they had before modern man impacted them.

Correspondence ID: 4113Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,27 2023 10:01:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: It is a waste of money let it happen naturally, and what ever happens lay the ground work so there can be a hunting season for them.

Correspondence ID: 4114Project:112008Document:132104

Address: dallesport, WA 98617
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,27 2023 11:07:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please complete the eco-system with the grizzly. The habitat is there for them. Grizzly attacks are so rare that I would have no problem with backpacking in an area with them. They deserve to return!!

Correspondence ID: 4115Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,27 2023 11:13:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: This comment is against bringing grizzlies back to the Cascadia Mountains. There are many roads and hiking trails in the foothills and mountains of Washington and Oregon. There will be bear encounters that can prove deadly to both grizzlies and humans. Please read the British Columbia article: 'This B.C. valley has become a death trap for young grizzly bears report'. The website is: <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/elk-valley-grizzly...> It appears that 2-6 year olds are not surviving well. They are being hit by cars, even killed by humans. The older bears seem to have gotten smart enough to avoid cars and people. There are no grizzlies now and there should not be any planted in the Cascadia Mountains. Yellow Stone Park is a safe place for them, not in the Washington/Oregon mountains!

Correspondence ID: 4116Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Yakima, WA 98902
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,27 2023 12:02:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please reintroduce grizzly bears to North Cascades National Park! It is perfect habitat for them. Reintroduction will help reverse the consequences to the ecosystem of their removal. I am an avid hiker and spend time backpacking every year in the North Cascades. No matter how much time and effort I spend exploring, I will never enter 95% of the park because it is so rugged and remote. Apex predators like grizzlies have vast landscapes to live and hunt without encountering humans. The North Cascades already enforces hiker practices for bears; food must be stored in bear canisters or hung correctly and bear boxes are often available. Hikers are ready for grizzly introduction. I am upset that my representative is so adamantly against this. Bears don't give enough to his campaign so special interests with money dictate policy. Please give nature equal voice and help restore it to it's proper balance. Thank you!

Correspondence ID: 4117Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America
Outside Organization: none Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,27 2023 12:16:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem in Washington state. I live in direct proximity to US National Forest Land and, while I understand that there are some risks to homeowners and hikers, it is important to me that the North Cascades Ecosystem has a grizzly bear population living and thriving.
Sincerely,
[REDACTED]
Winthrop, Wa

Correspondence ID: 4118Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Colville, WA 99114
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,27 2023 12:39:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: With such a large population of Washington residents recreating in the North Cascades my concern would be how long after introduction of grizzlies is it anticipated that a human conflict will begin? Which we know will lead to bear relocation or the animal being dispatched. We already have a growing population in Eastern Washington and have seen more and more human conflict the last couple years. Will the Eastern Washington bears be what is relocated to the North Cascades or will the introductory bears be from out of state? Overall, I am very concerned and against the reintroduction of bears in the North Cascades do to the inevitable human conflict it will bring and also the impact to the already suffering ungulate population do to poor predator management in Washington state.

Correspondence ID: 4119Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,27 2023 12:41:31

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Apex predators play a huge role in the health of an ecosystem. The north Cascades are a gem of Washington state, let's bring back our bears!

Correspondence ID: 4120Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Shoreline, WA 98155
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,27 2023 13:08:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I believe we need these bears and American bison to recover our ecosystems. These large animals are necessary for a healthy wildlife and earth.

Correspondence ID: 4121Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Burien, WA 98166
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,27 2023 13:27:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm a parent and a hiker, who cares about wildlife, and I want my children to experience grizzly bears as an important part of our regional culture through education and safety training on our hikes. There is plenty of room for all of us!

Correspondence ID: 4122Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Yakima, WA 98908
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,27 2023 14:52:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Though not a resident of Okanogan County, I feel concerned about the reintroduction of grizzly bears into the state. I enjoy outside activities and I like the freedom to do so without fear of yet another massive predator. I believe that grizzlies will quickly spread to the rest of the state, endangering the balance of nature that currently exists. I would also

feel less safe camping and hiking, especially with young children, if I knew grizzlies were around. If the bears spread naturally from other areas, that is according to nature, but man's reintroduction artificially could spiral out of control. Please do not intentionally reintroduce grizzly bears to WA state.

Correspondence ID: 4123Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Yakima, WA 98902
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,27 2023 15:05:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not want or need "the opportunity to again experience grizzly bears in their native habitat" as is stated in the Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/EIS on page ii. Alternative A should be the only option. Grizzlies can pose a serious problem for anyone who may be unfortunate enough to come in contact with them in the wild. Washington state, and especially the Cascade Range area, contains a vast number of hiking and other outdoor opportunities. Voluntarily introducing the animals will increase the probability of humans accidentally coming into contact with them. Their range is massive and they can easily travel much farther than intended. Leave the grizzly population alone and do not introduce them into the habitat. If they make it on their own then so be it, but we do not need to bring them here just see them roaming in the woods or into our streets and homes. I do not want to encounter a grizzly in the woods, nor do I want my children to encounter one.

Correspondence ID: 4124Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Brewster, WA 98812
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,27 2023 15:43:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to ask that Grizzly bears do not be re-introduced into the North Cascades Region.

We, the taxpayers, are already paying WDFW a very large amount to handle the wolves in the North Eastern section of the state. Tracking, Monitoring, paying for cattle depredation, etc. Even paying citizens to watch herds of cattle to chase of wolves.

Now you want to add Grizzly bears to the taxpayer cost....not to mention the cost to pay when one person is killed, which is only a matter of time....a when not an if.

They belong in the wilds of Alaska and Canada now because of human development.

You would be directly impacting the hikers of the North Cascades....I wonder what they say about this/

OK....Well I am a NO GRIZZLIES IN WA STATE

Thank you

Correspondence ID: 4125Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wenatchee, WA 98807
United States of America

Outside Organization: Northwestern Outdoors Radio Business(Official Rep.)

Received: Oct,27 2023 17:36:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I urge the US Fish and Wildlife Service and National Park Service to abandon the plan of physically reintroducing grizzly bears into North Cascades National Park. As you are well aware, these bears can range hundreds of miles from where they are introduced and conflicts with both humans and livestock will certainly take place on ranches, in

orchards, and in hiking areas some distance away from North Cascades National Park.

If there was a way to keep them in the park I'd be all for it because this is rugged and remote country and I would love to see grizzly bears there. The problem is, they won't just stay there. They will spread out, just like they have in Montana and other places, and eventually, humans will be hurt and killed.

If the bears come back to this range by themselves from Canada, that's fine. But physically reintroducing these apex predators, knowing the conflicts that will occur, is reckless.

Correspondence ID: 4126Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,27 2023 18:30:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzly bears belong in the North Cascades where they historically lived. They are seed dispersers, plant diversity encouragers, and spiritually and culturally significant to Pacific Northwest native peoples. I believe we have a moral and legal obligation to restore grizzlies to their natural landscape.

The North Cascades is a vast wilderness in which there will be minimal contact and conflict between bears and humans. With education, all stakeholders should be safe.

As a designated endangered species, Grizzly bears have a right to a safe home where they used to roam.

Correspondence ID: 4127Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Richland, WA 99354
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,27 2023 19:16:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do not reintroduce grizzly bears in Washington State!
My family hikes with children a lot and this would make us hike and exercise less. I have hiked the Northern Loop of Mt Rainier's Wonderland Trail and have seen black bears. We are careful but not usually in trepidation. I have hiked in states with grizzly bears and we always have to be on high alert, particularly with children. We have always said that we are so lucky that we do not have to worry about grizzly bears. As a former teacher, I want to do everything I can to help children and families get outdoors and hiking. This will make even less parents feel safe taking their kids hiking. Please keep kids safe and grizzlies out of our state.

Correspondence ID: 4128Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Lake Forest Park, WA 98155
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,27 2023 19:29:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I strongly believe grizzly bears should be re-introduced to the North Cascades Ecosystem. They were here long before so many humans showed up and hunted them to the point they no longer had a territory in this location. If there's one thing we've learned from conservation efforts, animals in certain areas provided for the ecosystem. It's time humans began to give back to the animals that were eliminated by human occupation.

Correspondence ID: 4129Project:112008Document:132104
Address: WENATCHEE, WA 98801
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,27 2023 20:35:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I totally oppose the grizzly bear restoration plan. The potential harm that could come to livestock, hikers, campers, wildlife and various outdoor recreationists is not worth it. I just cannot understand why anybody would want to increase the numbers of grizzly bears.

Please drop the whole idea of introducing more of these animals in the Northwest. It is not worth one human life to have them wandering in our forests.

Correspondence ID: 4130Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Vancouver, WA 98663
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,27 2023 21:10:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I believe we need to bring back the Grizzly bear and I welcome this plan. The ecosystem will benefit just like when wolves were returned to Yellowstone.I love the outdoors and yes I'm afraid of Grizzly bears but they have a right to exist and this is perfect habitat for them.

Thank you,
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 4131Project:112008Document:132104

Address: SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84105
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,27 2023 21:44:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: In favor of alternative C.

Correspondence ID: 4132Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Clearlake, WA 98235
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,27 2023 21:46:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly support the National Park Services preferred Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation.

This plan will both effectively restore grizzly bears in North Cascades National Park and give people the tools they need to thrive in and around grizzly bear country. Grizzlies belong in the North Cascades, as they enhance the park's ecological integrity and contribute to its wildness.

Grizzly bears play a vital role in maintaining ecosystem balance, cycling nutrients, dispersing seeds, and changing the behavior of species around them. Restoring them would benefit the park and the people who use it.

A restored population of grizzlies will boost the park's appeal and attract nature enthusiasts, scientists, and tourists from around the world. This would provide economic benefits to local communities and support the park's mission to protect park resources in perpetuity.

Alternative C, with the 10(j) rule, provides managers flexibility to address community concerns while protecting the grizzly population. It ensures coexistence between humans and bears.

Please consider the positive ecological and economic benefits and support Alternative C. Restoring grizzly bears will secure the park's natural heritage and conserve an iconic species for current and future generations.

Thank you for your dedication to our national parks.

Correspondence ID: 4133Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98178
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,27 2023 22:43:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Since 1967, a valued participant, in our ecosystem, has been missing. They played a vital role in maintaining the balance in our Northwestern environment. Having a top-tier animal, like the Grizzly Bear, return to the Cascades would go a long way to ensuring the long term health of our states Wildlife.

Correspondence ID: 4134Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Portland, OR 97232
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,27 2023 22:48:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing in opposition to the plan to reintroduce grizzly bears to the Northern Cascades. This is a well used hiking area and includes among others the Pacific Crest Trail. The risk for human- bear encounters during late summer is high especially with ripe huckleberries and other berries in late August/early September. During our hikes in this region we have seen abundant bear scat on the trails at this time and heard reports of encounters with black bears from other hikers. None of these have resulted in attacks on humans, but the record for much more aggressive Grizzlies is different. This year alone several deaths have occurred (MT) when grizzlies attacked hikers or back packers. Introducing Grizzly bears to the Northern Cascades will inevitably lead to such incidents in Washington state. These deaths are preventable if Grizzlies are not reintroduced to this region.

Correspondence ID: 4135Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Camas, WA 98607
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,28 2023

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: From the "Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan /Environmental Impact Statement":

(1) The scientific name of the Grizzly bear is "Ursus arctos horribilis". Can you image why the word "horribilis" appears here?

(2) An objective is to "Provide Pacific Northwest residents and visitors with the opportunity to again experience grizzly bears in their native habitat." What sort of experience is being alluded to here? Fear? Surprise? Worry? Running for one's life? Are these to be considered positives? Good grief.

(3) So when hikers (and their kids) are out hiking in the WA State northern Cascades National Forests, they'll have to wear bells on their shoes, so as not to surprise any nearby Grizzly. I would also carry bear spray (at least) and more likely carry a handgun. Studies indicate that bear spray is ineffective as compared to handguns: "Seven times as many people have been killed by bears when bear spray has been sprayed in defense than have been killed by bears when a handgun has been fired in defense." (<https://www.ammoland.com/2023/06/bear-spray-is-human-seasoning-take-a-gun-if-you-want-to-survive-a-bear-attack/>). Therefore, many hikers will now have to carry firearms on their hikes. Is this really what the

administrators' want - more firearms in the National Forests?

These proposals are, at heart, anti-human and cruel and will discourage hiking and camping.

If us hikers and campers want to experience Grizzly bears, we will go to Alaska or Glacier National Park.

I emphatically oppose this Draft.

Thank you.

██████████
Camas, WA

Correspondence ID: 4136Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Redmond, WA 98052
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,28 2023
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades. Apex predators are an important component of any ecosystem, and the reintroduction of bears will serve an important ecological role, making our ecosystems more resilient.

Correspondence ID: 4137Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Kennewick, WA 99336
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,28 2023 01:25:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Easterners don't understand the outdoor lifestyle of Washington state. People here spend a lot of time in areas where we're likely to encounter grizzlies, unlike people back East who are more worried about mayflies. (I grew up on the East Coast.)

Correspondence ID: 4138Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Newcastle, WA 98056
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,28 2023 09:02:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Restore the grizzlies 🐻

Correspondence ID: 4139Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Chelan, WA 98831
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,28 2023 09:10:49
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: YES! Let's bring the 🐻 grizzlies back! They were here first and thriving and they deserve that! We need them in the environment just as much as they need their home back! The Cascade mountains are SO beautiful and the perfect home for them! The public needs to do research and test about bear safety and how to react if running in to one of them plan on going in an area where they live! PLEASE re populate the grizzlies ☐

██████████

Washington State residents, hikers, outdoor enthusiasts!
whole lives!
:)

Correspondence ID: 4140Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,28 2023 11:13:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a nature lover and avid hiker, I believe that nature should be left alone.
I do not support re-introduction of Grizzly bears to the Pacific Northwest.

Correspondence ID: 4141Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Okanogan, WA 98840
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,28 2023 11:39:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We do not need grizzly bears. We have too many predators as it is. There are no advantages in having grizzly bears in the northwest. No action is needed in this matter.

Correspondence ID: 4142Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Twisp, WA 98117
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,28 2023 11:57:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I favor restoring grizzlies to the North Cascades under the alternative "C" option (guided by the 10(j) rule) in order to support a more diversified and balanced ecosystem. The North Cascades are among the few remaining places in the US that are suitable to safely maintain a healthy grizzly population. The Methow Valley in particular, with its supportive populace and measures aimed at coexistence including bear-proof garbage, electric fencing, carcass composting programs, and range riding, is an ideal community to demonstrate how coexistence can work with this majestic creature.

For comparison, the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem which includes Yellowstone Park supports over 1100 grizzlies today, far more than the 200 that the North Cascades may support a hundred years from now. Nearly 5 million people visited Yellowstone in 2021. With so many people and bears, grizzly encounters and especially attacks in Yellowstone have remained very rare.

Humans created this grizzly gap in the North Cascades ecosystem and humans can repair it. It is my fervent hope that we can move forward with this re-wilding project as soon as safely possible.

Correspondence ID: 4143Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,28 2023 12:08:19
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Sirs, I've reviewed the documents provided relating to the reintroduction of grizzly bears into the North Cascades ecosystem and I hereby submit the following comments.
One of the stated reasons for reintroduction is that the presence of grizzlies would increase human presence in the NCE as

visitors would be drawn to have a direct experience of the bears. While the purported purpose of reintroduction is to create a "local" population of grizzlies to avoid their extinction, reintroduction for the recreational pleasure of humans seems at odds with this purpose. Increased recreational visits to the NCE will not benefit the grizzly bear as a species as it will likely create more human/bear interactions and conflicts with the likely result of humans being killed by the bears as very few visitors to the NCE will be familiar with appropriate behavior when crossing paths with a grizzly. This generally leads to human deaths and the resultant killing of the offending bear(s). With bears taken from another ecosystem and brought to the NCE, the bears will be under extreme stress after being captured and transported to the NCE, they will be unfamiliar with the NCE environment and will be in an adaptive situation learning the terrain, the fluxes of weather and climate in their new "home", available foraging sites, other local species vying for the same or similar resources and the location of human habitation and areas where potential conflict may result. It is not a good situation to relocate bears to an unknown environment with only a few months to adapt before winter hibernation. These elements do not provide encouragement that such reintroduction will be successful

Another concern is the likelihood that reintroduced bears will be collared and tracked in essence making them guinea pigs in a human based experiment. Is this about the prevention of extinction or a case of making humans feel better after bringing the bears to the brink of extinction and making some effort, regardless of the outcome, to extend the survival of grizzly bears as a species? With human caused climate chaos creating an uncertain environment in the NCE where the proposed reintroduction will occur, this reintroduction is likely to fail. With the inclusion of the 10(j) rule, it is obvious that this experiment is just that, an experiment with the ability of humans to consider the reintroduced bears as expendable. This further strengthens the argument that this is more about making humans feel better about themselves rather than the successful prevention of grizzly bear extinction.

To my mind, as one who has lived adjacent to and spent much of my time wandering the NCE for the last 47 years, the most viable means of successfully staving off the extinction of the grizzly is to allow for natural reintroduction and allowing the bears to be protected under the full authority of the ESA. This could be facilitated through the creation of wildlife crossings at highways and railroads or other human created barriers to natural dispersion and expansion from areas with current populations of grizzly bears. This would allow the bears time to adapt to a new ecosystem without the stress of capture and relocation providing a much better chance of their successful survival in new surroundings. It would also allow the human population to adapt over time as naturally relocated bears arrive in the NCE and reduce human/bear conflicts.

I encourage the NPS and the USFWS to select alternative A, the No Action alternative. I support this alternative as the best and most rational way to allow the natural reintroduction of grizzly bears in the NCE and prevent the extinction of this iconic species.

Correspondence ID: 4144Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Federal Way, WA 98023
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,28 2023 13:41:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to comment on the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades. It is vital to protect grizzly bears as they return to the lands they originally inhabited before they were killed off by settlers. Their return indicates the health of the environment: The return of grizzlies to the North Cascades means the environment is healing. Only the most healthy ecosystems can support apex predators. It is vital to educate people about these animals, there will be conflict with them and people as there always has been but the Cascades suffer greater in their absence. It is crucial that we no longer continue to demonize these creatures and find new ways to mitigate conflict between humans and bear and set the bar for environmental restoration worldwide. They must be allowed to return to the North Cascades and thrive with the proper protections, with the involvement of the tribes. Thank you

Correspondence ID: 4145Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,28 2023 14:14:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: NPS--

I live in the Methow Valley and am in favor of alternative A, the no-action alternative. While the North Cascades may be prime grizzly bear habitat, part of the species' historical range, I do not understand the wisdom of rebuilding this apex predator's population in a recreation-forward region. Many residents of and visitors to this area are accustomed to hiking, running, skiing, biking, camping, hunting, fishing, backpacking, and horsepacking in non-grizzly habitat; why invite the potential for negative grizzly-human encounters? Why introduce a new management conundrum and all the bureaucracy--and helicopter flights--it will entail? I'm not seeing how the hoped-for benefits put forward in the restoration plan could outweigh the likely downsides.

Thank you for your consideration of these concerns.

Correspondence ID: 4146Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,28 2023 14:58:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not introduce grizzlies back into the Washington Cascades. They are capable of moving there on their own if their current numbers determine that need, just as we saw the wolves do. There are too many people who utilize the area now to be able to do so safely with that reintroduction. Our family enjoys hiking, biking, and camping all over our state, including the North Cascades, and it is disturbing to hear that we may now have to avoid certain areas for personal safety. Outdoor activities are already becoming overly crowded, and this will put more people in danger, and limit the areas open for safe recreation. It's upsetting that people who do not even live in the Northwest are making decisions that do not affect them, but affect many rancher, farmers, homeowners, and recreational users in Washington state. If it must happen, then at least allow legislation that we can have local control of management. Thank you for listening to my concerns.

Correspondence ID: 4147Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Federal way, WA 98003
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,28 2023 16:43:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of grizzly bears in Washington state. They are an important part of our ecosystem and they deserve to live here too!

Correspondence ID: 4148Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98122
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,28 2023 16:58:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I agree with plan A: no action taken regarding the reintroduction of grizzly bears to Washington state. I find the need for action on this issue to be weak as they are not an endangered species at the federal level. Furthermore, I disagree with the potential benefits of tourist coming to "see grizzlies in their natural habit". I believe any potential visitor coming to see a grizzly in the wild will be offset by all the people not wanting to recreate now because they don't want to run into a grizzly bear. I also see a huge potential for risk of people interacting with grizzly territory without the proper education as Washington has not had grizzlies for so long.

As a frequent backpacker in Washington state, especially the north cascades, I enjoy the fact that there are relatively few apex predators that I need to be concerned about. While I pack spray and have other safety measures, it's comforting to know that the worst possibility is a black bear or cougar. While grizzly bear attacks are relatively small, but they do happen and they are

more likely to be deadly than a black bear, even for those who are prepared for a worst case scenario (which is a very small portion of Washington hikers).

Lastly, as a tax payer there are a plethora of opportunities for my tax money to improve critical issues around Washington state, financing a plan to pay for approximately 144 helicopter rides and capturing bears sounds expensive and is not where I want my taxes to go.

Ultimately, I am in favor of option A because it aligns with my goals regarding outdoor recreation, promotes public safety, and is the most cost effective option.

Correspondence ID: 4149Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Selah, WA 98942
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,28 2023 19:34:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am absolutely opposed to introducing an apex and very dangerous predator into the North Cascades ecosystem. That will change forever how comfortable recreationalists are in the woods. Once grizzly bears are introduced and start creating problems there will be no way to bring them back under control. Every attempt will lead to court battles that interfere with and/or kill any such attempts. The courts will end up managing grizzlies instead of trained biologists. Wolf control and resulting lawsuits are a good example of how that works. So, please don't even start us down that slippery slope with a dangerous predator.

Correspondence ID: 4150Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,28 2023 20:29:12

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly support the National Park Services preferred Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation.

I have lived and hiked in the North Cascades for the past 12 years. The park is vast and I will never be able to explore all of it. There are so many areas that people cannot readily access unless you are an ardent backpacker and even then it would be difficult. We need these bears to restore our ecosystem. They help manage their prey and keep them at healthy population levels. They dig and forage so that the soil is regenerated so that flowers and plants can thrive. They are seed spreaders and will enhance the food supply for other species. The North Cascades is bear territory. They were here historically and need to be brought back to enhance the biodiversity and restore ecological balance to the park.

This plan will give people the tools they need to thrive in and around grizzly bear country and will contribute to its wild nature.

Grizzly bears will play a vital role here and restoring them would benefit the park and the people who use it.

A restored population of grizzlies will boost the park's appeal and attract nature enthusiasts, scientists, and tourists from around the world. This would provide economic benefits to local communities and support the park's mission to protect park resources in perpetuity.

Alternative C, with the 10(j) rule, provides managers flexibility to address community concerns while protecting the grizzly population. It ensures coexistence between humans and bears.

Please consider the positive ecological and economic benefits and support Alternative C. Restoring grizzly bears will secure the park's natural heritage and conserve an iconic species for current and future generations.

Thank you for your dedication to our national parks.

Correspondence ID: 4151Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Pueblo, CO 81004
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,28 2023 21:41:03

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to voice my support for restoring a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades in Northern Washington, their home for thousands of years. Wherever grizzlies thrive, so does wildness, clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife.

Specifically, I support Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation for the following reasons:

Under Alternative C, the grizzly bears would fall under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) 10(j) designation. According to the regulation, this would designate the population of grizzly bears an experiments species. This would be beneficial because they would be released into a suitable natural habitat outside of their normal range but within what we consider a probable range. According to the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), treating the experimental population as threatened would allow the FWS the discretion to devise management programs and special regulations for that population. Alternative C is more flexible than Alternative B and would allow for more flexible management by the FWS.

With similar impacts between Alternatives B and C, and Alternative A (no action) ineffective to recover the grizzly bears, the clear answer is Alternative C.

Grizzly bears have a slow reproduction cycle that take a long time to establish. Alternative C accounts for the necessary time and strikes a balance to meet mutual goals. Adding bears over time to sustain population growth ensures progress towards recovery. Biologists in northwest Montana have been using similar strategies successfully for over 30 years to help their own grizzly bear populations recover.

Montana and Idaho have passed legislation that allow violent or unethical hunting practices such as hound hunting or trapping of black bears that would surely be extended to grizzly bears. These are concerns that need to be addressed by the close monitoring possible with Alternative C.

I believe the best science and community involvement should be used to recover the grizzly bears to ensure a sustainable, wild, natural environment in the North Cascades.

Please bring back this native species through the strategy laid out in Alternative C with additional bear transplants as needed to ensure genetic diversity and sustain population growth. Doing so will restore an important piece of the Northern Cascade ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage. They deserve our respect, and the highest level of protection - not to become a trophy on a wall.

Sincerely,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 4152Project:112008Document:132104

Address: SEATTLE, WA 98115
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,28 2023 23:10:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to voice my opposition to the proposal to reintroduce grizzly bears into the North Cascades ecosystem. While I understand the desire to restore native species, I believe this plan fails to adequately consider the risks to local communities.

Grizzly bears pose a serious threat to human safety. As apex predators, they are well-known for their aggressive behavior and lethal capacity. Their powerful bites and sharp claws make them capable of easily overcoming a human. Introducing them to an area where residents are unaccustomed to them exposes people to danger.

As climate changes and bears find drought interfering with their food sources, we might sadly see more aggressive behavior. That might explain a recent tragedy in Canada.

Two experienced hikers in Canada's Banff National Park were attacked in their tent, despite not storing food and taking proper precautions. The couple and their dog were killed in an entirely unprovoked bear attack. The bear even tried to attack emergency responders, showing a strong inclination toward aggression with humans. Intentionally reintroducing more grizzlies will needlessly put people at risk.

In summary, I urge you to consider the hazards posed by grizzly bears to local residents, as evidenced by attacks like the one in Canada, and reject the proposal to reintroduce them to the North Cascades. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input.

Sincerely,

██████

Correspondence ID: 4153Project:112008Document:132104

Address: leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,29 2023 08:25:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am not in favor of the reintroduction plan of Grizzly Bears. I see no benefit to this considering the cost/scope of the proposal. I understand the initial reasoning behind this, but it does not justify moving forward all things considered.

Correspondence ID: 4154Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,29 2023 09:08:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The North Cascades is my home.. I visit the park almost weekly in the 3 seasons of the year. I enjoy the wake up of Spring until the snow sets in during Fall. I have seen bear, elk, grouse, ptarmigan, hawks butterflies so many other species. I cant imagine life without this special place. Now we have a chance to return a species, the Grizzly bear, back to its natve lands and I encourage you to make this happen. I hiked this year in Glacier National Park and actually saw grizzlies and put my foot in their tracks. I was vigilant on our hike and followed all the safety precautions. It was a wonderful day.

Grizzlies belong in the North Cascades. They were here before white settlers came and hunted them to extinction here. They contribute to the enviroment by foraging, spreading seeds, digging in the earth to loosen soils for flora to establish. They keep the predator prey relationship in balance and so much more. In addition they will add to the enjoyment of people who come to the North Cascades as we now travel to GNP and the Canadian Rockies for tourism.

Please allow us to restore our balance in nature. The Grizzly Bear is a native to the North Cascades and must be returned here.

Correspondence ID: 4155Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,29 2023 09:20:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The North Cascades is my home.. I visit the park almost weekly in the 3 seasons of the year. I enjoy the wake up of Spring until the snow sets in during Fall. I have seen bear, elk, grouse, ptarmigan, hawks butterflies so many other species. I cant imagine life without this special place. Now we have a chance to return a species, the Grizzly bear, back to its natve lands and I encourage you to make this happen. I hiked this year in Glacier National Park and actually saw grizzlies and put my foot in their tracks. I was vigilant on our hike and followed all the safety precautions. It was a wonderful day.

Grizzlies belong in the North Cascdes. They were here before white settlers came and hunted them to extinction here. They contribute to the enviroment by foraging, spreading seeds, digging in the earth to loosen soils for flora to establish. They keep the predator prey relationship in balance and so much more. In addition they will add to the enjoyment of people who come to the North Cascades as we now travel to GNP and the Canadian Rockies for tourism.

Please allow us to restore our balance in nature. The Grizzly Bear is a native to the North Cascades and must be returned here. I am in support of Plan C which adds in the 10j rule. I think that there are some nuances in the 10j that need adjustment but I support Plan C.

Correspondence ID: 4156Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America

Outside Organization: citizen Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,29 2023 09:38:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a conservationist and lover of nature, I ask that you restore grizzly bears to the North Cascades. They will play key roles in the ecosystem that once included them.

I enjoy the bear cubs at Woodland Park Zoo, but too many are separated from their mothers, in part, because there is not enough space for them in the wild, where they belong.

Grizzly bears are ambassadors. They inspire many adults and children to step up our efforts to minimize climate change. They need our help.

Thank you.

██████████
████████████████████

Correspondence ID: 4157Project:112008Document:132104

Address: East wenatchee, WA 98802
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,29 2023 10:16:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To whom this may concern

I don't agree with grizzlies being reintroduced or transplanted. If there was food and habitat the bears would already be there. For hikers that hike up in the north cascades could potentially at some point run into them. When they do run out of food they will move either down further into farms and domestic animals or they will go up to Canada anyway. The people in these areas have said no over and over and there is a state law of 1996 that prohibits you from bringing back grizzlies.

Let the bears come and go if there was food they would already be there in big numbers and they are not. We hike sometimes up in the north cascades and I don't want to run into a grizzly . You all admit there is a danger of doing this for the public so why endanger people's lives. If people want to see them they can go to Alaska or Montana a woman was killed in Yellowstone and they were never able to find which bear did it.

So do what the public wants overwhelmingly said no to these areas we already have some bears in the state of Washington.

Thank you

Correspondence ID: 4158Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mazama, WA 98833
United States of America
Outside Organization: board member Mazama Community club, + some signs. Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,29 2023 13:16:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This member of Friends of the North Cascades Grizzly Bear is an old retired national park and forest backcountry ranger, helicopter ski guide, and ski instructor. My encounters with grizzly bears mostly involved keeping backpackers aware of, and away from them.

Actually I had more interaction with Moose in this regard. A mama Moose used to sleep right next to my cabin at Sanctuary in Denali National Park, so her baby would be safe from the grizzlies. In this way, and in these jobs, I became intimately familiar with both the North Cascades and bears. Dr. Sharsmith used to stay in my cabin at Sanctuary, and his extensive knowledge of bears in Yosemite and elsewhere, was also very educational for me.

Dr. Gordon Haber had a wolf den in my territory too, and I used to carry his shotgun when we had to go through areas with grizzlies. This was before spray cans of bear repellent were available, and of course I usually patrolled alone and with no firearms. The grizzlies seemed to know Gordy and were not alarmed by our passage. They probably knew me too as their ability to smell had familiarized them with me on my many patrols. I currently live near Lost River, deep in the east side of the North Cascades, near a handy prospective reintroduction site for grizzlies. We look forward to sharing our woods with these bears. So please count me in favor of grizzly reintroduction.

Correspondence ID: 4159Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Everett, WA 98203
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,29 2023 13:17:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am for the grizzlies being re-introduced I think it's a good idea. I think that they are a part of an ecosystem that people cannot always wrap their heads around, but they were an important part of the ecosystem, and the benefits may be more toward other animals Than us . Two thumbs up.

Correspondence ID: 4160Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98122
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,29 2023 13:37:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a conservationist, I know grizzly bears provide important ecological services, like distributing seeds and aerating alpine meadows. I'm a parent who cares about wildlife, and I want my children to experience grizzly bears as an important part of our regional culture. Humans were responsible for removing grizzlies from the North Cascades and it's our responsibility to bring them back home.

Correspondence ID: 4161Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bothell, WA 98011
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,29 2023 13:51:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My support for the reintroduction of grizzlies is being made known with this comment.

Correspondence ID: 4163Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98104
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,29 2023 15:08:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The Yellowstone park reintroduction of grey wolves demonstrates that the reintroduction of predator species creates a healthier ecosystem with virtually no negative externalities to local humans. Grizzly bears are awesome and would make the PNW better in every dimension.

Correspondence ID: 4164Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Sammamish, WA 98074
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,29 2023 17:37:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Option A. The bears will return on their own as populations in British Columbia continue to grow and spread. Reintroduction of large predators typically causes more problems than it solves.

The bears and the people will both lose if we don't just let them return on their own. Wait 15 years, and we'll have bears, without all the politics.

Correspondence ID: 4165Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Issaquah, WA 98027
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,29 2023 17:37:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please re-introduce Grizzly bears to the North Cascades. They are an important part of the ecosystem and I believe we can co-exist with these magnificent animals.

Correspondence ID: 4166Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Concrete, WA 98237
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,29 2023 17:48:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am not in favor of reintroducing grizzl bears in the cascade mtns

Correspondence ID: 4167Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98116
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,29 2023 18:21:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please bring back the bears! Let's take this great opportunity to restore the North Cascade ecosystem to have the balance it deserves and to return space to a species we have harmed. As someone who recreates in the North Cascades, I know that this means that some of my behaviors will need to change, but those changes are well worth the benefits that will come from restoring this area to be grizzly bear territory.

Correspondence ID: 4168Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Everett, WA 98201
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,29 2023 19:18:37

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am an avid hiker and outdoor enthusiast who travels the North Cascades (Mount Baker Area/Mountain Loop Highway/Highway 2/I-90 Corridor).

I love the wildlife but I DO NOT support the reintroduction of the Grizzly Bear to these parts of Washington State. This proposal to do so does not take into account the changes in human population that now populates these areas-and the hazard it would bring to human life/development.

The recent uptick of black bears being found roaming in Everett, Mill Creek, and the Eastside demonstrates that these bears are coming into contact with humans more than ever before even in the lowlands/city areas. These bears have a general fear of humans. Grizzly bears do not and are often aggressive.

Honestly, I'm a bit surprised that this fact is not being recognized. It seems, I might be wrong, that someone's agenda to reintroduce the Grizzly Bear to the North Cascades is not considering the detriment to human life/residence who choose to live in rural communities/and hikers who would like to be free from aggressive bears.

It seems this issue is brought up about every 2 years by the Park Service, and it is always shut down by public outcry. Please stop bringing this issue up.

No common sense science has proven that the Grizzly bear is necessary to the eco structure of the North Cascades. The Cascades have been fine without them and there have been no humans mauled by Grizzlies in WA. State as a result. It is the case in other states who have an abundance of Grizzlies.

Please perhaps put a focus on returning the mountain goats back to the North Cascades-they being less aggressive unless taunted would be a nice reintroduction to the North Cascades.

Thank you for hearing this public rejection of reintroducing the Grizzly Bear to the North Cascades. I will be expecting common sense action on this-as are many others who employ you.

Correspondence ID: 4169Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Chelan, WA 98816
United States of America

Outside Organization: ██████████ Orchards Business(Official Rep.)

Received: Oct,29 2023 19:19:58

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We commented in previous years, as feel grizzly bears will be a disastrous and unwelcome reintroduction to the North Cascades, since we hike frequently with both pack animals and children in the mountains. We want to continue to feel safe.

Particularly, in the Stehekin Valley, it is a ridiculous idea to bring grizzly bears as these bears would disseminate our kokanee run in Lake Chelan. The bears would feed on the spawning kokanee, reducing the fish run on the lake. People are not allowed to fish out the spawning kokanee and bears should not be either.

For both humans and animals, our eco system has done just fine since the grizzlies disappeared. Do not bring them back in!

Correspondence ID: 4170Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Medford, OR 97501-9643
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,29 2023 20:21:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I recommend adopting Alternative C, the preferred alternative. I favor reintroducing grizzly bears into the North Cascades Ecosystem. Alternative B would be my second choice.

The North Cascades Ecosystem is a wild place but grizzly bears are an essential feature of wildness and are missing. Our family recently fished in the Upper Stehekin River. It was a fine trip but would have been even better to know that grizzly bears were present in the area, even in low numbers envisioned by this plan. What a thrill it would have been to see grizzly bears fishing the large spawning run of kokanee moving up the Stehekin from Lake Chelan.

Correspondence ID: 4171Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Everett, WA 98201
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,29 2023 21:08:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a Washington state resident and avid camper, I fully support reintroducing grizzlies to North Cascades. They should be introduced as abundantly as the NPS is able to sustain.

Correspondence ID: 4172Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,29 2023 21:10:01

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The North Cascades National Park is a popular area for outdoor recreational activities. Introducing grizzlies to the area will expose people to unnecessary danger. Who determines if the expected environmental benefit is worth risking loss of human life?


Wenatchee

Correspondence ID: 4173Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Everett, WA 98203
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,29 2023 21:46:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As an avid hiker and backpacker of the Northern Cascades with a bachelors in Biology, I do not believe grizzly bears should be reintroduced to the northern cascades. These are apex predators and I fear for the safety of my family and others while hiking and being outdoors. These animals are magnificent and deserve to be conserved. However, I do not believe reintroducing them to an area that is so populated with hikers is a safe or logical idea. People will be hurt and property will be destroyed. I believe conservation efforts for grizzly bears should stay focused and concentrated on areas where they already exist. Grizzly bears were removed from the northern cascades for a very simple reason, they pose a huge

safety risk to the lives of humans. Being able to check a box saying you helped conserve an animal is not worth the cost of human lives.

Correspondence ID: 4174Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,30 2023 07:58:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The information provided indicates Grizzly Bears inhabited the North Cascades in pastimes, having conflicted with humans and eventually killed to extinction in the area. Were Grizzly Bears planted here before, or was this their natural habitat? What is it that makes people outside of this area, think planting Grizzly Bear here will go well now? With the population of humans growing in this Washington State, the idea that the same outcome will not occur is ridiculous. Grizzly Bear would have populated the area naturally, if the habitat was friendly. It is required that back country hikers acquire permits to use some areas, as the population of people increases. The number of people who want to enjoy the natural beauty of the North Cascades, will only grow. Conflict with all wildlife will increase. If the Grizzly Bear are living in a friendly habitat now, leave them alone. What good will come for replanting them in a hostile environment? None.

Correspondence ID: 4175Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellevue, WA 98008
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,30 2023 08:08:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am a lifetime citizen of Washington State and strongly object to the introduction of Grizzly bears into the North Cascades National Park. More and more hikers and climbers are recreating in the park. The incidents of bear attacks which will result in humans being killed and maimed are bound to increase in the North Cascades as have been increasing in Montana, Wyoming, and Canada. The human cost for the victims, their friends, and families is too high to pay.

Correspondence ID: 4176Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellevue, WA 98004
United States of America

Outside Organization: Family cabin owner in Stehekin Washington Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,30 2023 08:46:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have spent many summers in Alaska and am very familiar with how sockeye salmon spawning runs attract large numbers of grizzly bears. There are an estimated 50 around Brooks River alone. The Stehekin River supports a large spawning run of landlocked sockeye salmon, locally known as Kokanee. One can easily assume this would attract any grizzlies living in the North Cascades.

Once attracted to the area, which is heavily traveled by tourists and locals, the bears would find pets and livestock attractive. The same applies to local gardens and fruit trees as well as dwellings when no one was there to protect them. Once established in the Stehekin Valley, human encounters with grizzlies are sure to follow.

Correspondence ID: 4177Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Arlington, WA 98223
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,30 2023 09:25:37

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The North Cascades are a sanctuary for many outdoor activities. However, the existing grizzly bear population, as noted by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, is already a concern. Adding more bears could increase risks for visitors. I oppose this move.

Correspondence ID: 4178Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Carnation, WA 98014
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,30 2023 09:34:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: DO NOT artificially introduce Grizzlies to Washington.Grizzlies already exist in the North Cascades. There is no need for reintroduction.

Correspondence ID: 4179Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bozeman, MT 59715
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,30 2023 09:40:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I wholeheartedly endorse the Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/EIS for the North Cascades Ecosystem. The Plan shows ample viable habitat and an excellent plan for restoration. In Montana all carnivores (grizzly bears, wolves and mountain lions) are under attack from political forces. The Cabinet/ Selkirk restoration zone is under extreme stress and if the delisting process moves forward in either the GYE or the NCDE grizzly bears will be in much greater jeopardy. The North Cascades Ecosystem restoration would add an additional zone that might help offset the negative impacts occurring in Montana at this time and in the future. The North Cascades Restoration would greatly enhance the long term viability of the grizzly bear recovery. Thank You.

Correspondence ID: 4180Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Portland, OR 97206
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,30 2023 09:59:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I think reintroduction is a great idea, any steps taken to rewild our natural spaces are steps in the right direction. I come to NCNP at least once per summer for backpacking, and already take the extra precautions needed in bear county. Because that place IS bear county, humans changed that. We should do what we can to restore what once was.

Correspondence ID: 4181Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America
Outside Organization: [REDACTED] Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,30 2023 10:18:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The reintroduction of Grizzle Bears in the Washington State Cascades is like pouring gasoline on a fire. All it takes is one person getting killed or mauled and the fire is lit. This is the most insane plan I have heard of in a very long time. I live in a neighborhood in the Sunnyslope area of Wenatchee and I have seen black bears go through my yard. What is it that people don't understand about bears roaming through miles and miles from the reintroduction site to a neighborhood searching for food? The last thing I want is facing a Grizzly Bear in my yard let alone hikers that come across one that could prove fatal. I don't want to carry a gun when I put my garbage out but if this insane plan is adopted I will do just that. Do the right thing and listen to the folks that want NO part of this plan to come to fruition. Sincerely, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 4182Project:112008Document:132104
Address: E WENATCHEE, WA 98802
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,30 2023 10:32:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Introduction of an apex predator in my backyard is one of the most misguided attempts to remake nature as it was 200 years ago without any regard to the safety of the millions of people who live, work, visit and/or recreate in the designated reintroduction area. I lived in Montana for many years where every year some number of hunters or fishermen would have encounters with grizzlies that leave them anywhere from maimed to suffering a horrible death. Why does the government think that is something we should strive to put into place here in Washington State. Wouldn't be surprised if at one time grizzlies roamed N America in the bureaucrats' backyards in Virginia, West Virginia and Maryland. Doesn't seem to be any effort to place apex predators near them. Listen to the locals who know what they need to feel safe and secure while living and caring for this wonderful place. Statistically, the odds of an encounter may be relatively remote until it is one of your loved ones or friends that suffers the fate of a deadly encounter. Stop this effort to put us in harm's way.

Correspondence ID: 4183Project:112008Document:132104

Address: East Wenatchee, WA 98802
United States of America

Outside Organization: retired Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,30 2023 10:51:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: An October 27 article in the WENATCHEE WORLD newspaper about the North Cascades grizzly bear reintroduction plan by the U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service and National Park Service includes, "...The restoration of the grizzly bear population is also for the "benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations of people" and would allow residents and visitors 'the opportunity to again experience grizzly bears in their native habitat'."

Given the potential ferocity of grizzly bear/human contact (with humans on the losing side), it's hard for me to see a net benefit and enjoyment from reintroduction of grizzlies in the North Cascades. The population of grizzlies in the greater Glacier & Yellowstone parks areas, as well as in Alaska, seems to me to be sufficient to provide benefits and enjoyment (from grizzly bear presence) to present and future generations of people in the United States.

Sincerely,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 4184Project:112008Document:132104

Address: WHITE SALMON, WA 98672
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,30 2023 11:00:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As resident of WA State, I support reintroduction of Ursus arctos into the NCE. We need more fish & wildlife in the USA. Animals that have been essentially wiped out by human activity deserve special treatment and help to recover & augment populations in historic habitats.

I support

Alternative B: Restoration with Existing Endangered Species Act Protections

Under alternative B, grizzly bears restored to the NCE would be managed as a threatened species with the special rule (50 CFR 17.40(b)) under section 4(d) of the ESA governing the regulation of grizzly bears in the lower 48 states and NPS regulations in 36 CFR, chapter 1, governing resource management in areas within the NPS's jurisdiction. This rule allows grizzly bears to be taken under specific circumstances, as long as such take is reported promptly to the FWS. These circumstances include defense of life; federal, state, or Tribal scientific or research activities; or removal of grizzly bears involved in conflicts by authorized federal, state, or Tribal authorities.

My second choice is Alternative C, if B has less support than C. I am against, do not support

Sincerely yours,
Concerned citizen in White Salmon, WA

Correspondence ID: 4185Project:112008Document:132104

Address: East wenatchee, WA 98802
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,30 2023 11:08:21

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Do not introduce grizzlies. This is a bad idea. Reality and common sense is staring us all in the face and telling us this is a bad idea. Whoever within the NPS wants this to happen needs to be told "no" and this needs to end now. Stop antagonizing the people of this state.

Correspondence ID: 4186Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bothell, WA 98012
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,30 2023 11:12:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: While I support the re-introducing of native species to their former home ranges, I believe this the impact to humans would be greater than the benefit to Grizzly Bear re-habilitation. Grizzly are a keystone species and play an important role in ecosystems in the North Cascades, the Black Bear had done a relatively good job at filling the void that the absence of the Grizzly Bear. Many Washingtonian's do not know how to react to a Black Bear much less a Grizzly which are much larger and potentially more harmful. In conclusion, I believe it is in the best interest of human safety to allow Grizzly Bears to naturally migrate back into the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 4187Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98119
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,30 2023 11:15:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the Pacific Northwest. As long as they are not hunted after introduction!

Correspondence ID: 4188Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Brewster, WA 98812
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,30 2023 11:16:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: It is irresponsible for the NPS and FWS to release grizzly bears into the North Cascades Ecosystem! I do not believe that there is no grizzly bear population currently present in this area. In any event, there is too much potential for human-bear encounters in this area. Decisions are being made by desk jockeys who do not live near the areas that will be impacted. The "No-Action Alternative" needs to be taken. Leave it alone!

Correspondence ID: 4189Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,30 2023 11:17:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support reintroduction of grizzly bears in their historical range, including the North Cascades, Selkirks, and other areas of northeastern Washington state.

Correspondence ID: 4190Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Rock island, WA 988850
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,30 2023 12:03:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Three introduction of grizzly bears is a very bad mistake. Number one, it is against Washington states constitution to do so. Number two, it will further decline our declining deer and elk populations to add another Apex predator with the addition of wolves re-staking claims in Washington. Both grizzly bears and wolves population will grow unchecked as there's no conservation measure in place to help control this. Washington state has also shown, very poor management of predators with the example of the sea line problem, mountain lion problem, wolf problem, and now what seems to be a grizzly bear problem in the future. The state also has been having a push to outlaw all predator hunting as early as 2024. The WDFW is complicit in the matter and not standing up for our and my right as a hunter. Number three reason this is a bad idea, amongst many others, is that farmers with livestock will suffer tremendously. For many years, farmers, as well as avid outdoorsman have been sounding the alarm that this is a bad idea. It might be time to listen to them. Lastly, look at glacier Park, and there grizzly bear attacks with fatalities. Now look at Banff and their fatalities from grizzly bear attacks. Now go and try to tell the families of the people that unfortunately were mauled by grizzly bears that this is a good idea. It is only a matter of time before a grizzly bear gets a hold of a hiker on the Pacific Northwest trails. This needs to be stopped!

Correspondence ID: 4191Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98274-8902
United States of America
Outside Organization: - Select - Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,30 2023 12:37:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I oppose the re introduction of grizzlies in the North Cascades. Encounters of these bears with hikers will result in the killing of the bears. Nature is too out of balance to spend energy and money on this project and protection of remaining habitat makes more sense to me.
Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 4192Project:112008Document:132104
Address: East wenatchee, WA 98802
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,30 2023 12:51:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Because the grizzly bear is our top apex predator...putting it in an area with any other animals raised by man would be asking for a disaster!!!!!! It has been shown in the past and will continue to be shown as a poor idea and one which puts several of our industries at risk including the raising of any animals,inclusion of any human beings and other animals in the same territory as them!!!!!!! You would be asking for trouble if they were put in these same territories and would be putting people and businesses at risk!! The only way to reintroduce them would be to keep them in areas where there would be no human contact and sharing the same land with farm animals.....putting a 50 mile safe area around them and keeping them away from these areas!!!!!!! Introduction into the extreme north and interior areas of the north cascades would be the only way they could be left to survive!!!!!!

Correspondence ID: 4193Project:112008Document:132104

Address: winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,30 2023 12:53:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As residents, campers, hikers and hunters of the Methow Valley for over 30 years, my husband and I absolutely oppose any efforts to re-establish the grizzly bear population in North Central Washington. We hope that our children and grandchildren will also be able to safely enjoy the great outdoors of North Central Washington as we have. I do understand that they were once native to this area - but it was before it was a populated recreational area. Our area has become far to popular to outdoor enthusiasts and has lost so much wildlife habitat to recent wildfires that it seems that the possibility of the bears moving down to residential areas would be a likelihood in their search for food. Please do not bring grizzly bears to this area - I feel it would be a recipe for disaster.
Thank you!

Correspondence ID: 4194Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,30 2023 13:08:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] -- Bellingham, WA 98229

[REDACTED]
October 26, 2023 -- By Electronic Submission

Don Striker, Superintendent, North Cascades National Park Service Complex
810 State Route 20, Sedro Woolley, WA 98284
Hugh Morrison, Regional Director, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Pacific Region
RE: Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/Environmental Impact Statement, North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE)

Bears keep me humble. They help me to keep the world in perspective and to understand where I fit on the spectrum of life.

[REDACTED]

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I am writing in support of safely relocating existing grizzly bears into the North Cascades, an historic range in which these bears coexisted with indigenous peoples for thousands of years. Specifically, I strongly support action alternatives B and C in the Draft Restoration Plan.

After retiring from more than forty years of land and water conservation nonprofit work, I am now a landscape and wildlife photographer specializing in the Pacific Northwest and Northern Rockies Regions. You can view my images at the web link above. I have documented and photographed both black and grizzly bears in Yellowstone, Glacier, Denali, Katmai, and Lake Clark National Parks, at Pack and Fish Creeks in Alaska (both managed by the US Forest Service), and most recently in British Columbia's Khutzeymateen Provincial Park and along the Atnarko, Nusatsum, and Salloomt Rivers. It is my deepest wish to know (or for my daughter and granddaughter to know) that the grizzly bear again resides here in Washington's NCE!

The bear in Northwest Coastal Native culture represents strength, family, and healing. For me, grizzly bears are as well a symbol of grace, environmental health, wilderness, and everything wild. They once roamed most of North America, from Alaska to Mexico and as far east as Ontario and the American Midwest. Today, grizzlies occupy less than six percent of their historic range in the lower 48, and they exist in isolated populations. A "keystone" species, grizzlies help regulate prey and disperse seeds, maintain plant and forest health (aerating soil as they dig for roots, pine nuts and squirrels), and help to move spawning salmon carcasses into the forest to fertilize trees, plants, and forest growth by providing high levels of nitrogen. As the NCE is one of North America's premier intact ecosystems, one of two federal grizzly recovery areas without an established population of bears and given that there may be no grizzly here today, we have ample evidence that Alternative A, the no-action alternative using only existing management practices, will fail to result in the future restoration of this species in the North Cascades. Based on current grizzly numbers (zero?) and the on-going degradation of habitat, dwindling

numbers of salmon (a primary source of food for both black and grizzly bears), the increasing impact of a warming climate, and from the slowest reproductive rate of any terrestrial mammal (one to four cubs only every two to four years), we clearly must look at new practices, solutions, and education regarding our coexistence with other species.

My preference are the action Alternatives B or C, where grizzly bears under either alternative would be protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) which governs the regulation of grizzly bears in the lower 48 states. I understand that in some rare instances, lethal action is required, but this should be the last solution if the plan is to move towards its eventual goal of restoration Of this iconic species.

I understand the value and need for greater management flexibility in restoring species where superstition, fear, and where both real and perceived conflicts may play a role. While I have spent time with wild grizzly populations and do not share those feelings, I would support Alternative C which designates grizzly bears in the US portion of the NCE and surrounding areas as a 10(j) nonessential experimental population (NEP) under section 10 of the ESA. Under either action alternative, my primary concern is how the issue of "take" is managed under the action alternatives (defense of life, non-lethal scientific and research activities, and removal when conflicts occur).

While I am not a hunter, I do believe in hunting for those who provide food and sustenance for their families, and as an important part of native culture and heritage. Under no circumstance would I support trophy hunting of grizzlies in the NCE. I am concerned how hunting can or will be managed with restoration [Opportunities for hunting are available in the NPS national recreation areas and on the national forests and state-owned lands (USFS 2016a, b)], especially since we are looking to eventually move from zero to two hundred grizzlies. I would like to see the final plan describe in detail how and/or under what limited conditions hunting will be allowed or managed. I would prefer that no hunting be allowed until we reach the target designation.

Finally, while the NCE is prime habitat for grizzly restoration, and is surrounded by other restoration and wonderful wilderness areas, adequate protections for grizzly (or wolf or bison) do not exist. The final NCE plan must detail how restoration in this area will be different than in neighboring states, and even just a step outside of NCE boundaries. There are currently four bills under consideration in Congress that would remove grizzly bears from ESA protections in Montana, Wyoming, and Idaho. In addition, the governors of those states are pushing the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) to prematurely delist grizzlies from the ESA and turn management over to the states. How will the USFWS protect grizzlies in the NCE with this Congressional and neighboring state pressure? Given the killing of so many bears, wolves, and bison just outside the boundaries of Yellowstone National Park (NPS), what regulations and planning will the National Park Service implement in the final NCE plan to make sure newly restored grizzlies are not killed if they step outside the designated boundary lines? How can the final restoration plan be strengthened to assure that ESA listing deters lethal take from individuals and nearby state and local governments?

While I thank, applaud and support NPS and USFWS efforts to restore grizzlies to the NCE, any final plan must, to the highest degree possible, address real world issues that will affect long-term restoration. No better example exists than the former administration's 2020 stoppage of the previous restoration plan, a plan supported by more than 159,000 public comments.

Thank you, once again, for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Restoration Plan.

Those who have packed far up into grizzly country know that the presence of even one grizzly on the land elevates the mountains, deepens the canyons, chills the winds, brightens the stars, darkens the forest, and quickens the pulse of all who enter it. They know that when a bear dies, something sacred in every living thing interconnected with that realm... also dies."

-- John Murray

Correspondence ID:	4195Project:112008Document:132104
Address:	Chelan, WA 98816 United States of America
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual
Received:	Oct,30 2023 13:08:48
Correspondence Type:	Web Form

Correspondence: This is at least the third time I've submitted comments over the last decade in opposition to the proposal to introduce grizzly bear into the North Cascades National Park area. It sure feels like the process is intended to wear down the opposition until we give up.

From my readings, and testimony of experts, there is no proof that the North Cascades subject area was ever populated by a significant number of grizzly bear. The best the historic record shows is an occasional lone grizzly sighting, probably migrating through from the Selkirk Mountains in Idaho. From someone who is familiar with the North Cascades, it is counter intuitive that there is enough food (salmon) in this food barren wild country to sustain a grizzly population. The notion of introducing the bear to his area to correct to an alleged ecological imbalance is not backed by science and wrong headed. It's also dangerous and destined to failure. The bears will starve and end up in the Methow attacking livestock. It's a recipe for disaster and a very real danger to the ever increasing backpacking population (PCT hikers). Those who have designed and executed this misguided plan will ultimately be responsible for the ensuing mauling and death of hikers from grizzly attacks in this area.

Correspondence ID: 4196Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Dallas, TX 75212
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,30 2023 13:22:03

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hikers, hunters, and outdoor enthusiasts already have to be cautious of black and grizzly bears. Introducing more grizzlies could lead to increased risks, as seen in states like Montana, Idaho, and Wyoming. The presence of grizzly bears migrating into Washington from places like BC and Idaho is undeniable. Without any physical barriers, they can naturally inhabit the state. Given the difficulties in managing the current wildlife populations, I believe it's in the best interest to refrain from reintroducing more apex predators.

Correspondence ID: 4197Project:112008Document:132104

Address: San francisco, CA 94122
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,30 2023 13:37:41

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I want to support efforts to heal the bioregion by allowing Brown Bear to come back to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 4198Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Shoreline, WA 98177
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,30 2023 13:54:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We need grizzly bears back in the North Cascades to complete the ecosystem we have damaged. Bears have a right to be there, more than humans, and it's time to do the right thing by returning them to their homeland.

Correspondence ID: 4199Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Prosser, WA 99350
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,30 2023 14:56:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzlies will spread through Washington on their own. There is no need to spend public resources to re-introduce them.

Correspondence ID: 4200Project:112008Document:132104
Address: WENATCHEE, WA 98807
United States of America
Outside Organization: Wenatchee Outdoors Recreational Groups(Official Rep.)
Received: Oct,30 2023 15:14:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am "for" restoring grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem as a crucial step in preserving the region's ecological and cultural heritage. Alternative C would redesignate the North Cascades grizzly as an experimental population allowing wildlife managers more options to reduce, prevent, and confront human-bear conflict. Therefore I would like to support Alternative "C" and to bring the Grizzlies back to their rightful home of the North Cascades!

Kind regards,


Executive Director of Wenatchee Outdoors

Correspondence ID: 4201Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,30 2023 15:44:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I read about your potential to reintroduce grizzly bears to the North Cascades. While I do understand the importance of environmental impacts and food chains, I am writing to oppose their introduction. Myself and my friends love to hike and camp in the area with our young children. I have hiked and camp in the Rockies in Montana where grizzlies are present and there is a different level of expertise and preparation needed there due to the risk with grizzlies. While it is sad they are no longer here, I think that a reintroduction will make it more difficult for families to enjoy nature securely. If there is an attack then you will need to euthanize the grizzly that you introduced to the area. Seems better to leave be for now and let families enjoy nature and then those children will grow up to be stewards of nature.

Correspondence ID: 4202Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America
Outside Organization: Private Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,30 2023 16:11:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Re-introducing grizzly bears is not in the best interest of the people of Washington State or the bears themselves. There is no food source available in the proposed areas. The biologist involved are over inflating the pro-bear statistics to justify their jobs. The deer herds are very low as well as other potential food sources. This is merely a pet project for the biologist and other employees involved. I do not agree with introducing grizzly bears to Washington State or anywhere else that may be considered. How about working on bringing back our deer population? Maybe once a sustainable deer population is restored, then consider introducing Alpha predators.

Sincerely,

Long time Twisp Washington and Alaska resident,


Correspondence ID: 4203Project:112008Document:132104
Address: darrington, WA 98241
United States of America
Outside Organization: none Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,30 2023 16:30:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: keep your stinking bears in your own state we want to keep what game we have left. There is know good use to be had at all to such a dangerus bear in our woods .we should have the rights to say no to this or is our freedom to choose lost !!! .who has made the parks lord and master over the fish& game all of & suden!!!!

Correspondence ID: 4204Project:112008Document:132104
Address: BELLINGHAM, WA 98225
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,30 2023 16:35:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I've spent my life exploring the regions in our area where grizzlies would be introduced and while I've enjoyed the relatively "safe" wild areas we recreate in, i support bringing grizzlies back to the North Cascades even though the danger level may increase substantially. I do think, however, that a big education campaign will be paramount for people to understand how to safely share wild spaces with grizzlies. I would also like to see more information available to people about the ecological benefits of bringing grizzlies back to the North Cascades. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 4205Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Gardiner, MT 50930
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,30 2023 16:40:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzly bears are a native species in the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE), and like all other native species, they belong there. They benefit the ecosystem in a variety of ways, from seed dispersion to prey species population management to disrupting and "tilling" soil which allow for healthier soils and plant growth... the list goes on and on. The bears would most certainly have a positive impact on the NCE. Grizzly bears are listed under the Endangered Species Act as well, and per the Endangered Species Act, the federal government is required to make an effort to recover this species within critical habitat areas. The NCE is certainly critical habitat for this species, as it's one of a small number of places left where these bears can still thrive in the USA. In addition to this, grizzlies are a public resource, and given that 97% of the NCE is lies within public lands, the public has a right to decide which species roam this land. If the people want these animals on the landscape (like myself), they should be on the landscape.

Correspondence ID: 4206Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bartlett, IL 60103
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,30 2023 17:22:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I would love to see Grizzly bears restored to the Cascades eco system. I visit Montana annually to see grizzlies. I know that if Washington had bears I would also visit

Correspondence ID: 4207Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Ferndale, WA 98248
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,30 2023 17:25:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I oppose the plan to introduce grizzly bears into the North Cascades. As a scout leader I take youth hiking and camping regularly. This honestly scares the heck out of me.

Correspondence ID: 4208Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Everett, WA 98201
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,30 2023 17:25:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am writing to oppose the restoration of grizzlies to North Cascades National Park and Recreation Area.

As an avid hiker and backpacker of the area, I do not like the idea of encountering a dangerous predator like a grizzly.

The population of Puget Sound has exploded and shows no signs of letting up. These mountains are right in the backyard of a major metropolitan region. The number of hikers exploring the Cascades has also vastly increased. With the increased number of people in the wild, repopulating the mountains with an apex predator will result in injury and death. It will be only a matter of time, should this project move forward.

Grizzlies have been gone from these mountains for decades. With the population increase of Puget Sound, putting grizzlies in the North Cascades is a very bad idea. Every year, Yellowstone National Park reports an innocent hiker killed or mauled by a grizzly. I don't want that to happen in Washington state. I oppose the the restoration of grizzlies to North Cascades.

Thank you for reading and your time,

Correspondence ID: 4209Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,30 2023 17:32:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am writing to you today to voice my support for the reintroductions of grizzly bears into the greater North Cascade ecosystem. It is time to repair this area and bring it back to a complete ecosystem. I do not have a preference between either of the active introduction methods you have outlined in the EIS.

I have lived and recreated in all the current grizzly regions of the lower 48 (Yellowstone, Glacier and the Yaak/Cabinets) and have managed to see these amazing creatures at a respectful distance while hiking, camping and bicycling. Like most people I do understand and fear what these animals are capable of. I've always been careful with camp hygiene and carrying bear spray. I know that with good skills we can live in proximity to these animals. I also know that farmers and ranchers can mitigate the risk of interacting with grizzlies. The benefits to society of having a complete ecosystem in the North Cascades and the opportunity to see these animals in the wild outweighs any cost of mitigation.

I also believe that 25 bears over the next decade in this enormous area means that there is not going to be a whole lot of conflict. Even 100 bears over the next 75-100 years is a drop in the bucket when you consider the entirety of the North Cascades, and the Pasayten and Mt Baker wildernesses, not to mention the Canadian land north of the introduction site. It will be exceedingly rare for humans to see, much less come in conflict with, these reclusive animals.

I am now a resident of Winthrop, WA and I wish to see this area returned to a full and complete ecosystem. Please reintroduce grizzlies into the North Cascades by whichever method you think is best.

Rocco Altobelli

Correspondence ID: 4211Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America

Outside Organization: self Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,30 2023 17:58:12

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I wish to express ambivalence toward reintroduction of Grizzly Bear Restoration in the North Cascades Ecosystem. On the one hand, if the professional biologists and other knowledgeable personnel think the ecosystem can support them, then I have no objection. I think that, similar to Glacier National Park, hikers/backpackers can co-exist with the bears. On the other hand, the ecosystem has functioned just fine without them for many decades, so I don't see this as a necessary exercise. There are plenty of ursus americanus already in the North Cascades that serve a similar ecological purpose.

I'm very much in favor of wildlife corridors where animals can navigate around human constructions that prevent their normal migration. Such corridors are much needed for ecosystem health and maintenance of healthy wildlife populations. Of the options presented, I would be very much in favor of use of such corridors that would allow natural reintroduction. I do understand, though, that natural migration may be difficult due to geographic limitations.

I have a problem with forced reintroduction. This may come across as silly, but who is going to ask the bears selected to move from their existing habitat? What sort of logic will they understand to go along with the move? What sort of stress will forced removal from their existing homes place on their well-being? Is this exercise necessary for bear and habitat health, or is it an anthropomorphic guilt trip meant to make up for past human atrocities?

With forced Grizzly reintroduction, similar to the experience with Fisher reintroduction in the North Cascades, it can be expected that many bears will perish before they can reproduce. And if the habitat is isolated such that there is no wildlife corridor to bring new animals into the area, what effect will lack of genetic diversity have on long-term viability of the isolated population?

My concern is for the long-term health of the animals. If forced reintroduction is assured to be successful, then proceed. If not, it appears to me that we're getting the proverbial cart-before-the-horse by not first establishing wildlife migration corridors, which from my perspective is the higher order of priorities for the expense and effort required.

Correspondence ID: 4212Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ocean Shores, WA 98569
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,30 2023 18:01:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Definitely yes, we as Native Nations and residents of Washington should support reintroduction of brown bears into the North Cascades range.

Correspondence ID: 4213Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Stehekin, WA 98852
United States of America

Outside Organization: Stehekin family resident Unaffiliated Individual(Official Rep.)

Received: Oct,30 2023 18:12:48

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Greeting

Yet again the effort to import Grizzly Bears (G-B) into the North Cascades (NC) is playing-out.

What is it these folks do not realize about the G-B by their virtual absence from this region, they recognize the NC as an undesirable region to 'make a living'. They may make infrequent trips into the zone and then - apparently - move on to better places.

Here it was stated ==>

=====
"Fish & Wildlife wrote that reintroduction would also go toward removing the grizzly bear from the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife where it's listed as a threatened species in 48 states.

The restoration of the grizzly bear population is also for the "" and would allow residents and visitors "the opportunity to again experience grizzly bears in their native habitat."

The plan acknowledged that grizzly bear restoration does pose certain "safety risks to backcountry recreational visitors and residents of the (North Cascades)." "

=====
"Endangered and Threatened in 48 States" ! Huh? Seems to me Florida/Georgia/Alabama/South Carolina, among other States. have never had in recent times - say 1700-to-present - a G-B population (guessing here) so why do those promoting G-B transfers to the N-C present the impression G-B's were hunted-out all across America?

"... benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations of people..." Hmmm - what about those populations in the proposed affected areas who do NOT want to deal with the G-B in their back yards?

The previous effort a few years ago to promote moving G-Bs to the N-C TOTALLY omitted the presence of Stehekin on their maps of areas to receive these Bears. Such incompetence in research and planning really scares me as do these words ==>

" "...safety risks to backcountry recreational visitors and residents of the (North Cascades... ".

The community at Stehekin presently enjoys living and recreating in a safe environment where the children can range-about on foot and bicycle freely around the valley never having to worry about a top predator seeing them as small prey as they scamper about.

WAY TOO MANY accounts out of Glacier National Park of visitors being mauled/killed by G-Bs.

What kind of stress will be put upon G-Bs drugged/captured and moved to the N-C region? Will the apparent lack of decent foraging (why else would they NOT be here already?) stress them to predate upon campers cooking their meals, upon family dogs/cats or livestock ? OR will these transferred G-Bs become virtual garbage-dump-fed critters getting meal-drops from those who would dump them into the NC?

IF the G-B moves in by itself, I am all for that event. I am curious how the poor little "Black Bear" will deal with a Mean-Uncle G-B when their habitat is invaded - poorly I suspect.

Don't mess with Mother-Nature! The G-B will move in when THEY determine it is a great place to live.

Correspondence ID: 4214Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98273
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,30 2023 18:15:08

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Having worked and spent many years in Yellowstone National Park, I have seen that bears and people can coexist without issues. The grizzly bear is an integral part of an intact ecosystem. North Cascades National Park would greatly benefit from the reintroduction of grizzlies, as this encourages healthy natural populations of many other species as well.

Thank you

Correspondence ID: 4215Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98122
United States of America

Outside Organization: Methow Valley property owners Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,30 2023 18:32:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Don Striker and Supervisor Brad Thompson,

My family and I are writing in support of Alternative C for the proposal to restore a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascaes. My husband and I have been backpackers for 55 years (our entire adult lives) in all of the protected wilderness areas, national parks, and US Forest Service public lands of Washington State. We have had experience with Black Bears, carnivores (coyotes and wolves), and deer and mountain goats throughout our half century of wilderness hiking and camping. We have been active and engaged with many campaigns to protect and secure wild public lands in our state and elsewhere in the US, and we know that, where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. The proposal would bring up to 25 non-problem grizzly bears into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade and manage them as an experimental population. The area in the remote areas of the North Cascades where this re-introduction would take place is far from any human settlements or agricultural or ranching lands and activities. Alternative C would support re-introduction over a deliberate and gradual timeline into optimal areas for grizzly bears where any human contact would be absolutely minimal, and where prey for the bears would be abundant.

We are age 78 and have no fear of any potential contacts we or our family members or friends might have with grizzly bears to be re-introduced into the North Cascades. We have hiked in the Rocky Mountains (Glacier NP, and Yellowstone and Teton NPs) where grizzlies are more abundant, and have had no contact or conflicts with bears in these wilderness areas. In the North Cascades National Park and Recreation Areas, we have hiked and camped frequently in the Ross Lake area, Copper Mountain Trails, on the Pacific Crest Trail (PCTs) throughout Washington State, particularly in the North Cascaes, and in the Pasayten Wilderness. Our wilderness mountain cabin abuts the US Forest Service lands adjacent to the Pasayten Wilderness.

We have also traveled to Katmai National Park in Alaska, where we had the opportunity to hike with and observe Alaska Brown Bears (same species as the grizzlies to be re-introduced to the North Cascades) in close proximity. This was our first chance to observe and be close to these magnificent animals, as we watched them live and fish in the salmon-rich streams of the Brooks River. We want all Americans and visitors to our vast country to have the knowledge that we are protecting these large mammals and, if they are lucky, the chance to observe them in the wild.

Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. (I have a large map of the North Cascades Ecosystem in our outdoor facilities, where it reminds us of the importance of this large ecosystem we share with Canada, and the value of wildlife protection in this huge wild area.)

Alternative C is modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities. Furthermore, the 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and sometimes respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who, like

us, live and own property adjacent to these precious wilderness areas, and for those who are full-time residents in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Let all of us be the ones to help restore this apex animal to the North Cascades.
We join all of you who are engaged in helping to keep our North Cascades wild!

Sincerely,

██████████ (retired judge and teacher), lifetime conservationist, environmental activist, and advocate for healing our Earth

Correspondence ID: 4216Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Westminster, MD 21158
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,30 2023 18:37:21

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Bring back the bears!

Correspondence ID: 4217Project:112008Document:132104

Address: LEAVENWORTH, WA 98826-9164
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,30 2023 19:15:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello and thank you. My husband and I are wildlife lovers and enjoy hiking and walking in the lower Enchantments and foothills of the North Cascades. I write to express serious concerns over the reintroduction of Grizzlies in our area. When hiking we are already well prepared for encountering black bears, we even have black bears visiting our home. But the thought of encountering a Grizzly on one of our walks is cause for us to probably just stay home. We would like you to reconsider the safety of not only these Grizzlies but the people out enjoying our natural surroundings. Most hikers may not be well prepared for an encounter, especially in the autumn when these bears may be hungry and predatory. Many hikers in our area also bring dogs along on hikes, most are off leash even though the signs say to keep them leashed, thereby potentially causing dangerous encounters. Please rethink this reintroduction.

Correspondence ID: 4218Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Goldendale, WA 98620
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,30 2023 19:33:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I oppose introducing (or reintroducing) Grizzly Bears in to the Northern Cascades, in Washington State. I live in south central Washington.

Grizzly Bears are an Apex predator that can roam 500 miles or more. There is a lot of Grizzlies in Canada, they will come on their own.

I have nothing new to add to the long list of reasons why not to add more Apex predators closer to human populations. I've watched with interest the reintroduction of the grey wolf.

I do believe the restoration of the Grizzly Bear populations in the Yellowstone region is awesome, but let's keep them there.

Sincerely,

Correspondence ID: 4219Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,30 2023 20:07:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Sir/Madam,

I have lived in Washington State 60+ years , of those years 39 in Wenatchee Wa. I've done hiking, camping, berry picking with family and backpacking trips in this beautiful state I call home. I am against the release of grizzly bears into the North Cascades and the roaming ranges projected for the bears.

There is a variety of Outdoor Recreation in the Chelan, Douglas, Okanogan, that would suffer a negative impact from the grizzly restoration program. There are already a few grizzly bears in the North Cascades area. A natural increase for the the grizzly population over the years is a better plan than to unnaturally increase the grizzly population by the above restoration program . This maybe be a good intention (?) by the powers that be , BUT it is a bad idea for the grizzly bears already in established roaming territories. To unnaturally increase the population of grizzly will most likely push some of the black bears and recently introduced grizzlies to seek plant and animal meats in to populated areas beyond the boundaries projected.(Black bears are already roaming into towns for food sources) The Chelan County boundary is a few miles from my home on Burch Mountain. This area has Forest and DNR land but currently the private land below the DNR land has become a prime area for home building and residential areas in the last 5 years. Grizzly are Apex predators that are wild animals that don't conform to mapped boundaries.

Please base your decisions by the voices of Washingtonians who actually live and work in the areas effected by this proposed restoration plan.

Correspondence ID: 4220Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Roachdale, IN 46172-9124
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,30 2023 21:52:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Alternative C would redesignate the North Cascades grizzly as an experimental population allowing wildlife managers more options to reduce, prevent, and confront human-bear conflict. The National Park Service, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and many locals believe Alternative C will provide the best path forward for both people and grizzlies in our region. Taking active steps to recover their population is necessary.

Correspondence ID: 4221Project:112008Document:132104
Address: East Wenatchee, WA 98802
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,30 2023 21:57:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please don't.

Correspondence ID: 4222Project:112008Document:132104
Address: El Paso, TX 79902
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,30 2023 22:35:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I think it is a great idea to reintroduce a species such as the Grizzly to a place where it once belonged. The ecosystem is going to bloom thanks to the new balanced provided by the Bears.

Correspondence ID: 4223Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Portland, OR 97223
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,30 2023 23:19:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We want grizzlies back in their native habitat! I would spend much more time in the region if I knew that I had a chance to see a grizzly.

Correspondence ID: 4225Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 02:04:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a lifelong resident of north central Washington, where our family spends countless hours working and recreating in the beautiful North Cascade mountains, I am strongly opposed to the Introduction of grizzlies to our local ecosystem. The major reason is for the safety of people and livestock. I consider myself environmentally conscious and a advocate for public lands, however, this predictor should not be introduced to an area that demographically is no longer is compatible with this bear.

Correspondence ID: 4226Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Ashburn, VA 20147
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 04:58:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: body content

Correspondence ID: 4227Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Nine mile falls, WA 99026
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 06:33:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Washington and its politics can't even manage black bears how are they going to manage grizzlies take them off the endangered list and let the people manage them then we can talk about it. We still have to figure out how to manage the wolves that are spreading all over the state we haven't even addressed that problem why would we add another. There's already public land that is closed to the public in northeastern wa. do to grizzly encounters why would we want to give up more of are land.

Correspondence ID: 4228Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Boise, ID 83702
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 06:46:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Thanks for considering reintroducing grizzlies in the North Cascades ecosystem. My family and I are looking forward to visiting and hiking in the North Cascades once the reintroduction is complete.

Correspondence ID: 4239Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Phoenix, AZ 85029
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 07:40:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: All animal lives matter stop the killing let them live please

Correspondence ID: 4240Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Romney, WV 26757
United States of America
Outside Organization: Self Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 07:40:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Bring them back.

Correspondence ID: 4241Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Loch Arbour, NJ 07711
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 07:41:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness. I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection. Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest. A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive. For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred. An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed. The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 4242Project:112008Document:132104

Address: PALM HARBOR, FL 34684
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 07:41:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness. I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection. Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

Correspondence ID: 4247Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spotsylvania, VA 22553
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 07:41:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No helicopters!

The bears were here before humans - LEAVE THEM ALONE!!!

Correspondence ID: 4251Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Driggs, ID 83422
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 07:42:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 4253Project:112008Document:132104

Address: St. Pölten, UN 3100
Austria

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 07:42:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 4255Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Towson, MD 21204
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 07:42:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Thank you,
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 4256Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wien, UN 1030
Austria

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 07:42:56

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Save all Grizzlys !

Correspondence ID: 4263Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Atlanta, GA 30329
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 07:44:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 4273Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Montville, NJ 07045
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 07:46:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly urge you to protect grizzlies across the country. Specific to this area, the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades is vital, but must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness in general.

The action alternatives being considered have not been thought through, as both alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and in no way involve heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. It's an extremely underhanded tactic and must not be allowed. If implemented, grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection. Then, of course, they can be killed in the new location.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

Any alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives.

All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Grizzlies and wildlife in general should not be killed or punished due to human population growth. It's their territory - they were their first. People need to learn to live with wildlife when they choose to encroach on their territory.

Correspondence ID: 4278Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mesilla Park, NM 88047
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 07:47:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

Correspondence ID: 4281Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Toledo, OH 43682
United Kingdom

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 07:48:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

Correspondence ID: 4282Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Des Moines, IA 50322
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 07:48:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please let wildlife live. We don't need to kill them for us to live.

Correspondence ID: 4287Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Reeds Spring, MO 65737
United States of America

Outside Organization: Citizen of the US Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 07:49:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: You must know that maintaining a healthy apex predator population ensures a healthy ecosystems.

But moreover, as the stewards of Mother Earth we have a moral obligation to preserve and protect all plants and animals.

There is no Planet B...

Correspondence ID: 4291Project:112008Document:132104

Address: São José do Rio Preto, PA 15015500
Brazil

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 07:51:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzly bears in the North Cascades and that restoration must be done in a way that does not violate the Law of the Wild and harm the wild character of the area. This is good for bears and nature. Both alternative courses of action, as they now stand, would violate the Law of Nature. Action alternatives must be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in the wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry facilities, and avoid heavy management of bears. There are many roads that cut through or penetrate the recovery area or dead ends near the wilderness that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters into the wilderness. I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for grizzly bears in restoration work. This would mean that grizzly bears that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be removed from their homes, dumped in the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection. Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzly bears to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzly bears have not yet been recovered by the ESA, and any grizzly bears dispersing from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas such as the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest. A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery takes longer than active repopulation. New information presented by Superintendent Striker about the likelihood of natural bear migration from Canada suggests that the urgency of active repopulation may be more about protecting the agency's discretion than protecting nature and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate. , live and prosper. For the long-term success of grizzly bear restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives, thereby reducing the need for wilderness-degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for grizzly bears. bears. This requires working with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzly bears have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small population of North

Cascades grizzly bears from declining over time and becoming become inbred. An alternative that combines natural recovery with an increase in the population under full ESA protection must also be analyzed. The no-action alternative has many good Bear Smart components about how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears, and these coexistence measures should also be included in both action alternatives. All possible measures should be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, especially given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and the rapidly increasing recreational pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 4294Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Godfrey, IL 62035
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 07:51:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 4298Project:112008Document:132104

Address: fleminton, NJ 08822
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 07:52:56

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: save the grizzly bears. they are part of god's plan for this earth and they contribute to a healthy environment. stopinsane hunters and trappers who kill and murder with abandon. its one thing to kill to ear. its another thing entirely tokill to make a statue of a formerly alive bear and puot it in your house as a trophy. we dont need trophies allowed at any time. stop all hunting, which should be from 100 years ago, but this is 2023 and we need to move forward to protect and respect animals and wildlife for the good they do to the environment. they ae part of a living environment. humans are part of a dead environment. we turn it into concrete like the dead cities of this country. few want to live in cities anymore with the garbatge that humans bring about and the concrete.

Correspondence ID: 4299Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Stroudsburg, PA 18360
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 07:53:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I live part-time in the Yellowstone ecosystem and follow these issues closely.I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm

the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. Apparently, there are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection, which is unreasonable.

Our area of Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred. Consider this:

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park. Please revise your proposal for these reasons. Thanks.

Correspondence ID: 4300Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Willoughby, OH 44094
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 07:53:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Let us not take foregranted any of God's gifts to us in the animal world. Each species is a indispensable piece of our ecosystem for it to stay healthy and fight Climate Change. Please do your part to save these magnificent creatures.

Correspondence ID: 4302Project:112008Document:132104

Address: OCEAN ISLE BEACH, NC 28469
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 07:54:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please return the grizzly bears back to thewlr ecosystem!

Correspondence ID: 4303Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 07:54:41

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am opposed to the reintroduction of grizzlies into the North Cascades. If the Grizzly bear would come back on its own, that's one thing but I don't feel we should meddle and try to reintroduce them ourselves. I am a hiker and this

would add just one more thing to be aware of. We already contend with the black bear and cougar.

I'm not sure of the history of why the Grizzly left in the first place but let them come back on their own if they want to and keep human interference out of the picture. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 4306Project:112008Document:132104

Address: buffalo, NY 14213
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 07:55:24

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness. I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Correspondence ID: 4308Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spanish Fork, UT 84660
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 07:56:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 4312Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Elizabeth, NJ 07201
United States of America

Outside Organization: rutgers university University/Professional Society

Received: Oct,31 2023 07:56:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello. I am contacting you today in the hope that you will reconsider your approach to grizzly recovery in the North Cascades.

- I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.
- Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.
- I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.
- Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the

ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

- A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.
- For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.
- An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.
- The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 4314Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33418
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 07:56:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: • Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest• The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 4315Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winsted, CT 06098
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 07:56:55

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: One of my fondest memories is traveling through the cascades and watching momma grizzly bears with their cubs. Such a wonderful site. These animals need to be protected. Anyone with a brain knows we are constantly killing off our precious wildlife. Enough of this garbage. Save them all. I've never been chased by any wild animals and I've been around hundreds of them. From grizzly to black bears to mountain lions and even a real African Lion bit my bumper and dragged my car around like a ragdoll. I know what to do and how to stay safe. Just wish these horrible humans would stop destroying wild life.

Correspondence ID: 4316Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Fort Collins, CO 80526
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 07:56:58

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, but the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act do not harm bears. A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed,

even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive. For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

Correspondence ID: 4321Project:112008Document:132104

Address: TWISP, WA 98856
United States of America

Outside Organization: Northern Quest Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 07:58:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support grizzly reintroduction to the North Cascades. My strong preference would be the creation of protected corridors so that the grizzlies could migrate to the North Cascades in WA by themselves. That seems the best way to avoid traumatizing the bears, increase their odds of survival (as many as one-third of forcibly relocated bears don't survive six months after relocation according to North Cascades Conservation Council), and lessen the likelihood of future negative interactions with humans. If that remains an impossible policy choice (might it still be considered?), then I do support the adoption of rule 10(j) to increase management flexibility of the bears. Thank you for listening.

Correspondence ID: 4323Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Syracuse, NY 13210-3611
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 07:59:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To the National Park Service,

I completely support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I am against the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection. This is ludicrous.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

It would be cruel to trap Grizzlies out of their homes to move them to an entirely different state and environment. This is a no brainer.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive. It would be a more normal process of wildlife.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives

thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Thank you for listening, please seriously take my comments into consideration.

Correspondence ID: 4325Project:112008Document:132104

Address: savannah, GA 31406
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 07:59:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I keep reading about RULES RULES RULES....that can be bent and provoked in order to destroy what it was meant to protect in the first place. Leave the bears aloneand their lands alone. JUST LEAVE THEM ALONE....and they will be fine. No one should be tracking them , collaring them, killing them. Would you like that done to you? Leave them alone and they will manage....if their food supply is not tainted, poisoned by humans..... or their air contaminated.....or noisy coppers in the air all over the place and other vehicles.....All they want is to be left alone, in peace, the way God intended them to live. Do not keep inventing plans to mess with them... pretending you are doing it to help them.....when the exact opposite is true. I am sick of people who are supposed to be caretakers of our planet and animals being in fact destroyers...always inventing new rules to do it. Stop this madness and leave them in peace.....away from humans and their interference. May God protect the animals....especially our beloved bears... I hope He does in fact see everything that people do... and one day be held accountable for their actions.

Correspondence ID: 4330Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Salt Lake city, UT 84105
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 08:01:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm writing to encourage the National Park Service to restore grizzlies to the North Cascades in a way that is good for bears and Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 4332Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Altamone Springs, FL 32714
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 08:01:55

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To whom it may concern,

Thank you for taking time to read my concerns and supporting my request to reconsider your approach to grizzly recovery in the North Cascades.

I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the

Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation.

The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Thank you again for your time and support.

Correspondence ID: 4333Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Windsor, NY 13865
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 08:02:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I would appear that the current push is to move animals from their home where they are protected into an area where they can be experimented upon. Any human related push into wilderness with the heavy handed "management" these alternatives would entail would only serve to breakup Wilderness and the wildlife that lives there.

What is needed is protection and enchancement of the area's Wilderness character AND that also absolutely MINIMIZES the human handling and harassment of grizzlies.

All, it would seem, just to make sure the present Park Superintendent isnt going to be "stuck with normal fish and wildlife rules that say you pretty much can't do anything" to the bears.

Seriously - in this day of species extinction and climate change - is that the attitude towards another species in danger of extinction? Really?

Correspondence ID: 4337Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Hot Springs, AR 71913
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 08:02:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in this restoration project. Grizzlies that have full ESA protections in states like Montana could be taken from their homes, put in the North Cascades and lose those critical protections.

Correspondence ID: 4339Project:112008Document:132104

Address: gilmer, TX 75644
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 08:03:24

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Restore Grizzlies to North Cascades

Correspondence ID: 4340Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Southfield, MI 48075
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 08:03:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness. That looks to me like you are owned and operated by bigCorp.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I used to work with a man that enjoyed killing them with his totally unfair high-powered guns. Let's go have a talk with him.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears

from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 4342Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Aylesford, KY me20 6bb
United Kingdom

Outside Organization: Equitini Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 08:03:50

Correspondence Type:Web Form

Correspondence: Just help bears

Correspondence ID: 4345Project:112008Document:132104

Address: oyster bay, NY 11771
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 08:04:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

Correspondence ID: 4350Project:112008Document:132104

Address: austin, TX 78733
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 08:04:58

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, but the restoration must be done in ways that don't reduce protections for brars or violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. There should be no helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, telemetry installations, and no heavy-handed management of bears. There is already many roads next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

No bears from Montana should be used in this project. Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The goal should be protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must be included in both action alternatives. We must reduce the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no-action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 4351Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Pine Plains, NY 12567
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 08:05:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I fully support recovering a healthy grizzly bear population in the North Cascades, but the effort must be done in a way that PROTECTS and ENHANCES the area's wilderness character and that also MINIMIZES the human HANDLING and HARASSMENT of grizzlies.

Grizzlies historically roamed what today is North Cascade National Park and the surrounding Wilderness and wildlands of north-central Washington--and we should help grizzlies return to this landscape.

Wilderness protection requires seeking ways to RECOVERS the area's grizzly population that AVOIDS the use of helicopters, motor vehicles and equipment, electronic installations, and trammeling or manipulating the landscape or its wildlife.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. They are unacceptable.

The current action alternatives would involve about 50 to 400 helicopter landings and twice that many helicopter flights. All, or almost all, landings would apparently be in Wilderness, either in North Cascades National Park or in surrounding national

forests. The extensive use of helicopters would continue indefinitely for monitoring and managing bear movement and numbers. This heavy-handed management would be detrimental to Wilderness and bears alike. Grizzly bears would be collared, drugged, samples taken, released in Wilderness, re-collared and re-sampled, if determined necessary, for many years. Any young grizzlies born in the Wildernesses may also be subjected to this invasive management.

Moving forward :

- The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.
- I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.
- Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.
- A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.
- For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.
- An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.
- The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Correspondence ID: 4353Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Salisbury, MA 01952
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 08:05:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 4355Project:112008Document:132104

Address: New York, NY 10009
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 08:05:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: THIS IS A NO BRAINER...IT NEED TO BE IMPLIED AS SOON AS POSSIBLE...

Correspondence ID: 4360Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Silver Springs, FL 34488
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 08:06:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Stop killing bears!

Correspondence ID: 4364Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Providence, RI 02903
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 08:06:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: save the grizzlies. when they're gone we're next.

Correspondence ID: 4365Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Brewster, MA 02631
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 08:06:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please allow restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades. Grizzlies must be protected under the Endangered Species Act.
Do not allow grizzlies to be taken from their homes in places like Montana and dropped into the North Cascades.
Humans must stop trying to control everything!
Please let grizzlies return to the North Cascade National Park and wildlands of north central Washington.
Human must not be allowed to handle and harass grizzlies.
Do the right thing for these beautiful animals.

Correspondence ID: 4366Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Austin, TX 78717-5504
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 08:07:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I love the Cascades, having lived in Bend, Oregon for several years and still own property there. I encourage you to reconsider your approach to grizzly recovery in the North Cascades.

I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.
Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 4371Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Scottsdale, AZ 85260
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 08:07:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To whom it may concern

I strongly support the reintroduction of Grizzlies in the North Cascades. They are an important part of the biological food chain and native to the area. The area is perfectly suited for them. Thank you

Correspondence ID: 4374Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Benton, AR 72019
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 08:07:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzly Bears have the right to be protected and for the powers that be to stop selling the rights to more and more land for a profit that only helps humans get rich.

Correspondence ID: 4384Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Meadow Valley, MS 95956
United States of America
Outside Organization: - None - Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 08:11:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support any efforts made to recover the natural balance of nature. We have disturbed the natural balance of our environment very close to a complete breakdown. Our planet cannot survive if we do not honor the balance that evolved before we became such a burden.

Correspondence ID: 4388Project:112008Document:132104

Address: jackson heights, NY 11372
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 08:13:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please support all Nature, the Environment and help us try to undo the damage we humans have imposed on all the above.

Correspondence ID: 4400Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Asheville, NC 28805
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 08:17:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Thank you for this opportunity to provide public comment.

I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades and strongly believe that the restoration must be done in ways that do not violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This would be the best approach for bears and Wilderness.

However, both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection. That would not constitute a sound plan for recovery.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

Additionally, an alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The 'no action' alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. Here in Western North Carolina, residents have been taught to become "Bear Wise". Education is key when it comes to successful coexistence.

All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Correspondence ID: 4402Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Fort Mill, SC 29715
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 08:18:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I want grizzly bears to return naturally to the North Cascades and have full protection and absolutely no hunting and trapping of them allowed. We - our federal government and agencies need to do so much more to expand and protect our wild lands and species.

I am totally opposed to road building and machine intrusion - helicopter, truck, car etc., in the North Cascades and wilderness areas and also as feasible our national parks. We the people cherish and value beyond measure our Wilderness areas, our national forests and parks. I want these protected to the utmost. My family and people make it a priority and take their precious vacation time and funds to visit and support these places. We want the sounds of nature and no mechanical sounds; we want to know that these lands and waters are totally safe and preserved and that our wild flora and fauna have these in which to thrive.

I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 4405Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Oakville, CT 06779-1958
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 08:20:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I would want any action or non action that would cause the least amount of threat to these bears. I trust that you feel the same way. They are living creatures that have a right to live. I hope they aren't transferred to a place with high hunting just for fun.

Correspondence ID: 4407Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Chicago, IL 60615
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 08:20:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 4408Project:112008Document:132104

Address: owatonna, MN 55060
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 08:20:10

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Protect the bears,all of them, everywhere now.

Correspondence ID: 4409Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bratislava, UN 84102
Slovakia

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 08:20:15

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 4411Project:112008Document:132104

Address: New York, NY 10003
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 08:20:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am hoping that you will reconsider your approach to the reintroduction of grizzlies to the North Cascades, but the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park. Thank you for your consideration of my views.

Correspondence ID: 4413Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Paonia, CO 81428
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 08:20:58

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have traveled much in the North Country of Canada and Alaska and have seen directly the beauty and majesty of the Grizzly Bear. The bears have every right to coexist with humans and it is we who must make accommodations for them as they are unprepared for interactions with a modern human world.

Still, I strongly support restoration of the grizzly to the North Cascades. Those areas there that retain wilderness designation and those potentially included in such designations should remain as such so as to preserve them for generations and importantly for the bears and stable, healthy ecosystems, ecosystems upon which humans depend.

My review of the alternatives suggests to me that both would whittle away at the Wilderness Act, an Act which specifically denies entry of any motorized vehicles including helicopters within their boundaries. The Act also denies roads, electrical equipment which should never be used in any restoration project in Wilderness areas.

I also strongly oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in any restoration effort. Any action that leads to the delisting of animals from endangered status is a non-starter. Let me be clear. Grizzlies must retain protections under the ESA in every location in which they live. Period.

Finally, given the risks to humans, pets and livestock, it is critical to develop protections for them, recognizing that Grizzlies do not abide by any laws or boundaries. Acknowledging that, we must also develop reasonable ways to fully compensate ranchers for any losses of livestock that can be directly attributed to Grizzly activity. Further, institution of the stiffest of penalties for the killing of Grizzlies must also be implemented.

Evaluating and implementing approaches to minimizing contact between humans, their vehicles and Grizzlies will also be

key.

We need apex predators for healthy ecosystems. They have every right, indeed, every requirement to be living where they do, every bit as much as do we.

Correspondence ID: 4414Project:112008Document:132104

Address: East Kingston, NH 03827
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 08:21:01

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am passionate about environmental/wildlife justice. I understand that the health of the forests and oceans of our world is the health of all life on earth and all are inextricably linked. Humanity everywhere must understand the urgency of protecting our planet so all life on earth including humans can thrive. Re-introduction of Grizzly Bears into the Cascade ecosystem will be a major accomplishment and has my full ardent support.

Correspondence ID: 4419Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Miami, FL 33131
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 08:22:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: YES TO GRIZZLIES!!!

Correspondence ID: 4420Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Miami, FL 33131
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 08:23:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: PLEASE reconsider your approach to grizzly recovery in the North Cascades!

Correspondence ID: 4422Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Miami, FL 33131
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 08:23:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We demand for grizzly recovery in the North Cascades!

Correspondence ID: 4424Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Miami, FL 33131
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 08:24:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: YES to grizzly recovery in the North Cascades

Correspondence ID: 4429Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Miami, FL 33131
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 08:24:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: YES TO GRIZZLY RECOVERY!

Correspondence ID: 4430Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Great Falls, MT 59404
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 08:24:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 4433Project:112008Document:132104

Address: West End, NC 27376
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 08:25:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: ?

Correspondence ID: 4435Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Miami, FL 33131
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 08:26:31

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active

repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

Correspondence ID: 4440Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Lubbock, TX 79407
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 08:29:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please have the least amount of human contact as possible with returning these grizzlies. Please do not be invasive.

Correspondence ID: 4443Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Littleton, CO 80120
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 08:30:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I strongly support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness. Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

Correspondence ID: 4447Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Lewes, DE 19958
United States of America
Outside Organization: None Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 08:31:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please know that I fully support recovering a healthy grizzly bear population in the North Cascades, but the effort MUST be done in a way that protects and enhances the area's wilderness character and that also minimizes the human handling and harassment of grizzlies. They need to be restored to this region, and they need protections from the predations and cruelty of human beings for nonessential reasons! Thank you so much.

Correspondence ID: 4453Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 08:31:47
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am in favor of the primary goal of the 10(j) rule, to: "support reintroduction and recovery of grizzly bears within the NCE and provide the prohibitions and exceptions under the Act necessary and appropriate to conserve the species within a defined NEP area."

Redesignation of the species in the North Cascades as an experimental population will allow land managers to prevent conflict before it happens and address it when it happens. Reducing and addressing conflict will help bears bounce back and

help people accept them on the landscape.

The 10(j) map imagines future

expansion of grizzly bear populations into Zone #2. This expansion could contribute to the conservation of the species as a whole, and potentially create connectivity between populations if more habitat is protected and corridors are developed.

The 10(j) is responsive to local community concerns and requests for more management certainty, as the 10(j) clearly defines what kinds of management actions can take place in and around Washington state.

The agencies have defined an active restoration and grizzly population augmentation effort as part and parcel of a 10(j) rule.

The 10(j) provides a clear and intentional management plan in the event that Canadian bears wander into Zones 1, 2, or 3 from British Columbia.

Correspondence ID: 4456Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Fort Collins, CO 80526
United States of America

Outside Organization: Melody Custom Crafts Business(Official Rep.)

Received: Oct,31 2023 08:33:15

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzlies historically roamed what today is North Cascade National Park and the surrounding Wilderness and wildlands of north-central Washington--and we should help grizzlies return to this landscape. I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Correspondence ID: 4459Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Morton Grove, IL 60053
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 08:34:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness. Please find an alternative to this. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 4464Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Star Valley, AZ, AZ 85541
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 08:34:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 4465Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Chicago, IL 60618
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 08:35:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The best course of action is to let nature take its course. All too often people think we can solve the issues but end up making things worse and need to try and fix it again later. We should learn from our past mistakes. Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

Correspondence ID: 4466Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Herndon, VA 20170
United States of America

Outside Organization: Self employed Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 08:35:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm writing today to strongly encourage you to reconsider your approach to grizzly recovery in the North Cascades. Neither of the current action alternatives, involving translocating bears from other regions, is compatible with Wilderness and the Wilderness Act.

While I strongly support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character.

Unfortunately, both of the action alternatives, as they now stand, would violate the Wilderness Act. They should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I STRONGLY oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative MUST be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears

from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no-action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the park.

Correspondence ID: 4472Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Meriden, CT 06451
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 08:37:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I oppose you killing or destroying anymore animals or environment. We must coexist. Your the people that are supposed to care and be intelligent you are completely detached and are furthering destroying our environment and murdering or animals. STOP

Correspondence ID: 4473Project:112008Document:132104

Address: New Berlin, IL 62670
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 08:37:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 4474Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Great Barrington, MA 01230
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 08:37:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do all that you can to protect grizzly bear populations. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 4476Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Austin, TX 78722
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 08:38:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection. For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears.

Correspondence ID: 4477Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Wethersfield, CT 06109
United States of America
Outside Organization: individual Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 08:38:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I strongly support the restoration of grizzlies to the Northern cascades. This MUST be done in ways that do not violate the Wilderness Act.
All the proposed actions would violate the Wilderness Act.
I also oppose the use of a 10(j) rule.

Correspondence ID: 4480Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Eureka, MT 59917
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 08:39:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear respected persons,
Please restore grizzlies to the North Cascades in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

I strongly oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into

the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Correspondence ID: 4481Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Green Bay, WI 54301
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 08:39:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Yes, Yes, and YES to grizzlies and the wilderness!!!

Correspondence ID: 4489Project:112008Document:132104
Address: santa fe, NM 87507
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 08:43:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Yes, Grizzly Bears ARE necessary to the environment of these nations. Protect them because they protect the land and the environment.

Correspondence ID: 4491Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Summit, WI 53066
United States of America
Outside Organization: Citizen Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 08:43:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Stop killing grizzlies!

Correspondence ID: 4493Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Walsenburg, CO 81089
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 08:44:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I prefer that grizzly bears migrate on their own to the North Cascades Ecosystem. The 10(j) rule must not be applied to grizzly bears; the bears must have the full protections of the ESA. -- [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 4496Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tucson, AZ 85704
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 08:45:08

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades without violating the Wilderness Act.

The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred. An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 4503Project:112008Document:132104

Address: West Chester, PA 19382
United States of America

Outside Organization: JW Crouse, Inc. Business(Official Rep.)

Received: Oct,31 2023 08:48:15

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Restoring the Grizzly Bear to the North Cascades Ecosystem is of great importance to the health of the ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 4504Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Thousand Oaks, CA 91362
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 08:48:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 4508Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Citrus Heights, CA 95610
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 08:50:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 4510Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Highland Park, NJ 08904
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 08:50:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Wilderness Watch fully supports recovering a healthy grizzly bear population in the North Cascades, but the effort must be done in a way that protects and enhances the area's wilderness character and that also minimizes the human handling and harassment of grizzlies. Please have compassion and consideration for all the precious lives in the area

Correspondence ID: 4512Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Leominster, MA 01453
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 08:50:41

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 4515Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sanibel, FL 33957
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 08:50:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 4520Project:112008Document:132104

Address: SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94114
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 08:52:52

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzlies historically roamed what today is North Cascade National Park and the surrounding Wilderness and wildlands of north-central Washington--and we should help grizzlies return to this landscape.

To that end, the National Park Service and U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service are seeking public input through November 13 on a draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) that evaluates options for returning grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem in Washington, where the animals once roamed.

Wilderness Watch fully supports recovering a healthy grizzly bear population in the North Cascades, but the effort must be done in a way that protects and enhances the area's wilderness character and that also minimizes the human handling and harassment of grizzlies.

The grizzly bear recovery area includes North Cascades National Park, 638,173 acres of which is designated the Stephen Mather Wilderness. Two other Wilderness areas bordering North Cascades National Park--the 531,325-acre Pasayten Wilderness and the 119,966-acre Mount Baker Wilderness--are also part of recovery area for grizzlies. Wilderness protection requires seeking ways to recover the area's grizzly population that avoids the use of helicopters, motor vehicles and equipment, electronic installations, and trammeling or manipulating the landscape or its wildlife.

Unfortunately, the current action alternatives would involve about 50 to 400 helicopter landings and twice that many helicopter flights. All, or almost all, landings would apparently be in Wilderness, either in North Cascades National Park or in surrounding national forests. The extensive use of helicopters would continue indefinitely for monitoring and managing bear movement and numbers. This heavy-handed management would be detrimental to Wilderness and bears alike. Grizzly bears would be collared, drugged, samples taken, released in Wilderness, re-collared and re-sampled, if determined

necessary, for many years. Any young grizzlies born in the Wildernesses may also be subjected to this invasive management.

There are no alternatives that look at less invasive or non-invasive means of grizzly reintroduction or recovery, and no natural recovery alternative. Neither of the current action alternatives, involving translocating bears from other regions, is compatible with Wilderness.

The federal agencies also propose under their preferred alternative (Alternative C) that the grizzlies moved to the North Cascades would be designated as a nonessential experimental population under section 10(j) of the Endangered Species Act (ESA). This means that a grizzly that is fully protected under the ESA in Montana could be taken from her Montana home range, dropped into the North Cascades, lose full protections under the ESA, and essentially be killed and harassed with fewer restrictions. This is unethical and must not be allowed to happen.

Wilderness Watch has serious concerns that the urgency for the current proposal, combined with a 10j experimental listing under the ESA, is more about safeguarding agency discretion than it is about protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

This year, North Cascades National Park Superintendent Striker told newspapers that changing conditions in Canada could mean naturally migrating grizzlies "may be down here before you know it." If bears migrate on their own, they have full protection under the ESA. Striker advocated for faster human-facilitated reintroduction stating, this way, "you can decide on different rules on how you are going to manage those endangered species ... [you can] define how we should treat bears, where do we want them, where don't we want them." Whereas, with migrating bears with full ESA protection, Striker worried, "We are going to be stuck with normal fish and wildlife rules that say you pretty much can't do anything" to the bears.

Please submit your comments to NPS and USFWS by November 13 and encourage the agencies to reconsider their approach to grizzly recovery in the North Cascades. Some points to emphasize:

I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 4521Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Jackson, WY 83001
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 08:53:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hi,

I fully support grizzlies in the Cascades.

I trust this will be done in coordination so that bear have natural migration corridors to assure proper gene flow.

I also trust you will also find ways to do the reintroductions in compliance with all laws such as the wilderness act and clean water act and roadless rules.

As someone who lives with grizzly in the GYE, I understand that there are manageable challenges to coexistence that are better dealt with early.

Thank you for taking on these important challenges. All is possible with persistence, patients, imagination and knowledge.

Correspondence ID: 4522Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Ann Arbor, MI 48104
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 08:53:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please find a way to restore grizzly bears to the North Cascades !

These magnificent animals were here long before we were. Their range has been severely compromised, and their numbers are few.

Correspondence ID: 4523Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Glendale, AZ 85304
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 08:54:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As human beings we MUST ensure that all wildlife is protected and not brought to harm. Grizzlies are an important part of the ecosystem and it is our responsibility to protect them!

Correspondence ID: 4524Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Aurora, CO 80012
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 08:55:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please, reconsider your decision about grizzly bears in the North Cascade. These animals are ESSENTIAL! They are living beings. They need to be protected!

Correspondence ID: 4535Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Minneapolis, MN 55409
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 08:57:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, but that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act.. As they stand, both of the action alternatives would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection. Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good components that would help people and communities coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

These changes will be good for bears and Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 4537Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Muscle Shoals, AL 35661
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 08:58:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

Correspondence ID: 4539Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Coconut Creek, FL 33066
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 08:59:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Both of the current action alternatives would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives MUST be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in the Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I strongly oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection. This is shameful and deceitful.

Furthermore, Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies have not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

Correspondence ID: 4547Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Eugene, OR 97402
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 09:01:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 4551Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ohkay Owingeh, NM 87566
United States of America

Outside Organization: - Select - Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 09:02:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I fully support the expansion of grizzly bear range into the Cascades. Extinction is accelerating and every species needs to have more room to roam. They will fulfill the ecological niche for which they were intended.

Correspondence ID: 4563Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lincoln, CA 95648
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 09:06:55

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness. I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection. Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest. A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

Correspondence ID: 4565Project:112008Document:132104

Address: SPOKANE, WA 99204
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 09:10:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: After killing off much of the wildlife to make room for human activities, it is time to reverse that trend, before it's too late. Humans lose when other species become extinct. Restoring grizzlies is important a start.

Correspondence ID: 4566Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Eugene, OR 97408
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 09:10:41

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 4570Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Jacksonville, FL 32219
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 09:13:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please protect the grizzly bears and their wilderness in the north Cascades. Thank you

Correspondence ID: 4576Project:112008Document:132104

Address: LAS VEGAS, NV 89130
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 09:14:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please protect the grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 4577Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Saint Paul, MN 55105
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 09:15:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

Correspondence ID: 4579Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Oregon City, OR 97045
United States of America

Outside Organization: Pierry, Inc. Business

Received: Oct,31 2023 09:16:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

Correspondence ID: 4581Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Anoka, MN 55303
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 09:17:08

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Correspondence ID: 4585Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Santa Cruz, CA 95060
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 09:18:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on

Correspondence ID: 4588Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Newark, DE 19702
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 09:20:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears are symbols of our wild West and the US in general. They are majestic animals who deserve and need protection. Do you really want to get rid of all wild animals? What does that solve or prove? Nothing, except perhaps for the fact that humans think they are best of all.

Please consider these important points as you consider your decision and plan of action. Thank you.

I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 4596Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Upton, MA 01568
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 09:23:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To: National Park Service
Re: Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Environmental Impact Statement, North Cascades Ecosystem

I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and the Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Respectfully,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 4598Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wadsworth, OH 44281
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 09:23:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection. Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed. The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with

grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives.atic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 4599Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Endicott, NY 13760
United States of America
Outside Organization: self Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 09:23:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that restoration must be done in ways that do not violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness. I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection. Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest. A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive. For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred. An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

Correspondence ID: 4601Project:112008Document:132104

Address: San Diego, CA 92108
United States of America
Outside Organization: Private Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 09:24:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To Whom It May Concern,
My "comments" here are more in the form of questions. First off, since this park lies on the border of Canada, what exactly lies north of this park, in Canada? Is it designated wilderness or parks or are there towns and cities with a human population? And would "harvesting" of mature bears from other stocks exclusively be from Yellowstone National Park or Glacier? Why not harvest/relocate some bears from Alaska, or are those a different subspecies of what is in the lower 48 states? And why not have total protection over these bears as the bears have in Yellowstone N.P.?? And why would such heavy future monitoring of relocated bears be necessary? Why not relocate bears with GPS collars that would eventually fall off, then leave the bears alone in their new home? Why would constant helicopter flights and monitoring be needed? Reason says that some of these bears will establish home ranges where they are so why not relocate, with limited monitoring, then leave alone? These are answers that should be addressed before the program is begun. Thank you very much.

Correspondence ID: 4606Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mill Valley, CA 94941
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 09:26:08

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I Strongly Oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Thank you for Recording My comments.

Correspondence ID: 4614Project:112008Document:132104

Address: PLEASANT HILL, CA 94523
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 09:28:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in favor of restoring Grizzly bears to this area in a humane way that supports the surrounding environment.

Correspondence ID: 4615Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Martinsburg, WV 25403
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 09:28:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support grizzly bear recovery in North Cascades National Park.

Correspondence ID: 4622Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Oklahoma City, OK 73107
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 09:31:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The Grizzly Bear is the quintessential symbol of Wilderness and wildness in America and Canada. Grizzlies historically roamed what today is North Cascade National Park and the surrounding Wilderness and wildlands of north-central Washington--and we should help grizzlies return to this landscape. I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness. I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection. Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest. A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive. For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Thank you,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 4624Project:112008Document:132104
 Address: Mattawa, WA 99349
 United States of America
 Outside Organization: Individual Unaffiliated Individual
 Received: Oct,31 2023 09:31:57
 Correspondence Type: Web Form
 Correspondence: I, vehemently, oppose bringing Grizzly Bears into the North Cascades without 100% protection

with the Endangered Species Act! No exceptions.

Correspondence ID: 4631Project:112008Document:132104
 Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
 United States of America
 Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
 Received: Oct,31 2023 09:35:51
 Correspondence Type: Web Form
 Correspondence: I support the North Cascades Grizzly Bear Proposed 10(j) Rule

Correspondence ID: 4632Project:112008Document:132104
 Address: Mechanicville, NY 12118-0288
 United States of America
 Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
 Received: Oct,31 2023 09:35:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We must act within the letter and the spirit of the law when dealing with Wilderness areas. Wilderness should, as much as possible, be left in the hands of nature. Humans have done a lot of damage to many places in this country in many ways. In recognition of all this, Congress has set aside Wilderness areas that are meant to be free from human interference. We must undo the damage we have done as gently as possible and allow for nature to heal itself without our heavy handed interference.

I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Thank you for your consideration.

Correspondence ID: 4637Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Palatine, IL 60074-1291
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 09:39:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do NOT support the re-establishment of Grizzly Bears into the North Cascades Ecosystem. There are already too many people living and hiking through the area. The black bear population is sufficient enough and also causes enough problems with human interactions. I cannot think of anything worse than coming face to face with a grizzly while on a hike or fishing trip. This re-introduction plan is a foolish idealistic idea. You might as well want to re-introduce T-Rexs too

and we know how well that idea worked in the Crichton(?) novels. This idea should be STOPPED immediately and finally now!

Correspondence ID: 4639Project:112008Document:132104
Address: BELLEVUE, WA 98008-5306
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 09:39:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please bring the Cascades back to equilibrium and help all the animals live where they lived 300 years ago.

Correspondence ID: 4642Project:112008Document:132104
Address: placencia, CA 92870
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 09:42:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

I believe placing radio collars on wildlife, and effects that the electromagnetic frequencies have on them. Even if most wildlife mgmt personnel see this tool as very necessary to "manage" these animals, these devices may be doing great harm, including effecting their natural ability to navigate, effect heart & nervous systems, and, possibly making them more obvious, (less stealth), to prey & predator.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 4644Project:112008Document:132104

Address: McNeal, AZ 85617
United States of America
Outside Organization: Ms. Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 09:42:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Our forests need grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 4646Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Santa Rosa Valley, CA 93012
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 09:42:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

Correspondence ID: 4650Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Baltimore, MD 21227
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 09:43:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Correspondence ID: 4652Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Anchorage, AK 99504
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 09:44:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I love nature and wildlife. I hate how humanity just destroys nature and sends wildlife into extinction due to their greed or ignorance. Our gov't fails, hunters fail, even groups trying to conserve nature and wildlife fail. How will nature and wildlife survive with all this failure? Most likely it won't and you are to blame, your face, your name, your position will be held accountable.

- I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.
- Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next

to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

- I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.
- Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.
- A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.
- For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.
- An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.
- The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

If you have any good in you, save the grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 4657Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Boonville, MO 65233
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 09:46:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Thank you for allowing the public to participate process to allow Grizzly bears to populate and thrive in the Northern Cascades Ecosystem. Grizzlies are important apex predators needing large unbroken wilderness.

I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives in the DEIS as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives

thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Again, thank you for allowing the public to participate in this very important issue. I'm looking forward to the Final EIS.

Correspondence ID: 4663Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mount Pleasant, MI 48858
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 09:48:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Reintroduction should only occur if it will not violate wilderness act. Allowing bears to migrate in from Canada may be the best option. Thank you for your consideration.

Correspondence ID: 4664Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Oceanside, CA 92057-8344
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 09:49:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: National Park Service, I like many, are all for returning wild grizzlies to the wild, to Montana, for what makes America's wild, truly wild, filled with wonderous creatures and the awe and wonder they bestow, is having them the grizzly bear be there in its native habitat.

Correspondence ID: 4672Project:112008Document:132104
Address: New York, NY 10025
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 09:50:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am convinced that biodiversity--even grizzlies and alligators and poisonous snakes and bugs--make the earth a hospitable place for humans. We have to learn to be part of that biodiversity

Correspondence ID: 4673Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Boulder Creek, CA 95006
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 09:52:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear National Park Service and U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service:

I support the restoration of grizzlies to North Cascade National Park and the surrounding Wilderness and wildlands of north-central Washington, where they formerly roamed. But the restoration must be done thoughtfully, in ways that don't violate

the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character, AND in ways that minimize human handling and harassment of grizzlies. Wilderness protection requires using ways to recover the area's grizzly population that avoid the use of helicopters, motor vehicles and equipment, electronic installations, and trammeling or manipulating the landscape or its wildlife. This would be good for bears and for Wilderness.

However, as they now stand, both of the action alternatives you propose would violate the Wilderness Act. They call for 50 to 400 helicopter landings and twice that many helicopter flights, all, or almost all, in Wilderness areas, lasting indefinitely for monitoring and managing bear movement and numbers. The action alternatives should therefore be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, to avoid the placement and use of telemetry installations, and to eliminate the heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean that grizzlies fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection. Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than about protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives, thus reducing the need for wilderness-degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred. An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should therefore also be analyzed. The no-action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 4675Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Grand Isle, VT 05458
United States of America
Outside Organization: Title Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 09:53:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please protect black bears in the wilderness, and help park visitors learn how to do that safely.

Correspondence ID: 4676Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Medina, OH 44256
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 09:53:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: • I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.
• Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.
• I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.
• Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the

ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

- A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.
- For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.
- An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.
- The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

People cannot continue to think that the Earth's resources are here entirely for his/her benefit. We have got to protect America's wildlife before it disappears. Grizzlies are a vital link in the ecosystem and they must be given the space and protection needed to thrive. People must be educated about the grizzlies' lives, habits, and needs and learn to respect these magnificent beings.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 4679Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Menlo Park, CA 94025
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 09:54:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of grisly bears to northern parks.

Correspondence ID: 4681Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Rehoboth, MA 02769
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 09:54:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Recover a healthy grizzly bear population in the North Cascades, but the effort must be done in a way that protects and enhances the area's wilderness character and that also minimizes the human handling and harassment of grizzlies. As they've been here before (:+D) let Grizzlies live long and prosper....

Correspondence ID: 4683Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Haverhill, MA 01832
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 09:57:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Correspondence ID: 4684Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Edwards, CO 81632
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 09:57:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

Correspondence ID: 4685Project:112008Document:132104

Address: salem, NH 03079
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 09:58:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 4687Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Watertown, TN 37184
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 09:59:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 4688Project:112008Document:132104

Address: edgewood, MD 21040
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 09:59:45

Correspondence Type:Web Form

Correspondence: Save the grizzlies

Correspondence ID: 4689Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Anchorage, AK 99501
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 10:00:06

Correspondence Type:Web Form

Correspondence: Leave the Grizzly's alone!!!!!!

Correspondence ID: 4690Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Garner, NC 27526
United States of America

Outside Organization: N/A Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 10:00:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am supporting the efforts to return grizzly bears to the North Cascades. Like so many of the wildlife that we (humans) have had a negative impact on, I believe that we have an obligation to learn how to exist along side wildlife and benefit from their presence.

Correspondence ID: 4692Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Fort Gratiot, MI 48059

United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 10:00:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please restore Grizzly bears to ALL wilderness areas in north America including the North Cascades!! We & the ecosystems need them to survive.

Thank you!!!

█

Correspondence ID: 4695Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lucca, UN 55100

Italy

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 10:01:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 4698Project:112008Document:132104

Address: New York, NY 10065

United States of America

Outside Organization: Upper Green Side Non-Governmental(Official Rep.)

Received: Oct,31 2023 10:01:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Re-evaluate the extensive use of helicopters, please!

Most sincerely,

█

Correspondence ID: 4708Project:112008Document:132104

Address: DURHAM, NC 27705

United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 10:07:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support restoring grizzlies to the North Cascades; the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

But both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act by allowing helicopter landings and

flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and heavy-handed management of bears. There is no need for these: there are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness. Also, please note that Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

I urge that you strongly consider a natural recovery alternative, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

Natural recovery alternatives greatly reduce the need for activities that are hard on both the bears and the wilderness. Ideally, you would work with British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from dwindling over time and becoming inbred.

A natural recovery alternative that includes population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be considered.

The no-action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 4709Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Dafter, MI 49724
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 10:07:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Bears, especially the Grizzly Bear, is an iconic symbol of freedom. There is much to admire about them when seeing them in the wild. They play an integral part in the ecosystem. By being omnivorous, they are opportunistic feeders and cull weak and inferior prey. I hope they will remain protected in the wild now and for many years in the future.

Correspondence ID: 4712Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Boulder, CO 80302
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 10:10:15

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Whatever happens to the grizzlies, they must be protected. If moving them from one state to another means they lose protection, then don't move them! They need safe corridors to move about on their own. Any restoration plans must be done within the definition of Wilderness as it applies to government lands.

Correspondence ID: 4713Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kensingtonq, MD 20895
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 10:10:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Reconsider your approach to grizzly recovery in the North Cascades.

I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, but the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the

Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

Reintroduce the bears, but keep the wilderness as wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 4714Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Marietta, GA 30068
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 10:11:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Do not proceed with restoration in such a reckless manner. Relocation is NOT restoration!

Correspondence ID: 4721Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Santa Fe, NM 87506
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 10:16:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness. I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection. Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

Correspondence ID: 4729Project:112008Document:132104
Address: St Paul, MN 55102
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 10:20:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/Environmental Impact Statement, North Cascades Ecosystem

Correspondence ID: 4732Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Columbia Crossroads, PA 16914
United States of America
Outside Organization: None Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 10:23:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: This is written to support the recovery of the grizzly population in the North Cascades, but it should be done in a way that does not violate the Wilderness Act: natural processes for recovery should be prioritized over the import of bears from Ofer areas which would require the use of helicopters for transport and monitoring which goes against any idea

of "wilderness". Furthermore, the population should not be declared as experimental as that could undermine the protection of the bears.

While these restrictions may seem cumbersome I encourage you to look at them as an important practice in a necessary attitude change: we have been thinking in a model of domination of nature and others for so long that it has become second nature to us, but in order to live sustainably we have to change our mindset and become vastly more economical with our interventions, sort of like an ecological martial arts. The lack of technology has not prevented indigenous people from managing their environments effectively and sustainably, better than we have done.

Thank you for the opportunity to give feedback!

Correspondence ID: 4733Project:112008Document:132104

Address: santa fe, NM 87505
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 10:23:08

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm a retired wildlife biologist with radio tracking experience, many hours in helicopters. Use of helicopters in wilderness, and radio collaring need to be avoided. Bears need full protection of the ESA, not experimental. Mexican Gray wolves are designated experimental and it has proved to be a poor and stupid decision.

I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

* Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

* I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

* Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

* A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

* For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

* An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

* The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 4734Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Rochelle patk, NJ 07662
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 10:24:43

Correspondence Type:Web Form

Correspondence: Please take care of the environment

Correspondence ID: 4735Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mullica Hill, NJ, NJ 08062
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 10:24:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: After what people/business are doing to Earth; any/all animals need our help to stay alive. The human population is over 8 billion. Humans need more space; so animals are slaughtered.

Look at NJ; a while ago it was the "Garden State". Now NJ is the "Complex State";

In other words; WAKE-UP.

Correspondence ID: 4738Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Orchard Park, NY 14127
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 10:26:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello.

I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

As you know, Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas (like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.)

A natural recovery alternative *must be* fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active re-population. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active re-population urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed. The no-action alternative has many good "Bear Smart" components related to how people and

communities can coexist with grizzly bears -- and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. In sum, ALL possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 4739Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Suisun City, CA 94585
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 10:26:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 4740Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Moravske Toplice, UN 9226
Slovenia

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 10:28:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support grizzly recovery in the North Cascades. At the same time, I believe it should be done in a way that does not compromise wilderness. Grizzlies should not be relocated from places that cannot afford to lose them and should not lose ESA protections; rather, corridors should be protected so they can naturally migrate.

Correspondence ID: 4746Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Venice, FL 34293
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 10:30:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act

Correspondence ID: 4749Project:112008Document:132104

Address: San Francisco, CA 94110
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 10:36:08

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is beneficial both for bears and Wilderness.

The action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act and should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

In the interest of wise wildlife management according to my understanding the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 4750Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Laguna Beach, CA 92651
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 10:36:55

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: just do it

Correspondence ID: 4754Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Denver, CO 80207
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 10:38:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Help monitor and protect this animal we killed off!

Correspondence ID: 4759Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Loveland, CO, CO 80537
United States of America

Outside Organization: Individual CO resident & United States citizen Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 10:41:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To the National Park Service:

I strongly support recovering a healthy grizzly bear population in the North Cascades, but the effort must be done in a way that protects and enhances the area's wilderness character and that also minimizes the human handling and harassment of grizzlies. Please reconsider your approach to your plan for grizzly bear management, and protect these magnificent animals and preserve their habitat!

I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would VIOLATE the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to AVOID helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next

to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I STRONGLY OPPOSE the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies ARE NOT YET RECOVERED under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be MORE ABOUT PROTECTING AGENCY DISCRETION than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive. PUT THE GRIZZLIES AS THE FIRST PRIORITY, PLEASE!

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation UNDER FULL ESA PROTECTIONS should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities CAN COEXIST with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park. HUMAN ENCROACHMENT CANNOT PREVENT THE PROTECTION AND PRESERVATION OF GRIZZLY BEARS!

Sincerely,

██████████
Loveland, CO

Correspondence ID: 4760Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Eagle, CO 81631
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 10:41:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection. As a resident of Colorado, I am seeing this play put in real time with wolf reintroduction and have grave concerns that in this situation, bears would lose ESA protection.

Montana doesn't have "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 4761Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Marysville, WA 98270
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 10:41:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to address the Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Environmental Impact Statement, North Cascades Ecosystem. I urge the NPS and USFWS to choose Alternative B: reintroduction and management under the Endangered Species Act (ESA).

Grizzly bears are an important part of a thriving ecosystem in the North Cascades and their reintroduction would help balance this wild area. However, a reintroduction as suggested in Alternative C would not facilitate the full potential of this work. Grizzlies are listed as a threatened in the ESA and therefore need to be managed as such--allowing a broader interpretation of how they can be managed would hurt the stated goal of the program of "restoring the grizzly bear to the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE) grizzly bear recovery zone, a portion of its historical range."

Thank you for your time.

Correspondence ID: 4763Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Loveland, CO 80537
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 10:42:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To the National Park Service:

I strongly support recovering a healthy grizzly bear population in the North Cascades, but the effort must be done in a way that protects and enhances the area's wilderness character and that also minimizes the human handling and harassment of grizzlies. Please reconsider your approach to your plan for grizzly bear management, and protect these magnificent animals and preserve their habitat!

I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would VIOLATE the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to AVOID helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer

clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I STRONGLY OPPOSE the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies ARE NOT YET RECOVERED under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be MORE ABOUT PROTECTING AGENCY DISCRETION than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive. PUT THE GRIZZLIES AS THE FIRST PRIORITY, PLEASE!

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation UNDER FULL ESA PROTECTIONS should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities CAN COEXIST with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Sincerely,

██████████
Loveland, CO

Correspondence ID: 4766Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Simi, CA 93065
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 10:44:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Top predators like bears are often in contact with people, as we encroach on their territory. Rules should give the most protections to bears and their habitat.

Correspondence ID: 4767Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Inver Grove Hts, MN 55076
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 10:44:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Yes, I am in favor of introducing grizzly bears back to the north Cascades. They were here before us and deserve to have their niche back. Any bit of land to live on, diversity is a

good thing. Please approve the reintroduction of grizzly bears back to the north Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 4770Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98107
United States of America
Outside Organization: Woodland Park Zoo, Seattle Conservation/Preservation
Received: Oct,31 2023 10:45:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I fully support the grizzly bear restoration plan. We removed them from our environment and we have an amazing opportunity to restore them. A healthy population of native animals, as well as native plants and trees, creates a healthy environment for us, our children, and our grandchildren. I am 81 and grieve the frightening loss of the natural world. We humans evolved to co-exist in nature. When we remove or eliminate parts of it the whole is threatened and our wellbeing is at risk. Please protect and restore our precious northwest environment so generations to come can have a healthy and complete experience with the natural world. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 4771Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Wilsonville, OR 97070
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 10:46:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello,
I am writing to express my support of the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades. In addition, the restoration must be done in ways that do not violate the Wilderness Act. Unfortunately, both of the action alternatives would violate the Wilderness Act as they stand now. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter flights and landing in the Wilderness, to change the placement and use of telemetry installations, and to avoid the heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect the recovery area that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters in the Wilderness.

Please note that I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection. Also, Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

The natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

Lastly, for the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred. The natural recovery should be combined with population augmentation under full ESA protections.

Thank you for time and assistance in this matter.

Correspondence ID: 4772Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Portage, MI 49002
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 10:46:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am concerned about efforts to regulate grizzly bears in the Cascade Mountains. I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, but that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act because they involve the use of helicopters, technology, and equipment which is not in keeping with Wilderness principles.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

Therefore a natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The primary criteria should be to protect Wilderness while creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

Obviously the situation for bears, Wilderness protection, and communities is complicate. The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 4773Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Nuevo, CA 92567
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 10:46:52

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Leave God's nature and animals alone. He gave them to all people to enjoy on this earth

Correspondence ID: 4776Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Las Vegas, NV 89121
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 10:48:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 4780Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Silver City, NM 88061
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 10:51:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I SUPPORT THE RESTORATION OF GRIZZLIES to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that DON'T VIOLATE THE WILDERNESS ACT and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites WITHOUT THE USE OF HELICOPTERS inside Wilderness.

I OPPOSE the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

Correspondence ID: 4787Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lanham, MD 20706
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 10:56:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: It's important to support recovery of a healthy grizzly bear population in the North Cascades, but the effort must be done so as to protect and enhance the area's wilderness character, while also minimizing the human handling and harassment of grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 4795Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Louisville, CO 80027
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 11:01:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am submitting the following comments because I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Unfortunately both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Please keep in mind that Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

I firmly believe that a natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

Clearly an alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments regarding this critically important issue. And thank you for your work on behalf of America.

Correspondence ID: 4798Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Pahoa, HI 96778
United States of America

Outside Organization: - Select - Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 11:04:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 4804Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Saint Paul, MN 55117
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 11:05:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support a strong grizzly bear population in the North Cascades region, if it can be done in an environmentally sound way and does not endanger people.

Correspondence ID: 4808Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Ferndale, WA 98248
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 11:07:19
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Parks Service,

As a National and Washington State Parks member, I ask that you hear my voice on plans to reintroduce Grizzly Bears into The North Cascades National Park. I used the North Cascades National Park. I believe Grizzly Bears are an essential species to this landscape and should be used as a tool for education for respecting wildlife and their habitat.

All my life with family reunions held near Mazama since I was a little girl. For the last twenty years I lived in Canada, on the East Slopes of the Rocky Mountains, near Banff-Canmore area of Alberta. My husband and I brought undergrad business students and MBAs into the wilderness with traditional elders to learn from the land and become closer to themselves. David loved Grizzly Bears and always said he wanted to always live in a world where he could be eaten by a Great One (our respectful name for these honorable species). We lived adjoining Grizzly Bear habitat and never had a problem, as we, and our community, were careful regarding our behavior with garbage and food storage. We knew how to act when we encountered a bear and we respected their space. Two years ago my husband was trail running near our home and encountered a momma grizzly on her way to the summer feeding grounds near Banff. Because he was trail running, he likely did not see or notice her warnings to stop or stay away. This is the problem with any fast focused trail activity. One must keep broad awareness in the bust, especially in the evenings, and especially in April and May when young are being guided out of the winter dens. David raised his arm up to block something touching his back and they both fell off an embankment. David hit his head on a tree on the way down, ending his life. The bear tried to pull him down to the river. She tried to make sense of what had happened, and when she could not, she left quickly. Conservation officers demonstrated she had not been a problem bear and has been peaceful since. She did exactly what she was supposed to do in that encounter. David was in the wrong by trail running in the woods in early May at dusk.

As long as we can negotiate the interface between bears and humans, such that humans do not engage in hyper focused activities like trail running, biking, or off roading, then we must have bears living where humans recreate. The bears must also be healthy bears that do not have a history of reward garbage meals or comfort around humans. As long as humans are educated and act in line with what they know, this will be a great opportunity for humans to learn about wild places and how they can enter them protected, by being prepared.

Thank you for reading this. I will not be afraid of bears, except for what allows for a healthy awareness and prepared actions for a peaceful encounter. It is the ultimate excersize in yielding space, something is humans could learn so much more about. Please reintroduce the bears. This is their land.

Sincerely,


Correspondence ID: 4811Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Cromwell, CT 06416
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 11:09:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support restoring grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 4828Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mayfield, KY 42066
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 11:16:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of grizzlies into the Cascades. Everything we do to restore our wilderness heritage will be appreciated by our descendents.

Correspondence ID: 4851Project:112008Document:132104

Address: arvada, CO 80005
United States of America

Outside Organization: MHP Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 11:29:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Help restore the iconic grizzly into its original home range and expand their biological diversity!

Correspondence ID: 4853Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Etna, NY 13062
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 11:29:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support recovering a healthy grizzly bear population in the North Cascades, but the effort must be done in a way that protects and enhances the area's wilderness character and that also minimizes the human handling and harassment of grizzlies.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

Correspondence ID: 4856Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kirkland, WA 98033
United States of America

Outside Organization: none Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 11:30:52

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active

repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

Correspondence ID: 4861Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Gualala, CA 95445
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 11:33:41

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I fully support recovering a healthy grizzly bear population in the North Cascades, but the effort must be done in a way that protects and enhances the area's wilderness character and that also minimizes the human handling and harassment of grizzlies. The restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears *and* Wilderness.

It is my understanding that both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

In keeping with the rubric of least invasive restoration methods, I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection. Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

It is important that we keep an eye towards restoring ecosystems in the most balanced and organic way possible, for long-lasting results and least impacts on other aspects of the ecosystems or the wider web of life. To this end, a natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed. The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 4863Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Massapequa, NY 11758
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 11:34:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next

to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

Correspondence ID: 4869Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801

United States of America

Outside Organization: Citizen Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 11:38:56

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am opposed to the proposed grizzly bear introduction to the North Cascades area-----am opposed now, and was opposed in 2019 when the exact same proposal was resoundingly voted down by the people of Central Washington. I believe option A is the correct choice.

I am an avid outdoorsman who has hiked and backpacked all over the Cascade mountains and have enjoyed the comfort knowing that I won't have to worry about a grizzly bear encounter. I have met many of the same who specifically come to this region to recreate grizzly free. This, I think, is a significant factor in producing recreational dollars for our area, and should be seriously considered in regard to the reintroduction plan

Listen to our Representative Dan Newhouse, who summarizes the sentiment of our region, back in 2019, and now in 2023. No grizzly bear introduction to the North cascades! Period!

Correspondence ID: 4870Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Orange, CA 92866

United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 11:38:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The last grizzly in my neck of the woods was killed in 1902. And my state flag proudly places the grizzly as its centerpiece. Grizzlies are apex predators that are necessary for the balance of nature. We cannot retrieve what's lost but we can save what's left.

Correspondence ID: 4876Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Old Bridge, NJ 08857

United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 11:43:56

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I Believe moving the Bears is a bad choice there so many moving parts that can and will go wrong . This population of Grizzlies need To be protected not Moved to another area where seems to be way more in favor of Ranchers Trappers and Trophy hunters killing our Wildlife

Correspondence ID: 4878Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wilson, WY 83914

United States of America

Outside Organization: n/a Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 11:45:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please consider how important Grizzlies are to the Rocky Mountain eco system. No and accordingly, please say yes to Grizzlies. Protect wolves as well. We need these large predators to keep the flora and fauna in balance. The issue is human encroachment. HUMAN damage MUST be limited.

Thank you-

Correspondence ID: 4882Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Virginia Beach, VA 23454
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 11:51:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: participated in a Grizzly bear study on genetic diversity in the population around Glacier National Park. We hiked in and out, we did NOT try to engage in any way with the bears.

I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection. Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades.

Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed. The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region.

Correspondence ID: 4890Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Moriarty, NM 87035
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 11:57:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I definitely support Grizzly bears restoration program. They are as part of our eco system as humans. I understand the danger they can pose, but so does driving down the interstate highway.

Correspondence ID: 4895Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bonita Springs, FL 34134-6916
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 12:00:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: While I strongly support grizzly bear restoration to its historical range, it CANNOT be done by violating the enabling legislation of The Wilderness Act of 1964. Compliance with the law is mandatory and NOT optional.

Correspondence ID: 4897Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Reno, NV 89509
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 12:04:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: You are monsters and murderers. Bears and wolves are not monsters who need to be eliminated, YOU ARE. Stop giving people "permission" to murder these beings. You need to realize that your grandchildren will despise you for killing these beings and destroying forests, no matter how much blood money you leave them.

Here are more polite words from Wilderness Watch:

I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 4903Project:112008Document:132104

Address: La Selva Beach, CA 95076-1609
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 12:10:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Don't we need to protect ALL flora & fauna to insure that a healthy ecosystem will continue for ALL Life on OUR SHARED planet??

Correspondence ID: 4904Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bullard, TX 75757
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 12:10:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness. I support restoration.

Correspondence ID: 4905Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Battle Ground, WA 98604
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 12:10:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both action alternatives would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 4909Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Redlands, CA 92373-6880
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 12:14:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears are American bears and belong in the environment. Please protect them.

Correspondence ID: 4912Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Phoenixville, PA 19460
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 12:15:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: **SAVE THE GRIZZLIES! THEY ARE PART OF OUR ECOSYSTEM. WE ARE CARE TAKERS OF THIS PLANET. THEY ARE PART OF IT. DO THE RIGHT THING...SAVE OUR PLANET AND THIS IS PART OF IT. PERIOD!!**

Correspondence ID: 4913Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 12:16:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I approve of this plan, and hope that you move forward with Alternative C, introducing them as a 10j population.

Correspondence ID: 4915Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Northfield, OH 44067
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 12:18:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Man is supposed to Protect NOT Harm! Do it!

Correspondence ID: 4917Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Stockbridge, MI 49285
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 12:23:47
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do all you can to protect grizzly bears for now and generations to come. They are important to the ecosystem where they live and have a right to live in peace.

Correspondence ID: 4918Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Kent, WA 98031
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 12:24:19
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I very much support the full restoration and protection of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

To be clear, the goal IS NOT to fiscal subsidize or benefit any politically connected private group or corporate use of public lands or resources! Regarding the Act as written both alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act so I offer the following modifications be included:

- The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.
- I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.
- Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.
- A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting

Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

- For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

- An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

- The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Thank you for addressing this most ecologically beneficial action. I just hope you'll stop addressing it from an "ecologically beneficial perspective" rather than continuing the very delusional short-sighted humanity survival risking "political perspective".

Correspondence ID: 4922Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Walnut Creek, CA 94597
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 12:26:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing this in support of the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades. The restoration needs to be accomplished in ways that do not violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness - current alternatives do not accomplish this

Correspondence ID: 4923Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Nogal, NM 88341
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 12:29:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears.

Correspondence ID: 4926Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Orlando, FL 32806
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 12:31:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, but the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This must be good for both the bears and the Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer

clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I also oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

What ever action is taken it must be taken in regards to the best ways to not only protect the environment but also the majestic grizzly bear that depends on us to save and protect them with the least interaction with humans possible.

Correspondence ID: 4929Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Berkeley, CA 94708
United States of America
Outside Organization: self Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 12:38:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act or harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. Avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. Bears can be released using the many inroads into the recovery area.T

The use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work is a bad idea, allowing the relocation of fully protected bears under the ESA, to lose their protection in the new area. Please don't do it.

Montana and other nearby locales don't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades; they are needed for the recovery of their own area. A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests repopulation would be a great way to achieve safe habitat for bears.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed. The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with

grizzly bears; these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 4931Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Berkeley, CA 94703
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 12:42:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: WE have found in Yellowstone that bring back top predators tends to regulate the entire ecosystem. Nature has a balance, we disrupt it at our peril. Please help restore the balance in areas where we can.

Correspondence ID: 4932Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mobridge, SD 57601
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 12:42:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Today, I would like to encourage you to reconsider your approach to grizzly recovery in the North Cascades.

I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

I believe a natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

From what I have read, for the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Thanks for allowing comments on this.

Correspondence ID: 4938Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kittitas, WA 98934
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 12:53:31

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Wild wolves and grizzlies' have been our wilderness managers for millions of years. They are the keepers of the balance in nature.

Trophy hunting has done nothing but wipe our our keystone predators for decades. There is no need to tamper with nature as humans have done enough damage for decades.

Seattle's 1854 Oration -ver.1.

WHEN THE LAST REDMAN
HAS VANISHED FROM THE EARTH,
AND THE MEMORY IS ONLY THE SHADOW
OF A CLOUD PASSING OVER THE PRAIRIE,
THESE SHORES AND FOREST WILL
STILL HOLD THE SPIRITS OF MY PEOPLE,
FOR THEY LOVE THIS EARTH AS
THE NEWBORN LOVES ITS MOTHER'S HEARTBEAT.....
CONTINUE TO CONTAMINATE YOUR BED,
AND YOU WILL ONE NIGHT SUFFOCATE
IN YOUR OWN WASTE,
WHEN THE BUFFALO ARE ALL SLAUGHTERED,
THE WILD HORSES ALL TAMED,
THE SECRET CORNERS OF THE FOREST
HEAVY WITH THE SCENT OF MEN,
AND THE VIEW OF THE RIPE HILLS
BLOTTED BY TALKING WIRES,
WHERE IS THE THICKET? GONE.
WHERE IS THE EAGLE? GONE.
AND WHAT IS IT TO SAY GOODBYE
TO THE SWIFT AND THE HUNT?
THE END OF LIVING
AND THE BEGINNING OF SURVIVAL...

"CHIEF SEATTLE 1855"

Correspondence ID: 4945Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Minnetonka, MN 55305
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 13:03:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the

ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

Correspondence ID: 4947Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Huntington Beach, CA 92649
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 13:05:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear NPS,

I strongly support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that do not violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good and fair for bears and for the Wilderness.

Thank you,
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 4952Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Glendale, CA 91206
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 13:10:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear National Park Service,

Grizzlies historically roamed what today is North Cascade National Park and the surrounding Wilderness and wildlands of north-central Washington--and we should help grizzlies return to this landscape. Therefore, I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Thank you for your time!

Sincerely,

Correspondence ID: 4958Project:112008Document:132104

Address: West Lafayette, IN 47906
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 13:15:03

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, but only if that restoration is done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are roads that bisect the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work.

Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. • An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 4959Project:112008Document:132104

Address: St. Paul, MN 55118
United States of America

Outside Organization: none Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 13:15:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Establishing a new population of grizzley bears in Washington State would greatly help to preserve this iconic American species.

Correspondence ID: 4960Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kansas City, MO 64111-2927
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 13:16:31

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I agree with Dawn Serra of Wilderness Watch that this proposed Grizzly Bear Restoration Action Plan is heavy-handed and counterproductive; in fact, it sounds more like a Chamber of Commerce Corporate Jobs and Busy-Work Plan than anything else. Please, please, PLEASE follow the WW's suggestions and come up with a non-invasive, natural recovery alternative that does not violate the Wilderness Act and Endangered Species Act.

I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 4961Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Boston, MA 02124
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 13:18:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears play a critical role in the environments they inhabit. Whenever a keystone species is eliminated from its habitat, there are downstream impacts on the rest of the ecosystem. I think if it is within the federal government's power to reintroduce Grizzlies to this habitat they have a moral duty to do so.

As climate change threatens many species and their habitats, having as many viable populations as possible becomes critical to overcoming a potential biodiversity crisis. To say nothing of the cultural importance of the bears and the awe they inspire.

Correspondence ID: 4975Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Morrow, GA 30260
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 13:30:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly Bears need protection. They are an essential part of our ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 4978Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Pittsboro, NC 27312
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 13:32:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Just want you to know that I support expansion of large predators in the northern Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 4981Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 13:34:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Howdy

Not enough time to comment. Please extend comment period deadline.

Correspondence ID: 5000Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Penn Valley, CA 95946
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 13:55:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Sir:

Thank you for the chance to comment on the Park Services' proposal to relocate Grizzly bear to the Cascades. I request the Park Service cancel this misguided proposal entirely. There are no spare grizzly bears to relocate. They're endangered and must not be used in risky projects that may or most likely fail to achieve the desired result. Cancel the NEPA analysis. Leave the ones we have alone, please.

No disrespect intended but the Park Service must concentrate entirely on protecting the endangered grizzly bears we still have. Let them relocate on their own free from the meddling hand of mankind.

Thank you for reading and carrying out my important request.

██████████

Correspondence ID: 5003Project:112008Document:132104
Address: ALTAMONTE SPRINGS, FL 32701
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 13:57:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

Correspondence ID: 5007Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Rutledge, MO 63563
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 13:59:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hey, they were here first!

Correspondence ID: 5008Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Santa Barbara, CA 93101
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 14:00:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear NPS and USFWS Officials:

My family and I welcome this opportunity to submit our comments re: the Draft EIS.

We fully support recovering a healthy Grizzly bear population in the North Cascades. We hope that the NPS and USFWS will work hard to ensure that future Grizzly bear populations are protected, and that the restoration of their populations is done in such a fashion as to enhance the wilderness character of the North Cascades. All of this must be done in a way that minimizes human handling and harassment of the Grizzlies.

It will be wonderful to see the Grizzly bears come into their own as a keystone species and predator of the North Cascades. We hope everything that can be done will be done to make this happen.

Thank you for your consideration of our comments herein.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 5009Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Columbia, MD 21045-5206
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 14:01:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Restore ecosystems. Only 3 percent of the original forests are left. Save what is left.

Correspondence ID: 5011Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Aloha, OR 97003
United States of America
Outside Organization: Salutation* Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 14:07:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We need to maintain wildlife populations.
https://www.ted.com/talks/george_monbiot_for_more_wonder_rewild_the_world?language=en

Correspondence ID: 5015Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Los Angeles, CA 90005
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 14:16:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Whereas I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, this restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to COMPLETELY EXCLUDE helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection. MONTANA DOES NOT HAVE "EXTRA" GRIZZLY BEARS TO PICK UP AND DRAG VIA HELICOPTER TO THE NORTH CASCADES! (Whoever, not in their right mind, came up with this screwy idea should seriously reconsider!)

Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest. A sensible and natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation.

Thank you.

██████████
██████████

Correspondence ID: 5018Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seaside, CA 93955
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 14:18:31

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please pass the Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan. These bears are important for a balanced ecosystem to happen.

Correspondence ID: 5022Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bayport, MN 55003
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 14:19:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: It is essential to protect the Grizzly Bears and the North Cascades Ecosystem. They/it is a part of our American heritage and should be protected for all US citizens to enjoy.

Correspondence ID: 5030Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Abrams, WI 54101
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 14:28:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I thank the NPS for accepting public comments regarding options for returning grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem in Washington. I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and I respectfully urge the Service to reconsider its approach to grizzly recovery so that it is done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act or harm the area's wilderness character. This is a win-win for bears and the wilderness they call home.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate that Act unless they are modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, carefully consider the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of a heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection. Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades, as they are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred. An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Once again, I thank the NPS for accepting input from the public and for all it can do to ensure our struggling biodiversity has every chance to flourish.

Correspondence ID: 5031Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Indiana, PA 15701
United States of America
Outside Organization: N/A Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 14:28:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I urge you to draft grizzly bear restoration plan as part of preserving nature along with our planet.

Correspondence ID: 5036Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Petaluma, CA 94954
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 14:36:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected

under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 5037Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mercer Island, WA 98040
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 14:38:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a lifetime hiker and backpacker, I am adamantly against reintroducing Grizzly Bears into the North Cascades. I understand what it's like to hike and backpack in Grizzley Bear country, as I was raised camping, hiking and backpacking in Montana, Wyoming and Canada. Co-existing with Grizzley's is not for the masses. It requires careful consideration and planning to keep both the hiker/Camper and bear safe. We had to be extremely careful packing our food, hanging our food and self care products, and scheduling around post menstrual cycles.

The Cascade Mountains are too close to the Seattle Metro Area to deliberately populate the area with Grizzley bears. There are literally tens of thousands of hikers and campers who frequent the trailheads in National Parks and Forests ranging from south of Mt Adams to north of Mt Baker. Our trailheads are "bursting at the seams" on the weekends and busy during the weekday. It's a mixed blessing. It's great to have Washingtonians appreciating our parks and natural areas. But we it's a recipe for disaster if you've got such a large population of outdoor enthusiasts who have no experience sharing their natural areas with Grizzlies. And as an avid hiker in the Northwest, I appreciate hiking in areas without the stress of encountering a Grizzley.

For the safety of our outdoor enthusiasts, I ask that you don't introduce a population of Grizzlies to Washington State. There is economic value in our Grizzley-free parks and forests by enabling more people to enjoy our forests. The end result of safe access to our parks and forests is a more eco-friendly population who appreciate the natural world.

Sincere regards,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 5038Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ashland, OR 97520
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 14:38:55

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please reconsider the policy that keep grizzlies out of the North Cascades--where they can take their place in our eco system.

Correspondence ID: 5042Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Lakewood, OH 44107
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 14:41:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Have a heart and draft grizzly bear restoration plan

Correspondence ID: 5043Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98136
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 14:47:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hello,

I support the plan to reintroduce grizzly bears into the north cascades wilderness. They are a keystone species and essential for the health and biodiversity of the ecosystem. And it is the right thing to do. The bears were here before us western colonial types showed up and they deserve to be back.

Correspondence ID: 5046Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Elyria, OH 44035
United States of America
Outside Organization: self Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 14:49:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please return grizzly bears to the area where they used to live.

Correspondence ID: 5049Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Altamonte Springs, FL 32701
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 14:52:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

Correspondence ID: 5051Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Snohomish, WA 98290
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 14:53:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am writing as a private citizen and former college instructor with a B.A. in Biology (retired) to express my enthusiastic support for the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades. Historically, these mountains have been grizzly bear territory and the ecology of the area can only be improved with the addition of these predators who will help balance the montane ecosystems.

Correspondence ID: 5053Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Beaverton, RI 97005
United States of America
Outside Organization: Mazamas Mountaineering Club Recreational Groups(Official Rep.)
Received: Oct,31 2023 14:54:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzly bears to the North Cascades NP in ways that do not violate the Wilderness Act in any way, shape or form. Thus allowing the wilderness to remain the same after the intro of grizzly bears.

Correspondence ID: 5055Project:112008Document:132104
Address: clinton, OK 73601
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 14:56:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness. I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection. Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest. A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive. For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred. An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed. The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park. Your attention to this most urgent matter would be much appreciated by all present & future generations of all species. Predators are vital for ecosystem balance.
Thank you

Correspondence ID: 5057Project:112008Document:132104
Address: SEATTLE, WA, WA 98118
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 14:58:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness. I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous

Correspondence ID: 5059Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Select a Utility, OH 45213
United States of America
Outside Organization: Kohls Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 14:59:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please consider protecting the wildlife and Natural Habitat by acting properly and enviromentally correct in this process

Correspondence ID: 5060Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Melvindale, MI 48122-1010
United States of America
Outside Organization: NONE Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 15:00:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: PROTECT GRIZZLY BEARS, STOP THE SLAUGHTER!

Correspondence ID: 5062Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Nixa, MO 65714
United States of America
Outside Organization: N/A Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 15:02:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Sir,

There are multiple reasons I oppose any effort to remove in any grizzly bears from protections under the Wilderness Act. The simple fact, if you cared to understand it, is that every ecosystem depends upon a apex predator. The function of that predator is to always cull the weak and the sick. This is a critical function and without it, species weaken. The lack of an apex predator often means grazers will demolish the natural balance of trees and grasses. This plus the reasons below are why I strongly oppose any actions to remove grizzly protections. And besides why would we want to exterminate such a wonderful species?

I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 5069Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Folsom, CA 95630
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 15:07:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: "These magnificent creatures just want to live their lives and raise their families without our interference." Stop MURDERING bears.

Correspondence ID: 5073Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Santa Maria CA, CA 93455
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 15:14:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am in favor of the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades. The restoration should be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness .

Correspondence ID: 5078Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Eagan, MN 55121
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 15:22:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Do everything possible to let ALL of Natures creatures roam and flourish in ALL National Parks and National Forests. It is Time to Let Mother Nature reclaim the Wild areas and keep them Wild.

Correspondence ID: 5079Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sandy Hook, CT 06482
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 15:22:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear National Park Service and USF&W service,,
You spent millions to do a joint EIS which the plans you have are the most heavy-handed thing you could imagine. WHAT IS WRONG WITH YOU.

I support the no-action alternative because anything you taint with your so-called help ends up being disastrous for the animals always . Please think of the animals first and yourselves and your plans "to help" the grizzlies last.

The plan's alternatives do nothing except hound the grizzlies to death. Another shame on two agencies this time.

Sincerely,

██████████
██████████

Correspondence ID: 5081Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ashland, OR 97520
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 15:24:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act.

Correspondence ID: 5085Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Saint Petersburg, FL 33707-1143
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 15:27:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

Correspondence ID: 5092Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Jackson, MS 39211
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 15:40:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

Correspondence ID: 5094Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98125
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 15:42:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please, please act so that our parks are healthy environment for us and all living beings.

Correspondence ID: 5099Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Coppell, TX 75019
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 15:48:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Save the Grizzlies!

Correspondence ID: 5100Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Montgomery, AL 36109
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 15:48:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness. I

oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection. Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest. A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred. An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed. The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 5103Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ogden, UT 84404
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 15:52:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please make grizzly Bears your first thing to do in the Ecosystem. We need to stop all the things that have been going on with the bears and wolves. We need them for our children and grand children. So please do all that you can to help them.

Correspondence ID: 5106Project:112008Document:132104

Address: redwood city, CA 94062
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 15:54:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Please do all you can to save these animals from extinction.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 5107Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 94941
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 15:55:01

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: After reading the Draft Grizzly Restoration plan, I believe action of some kind must be taken. While Option B would allow for the least amount of interference in grizzly populations while they reestablish themselves, Option C is the most viable simply due to the safeguards for human and economic stability in the area. While I have some qualms with the idea that lethal take would be permitted, as that could be seen as a go-ahead for bear hunting, I believe that keeping it legal will allow communities that have historically used bears to continue their usage once populations have reached

sustainable levels. Clear laws and regulations outlining when and where bear hunting can occur are necessary. Additionally, I have some doubts about the viability of relocating bears: What is getting these new bears to stay put in the Cascades? Overall, I believe that Option C is the most viable in the long term and will provide the most sustainable co-use of the Northern Cascades between humans and grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 5111Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Arvada, CO 80002
United States of America
Outside Organization: N/A Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 16:12:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a former resident of Washington, I support the reintroduction of Grizzly Bears to the North Cascade ecosystem. Grizzlies exist in 4 of the lower 48 states, with only a few if any remaining in Washington State. This represents a fraction of their historical range. The North Cascades is listed as a Grizzly Recovery Zone and is the largest intact Grizzly habitat outside of Yellowstone, yet the current population is not large enough to sustain itself. Grizzlies must be reintroduced to reestablish connectivity throughout the Cascade range between Washington and British Columbia before this Distinct Population Segment goes extinct.

Correspondence ID: 5114Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Florence, OR 97439
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 16:15:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: • I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

- Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.
- I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.
- Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

Correspondence ID: 5121Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tonasket, WA 98855
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 16:34:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please note that i am in Absolute Favor of restoring the grizzly bear to cascades/ Pacific Northwest that is shown as plan section 10/j. There are several reason a couple of which is it would restore the ecosystem which has been diminished by the decline of the grizzly, there is more than enough room and would restore them to their historic habitat. I'm sure you're aware that there is public support for this and it is so important to me to try and leave this world as good as it can be for my grandkid's. I am heartbroken that we have eliminated them in this area due to hunting etc. please approve this restoration

Correspondence ID: 5135Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Manitoush Waters, WI 54545
United States of America
Outside Organization: retired faculty Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 17:01:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I live in a region of northern WI where black bears roam across our forests. There is bear hunting for a little over a month from Sept. through Oct, and with all weeks allowing the aid of dogs except the final week. I mention this to state my familiarity with living in an area where bears are present (and were there before "we" were). Grizzly bears in the NW area of the US described are a keystone species. This means that they are key to biodiversity--through their eating and mating habits, but most especially their range. As bears roam across their range they play a truly central role in protecting interspecies ecologies, including population numbers and propagation (seeds in fur and scat). This sparse knowledge, gleaned from public lectures by wildlife scientists, leads me to believe strongly that over managing species and especially managing or overmanaging them in intrusive ways, does not mean that the target species are living in the wild or naturally. The notion of repeated, routing helicopter flights is neither wise nor humane; indeed, it sounds traumatic. Noise and pollution and other disruption seem like the use of maximum tools to accomplish ends that do not truly depend on their usage. Moreover, what are the ends? The particular ends, include (I paraphrase the regional supervisor) where we want the bears and where we don't want them!! Undisturbed habitat would go a long way to bears remaining within a range. If bears need to be "channeled," there are many quite unintrusive ways to "direct" them, as we have seen in national parks. All efforts must be made to leave range and hibernation places undisturbed. I urgently request that the current method being proposed be reconsidered and set aside for something that will have ecological integrity and will cost less at the same time.

Correspondence ID: 5138Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Longmont, CO 80504
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 17:04:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness. I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Correspondence ID: 5146Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Granada Hills, CA 91344
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 17:24:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: They belong there.

Correspondence ID: 5147Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lake Geneva, WI 53147
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 17:26:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We need to reintroduce the native wildlife back to their natural home range. It is essential to keep the natural balance of wildlife. It is a healthier way to maintain our ecosystem. Relying on hunters (that cannot instinctively select the sick, weak, or diseased). Is not helping to prevent the spread of diseases.

Correspondence ID: 5148Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Van Nuys, CA 91405
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 17:28:00

Correspondence Type:Web Form

Correspondence: please protect bears and the wilderness

Correspondence ID: 5150Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Salt Lake City, UT 84105
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 17:28:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing as a

- Chairperson of [REDACTED],

- lawyer (JD [REDACTED] 1979),

- Biologist (BS [REDACTED] 1977, Phi Beta Kappa, magna cum laude) with a [REDACTED] Secondary Teaching Certificate (1977 - 1992) ,

- member of Union of Concerned Scientists,

- member of Patriotic Millionaires, and

- member of Wilderness Watch.

I support

- restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and

- that restoration being done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character.

This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act.

The action alternatives should be modified to

- avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness,

- avoid the placement and use of telemetry installations, and

- steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears.

There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses.

Such roads could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work.

This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana

- would be taken from their homes,
- dropped into the North Cascades, and
- lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades.

Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA.

Any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the

- Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness, and
- Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation.

The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness.

Instead, the focus should be on creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives.

Superintendent Striker must reduce the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears.

This requires work with partners in British Columbia to

- ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border, and
- prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly

bears.

These coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives.

All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears.

Particular attention must be given to the

- dramatic growth of the human population in the region, and

- rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Thank you for your consideration.

Correspondence ID: 5152Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Las Vegas, NV 89156
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 17:32:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Helicopters? One of the most hazardous/intrusive instruments into the environment has to be avoided at all costs.

Correspondence ID: 5159Project:112008Document:132104

Address: SEDRO WOOLLEY, WA 98284
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 17:44:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I don't see an issue over all with reintroduction of Grizzlies provided the areas chosen are not extremely up against dense human population areas. Also every effort needs to be made to educate the public about how to safely live around these creatures. Including things like the use of bells to ensure the bears know there is a human or one of our pets in the nearby area.

Correspondence ID: 5165Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Placitas, NM 87043
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 17:49:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please consider the following comments:

Please submit your comments to NPS and USFWS by November 13 and encourage the agencies to reconsider their approach to grizzly recovery in the North Cascades. Some points to emphasize:

1. I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.
2. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

3. I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.
4. Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.
5. A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.
6. For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.
7. An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.
8. The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments.

Correspondence ID: 5166Project:112008Document:132104
Address: MOUNT TABOR, NJ 07878-9238
United States of America
Outside Organization: Denville Community Church Churches, Religious Groups(Official Rep.)
Received: Oct,31 2023 17:53:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I agree with Wilderness Watch's concerns. please reconsider your approaches using only the suggestions by Wilderness Watch. Thank you!

Correspondence ID: 5170Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Las Vegas, NV 89128
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 18:02:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Government cronies need to be stopped. Once and for all!!

Correspondence ID: 5175Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Lynnwood, WA 98036
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 18:10:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We need to STOP the killing of innocent animals and send them back to their natural habitat.

Correspondence ID: 5177Project:112008Document:132104
Address: portland, OR 97217
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 18:15:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: There are the official and correct reasons, and ways to express them, down below, of bringing grizzlies back to the N Cascades. I spend more time filling out these petitions, to tell my well meaning government, to either stop harming the environment/wildlife, or to undo the past harm they committed. Maybe it's time you quit meddling with nature once and for all???

I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 5181Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Everett, WA 98203
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 18:28:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: In the last centuries grizzlies lost about 99% of their traditional territories. Any little gain is very important to save them from extinction.

In details:

I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer

clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Sincerely,

Correspondence ID: 5186Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ketchum, ID 83340
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 18:47:37

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

Correspondence ID: 5191Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Baltimore, MD 21206
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 18:57:55

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: It is important to save our grizzly bears.

Correspondence ID: 5192Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Netcong, NJ 07857
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 19:03:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: THE GRIZZLY BEAR IS AN IMPORTANT PART OF OUR HISTORY, FOLKLORE, AND ECOSYSTEM. THEY MUST BE PROTECTED!!!!!!

Correspondence ID: 5194Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Madison, CT 06443
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 19:10:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Bears are more important!

Correspondence ID: 5195Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Waianae, HI 96792
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 19:11:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Although I recently relocated to Hawaii, I spent 30 years in Western Washington. We had black bears, coyotes, and cougars, but never a grizzly bear. I would love to see grizzlies returned to ALL of their original habitat. Stop preventing them from claiming new territories naturally and just allow them to roam and claim their land back. People have gotten too much in the way of allowing nature to care for itself, and just like the wolf, the bears are all on their way to being forgotten. Just allow them to reintroduce themselves and stop hunting/killing them because they're "inconvenient" to have around. They do NOT naturally "hunt" humans, and are not naturally aggressive animals, Please make a way to bring them back to all areas of North America, starting with the Cascades...

Correspondence ID: 5197Project:112008Document:132104

Address: San Diego, CA 92117-6713
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 19:12:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please PROTECT ALL THINGS WILD & WONDERFUL!

Correspondence ID: 5198Project:112008Document:132104

Address: San Cristobal, IA 5001
Venezuela

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 19:14:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: A grizzly bear is featured on Wilderness Watch's logo because the Great Bear is a quintessential symbol of Wilderness and wildness.

Grizzlies historically roamed what today is North Cascade National Park and the surrounding Wilderness and wildlands of north-central Washington--and we should help grizzlies return to this landscape.

Please, friends, do and fight the most you can for them. Protect them, embrace them every day.

Thanks a lot...

Correspondence ID: 5203Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Fairfax, CA 94930
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 19:26:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear National Park Service,

I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest. A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

Please protect Grizzly Bears! They deserve the utmost protection from those who have their fate in their hands.

Thank you for listening to this comment that urges full protection of Grizzly Bears!

Correspondence ID: 5205Project:112008Document:132104
Address: southampton, PA 18966
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 19:31:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Restore Grizzlies to the North Cascades without violating the Wilderness Act.No helicopter landings or flights in the wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 5206Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Ashburn, VA 20148
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 19:41:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada.

Correspondence ID: 5211Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Hickory, NC 28602
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 19:48:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Thank you for your time and considerations...

Alan

Correspondence ID: 5212Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Toms River, NJ 08753
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 19:53:45

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and

Correspondence ID: 5213Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bastrop, TX 78602
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 20:00:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies in the north Cascades. Gina Obrien.

Correspondence ID: 5215Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Westfield, NJ 07090
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 20:03:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Now more than ever, it's important to preserve our wildlife. From wildfires to other damages to habitats caused by human over development and failed environmental policies we must take every action to secure the future of grizzlies and their natural habitats.

I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

Correspondence ID: 5216Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Everett, WA 98201
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 20:07:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I strongly support the National Park Services preferred Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation.

This plan will both effectively restore grizzly bears in North Cascades National Park and give people the tools they need to thrive in and around grizzly bear country. Grizzlies belong in the North Cascades, as they enhance the park's ecological integrity and contribute to its wildness.

Grizzly bears play a vital role in maintaining ecosystem balance, cycling nutrients, dispersing seeds, and changing the behavior of species around them. Restoring them would benefit the park and the people who use it.

A restored population of grizzlies will boost the park's appeal and attract nature enthusiasts, scientists, and tourists from around the world. This would provide economic benefits to local communities and support the park's mission to protect park resources in perpetuity.

Alternative C, with the 10(j) rule, provides managers flexibility to address community concerns while protecting the grizzly population. It ensures coexistence between humans and bears. While I am supportive of releasing bears under 10(j) rule, I do not support a provision in it: the option for agencies to give conditioned lethal take authorization to a landowner. In this situation, once other deterrence or relocation options are exhausted, I would like to see problem bears handled by local management agencies, not private landowners who may not be supportive of establishing a viable bear population.

Please consider the positive ecological and economic benefits and support Alternative C. Restoring grizzly bears will secure the park's natural heritage and conserve an iconic species for current and future generations.

Thank you for your dedication to our national parks.

Correspondence ID: 5217Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Lake Geneva, WI 53147
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 20:07:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 5219Project:112008Document:132104
Address: San Francisco, CA 94107
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 20:13:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be

modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

Thank you for reading my submission.

Correspondence ID: 5220Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Park city, UT 84098
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 20:15:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please stand up for what is best for the grizzlies, and their Wilderness. They need our full support with minimal human intervention. Let them have their natural lives. Thank you.

Regards,

Correspondence ID: 5233Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 20:58:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am strongly in favor of the draft grizzly restoration plan; a sad history of slaughter and indifference that has diminished the grizzly population in this state and indeed, throughout the United States. Right now, there is abundant space in the area being considered, and it could be a catalyst for restoration across the US and Canada. Please go forward with this plan.

Correspondence ID: 5234Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Chicago, IL 60613-1014
United States of America

Outside Organization: National Parks and Conservation Association Non-Governmental

Received: Oct,31 2023 20:58:31

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: • We see that both of the action alternatives as is would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to circumvent helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and stay away from heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites as opposed to the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

• I oppose strongly, the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully

protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection. This does not benefit the bear population

- Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier NP or Yellowstone NP are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

- I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways (as mentioned) that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness

- A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed & analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and flourish.

- For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately terrible for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inadvertently inbred.

- An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no-action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Thank you for reading my comments.

Correspondence ID: 5235Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sacramento, CA 95831
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 21:00:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

. Neither of the current action alternatives, involving translocating bears from other regions, is compatible with Wilderness. The TERRIBLE current action alternatives would involve about 50 to 400 helicopter landings and twice that many helicopter flights. All, or almost all, landings would apparently be in Wilderness, either in North Cascades National Park or in surrounding national forests. The extensive use of helicopters would continue indefinitely for monitoring and managing bear movement and numbers. This heavy-handed management would be detrimental to Wilderness and bears alike.

Correspondence ID: 5237Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Houston, TX 77096-2107
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 21:05:55

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I join all those who support restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades. It is critical the restoration is done in ways that DON'T violate the Wilderness Act, which would harm the area's wilderness character.

This is good both for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act, so they should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and to steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The "no action" alternative has many good "Bear Smart" components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Thank you for considering all this critical information.

Correspondence ID: 5239Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Alexandria, VA 22314
United States of America

Outside Organization: TrueSurvivors.org Business(Official Rep.)

Received: Oct,31 2023 21:08:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

We all our beings on this planet From bacteria to human beings. All have a place and a part.

Correspondence ID: 5242Project:112008Document:132104
Address: snoqualmie, WA 98065
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 21:12:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Animals are God's creations, we need to take better care of them, and their environment.

Correspondence ID: 5246Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Lake Elsinore, CA 92530
United States of America
Outside Organization: Sierra Club Member Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 21:24:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: SAVE the precious Grizzly Bears NOW! All wildlife are struggling to survive the wrath of sadistic, greedy, and power hungry humans. Be kind to all living things!

Correspondence ID: 5251Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Altoona, PA 16602
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 21:32:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am in favor of introducing grizzly population to the northern cascades. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 5256Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Tonasket, WA 98855
United States of America
Outside Organization: Self Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 21:54:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzlies are indigenous to Washington. They are a key species & this area needs them . Cattle are invasive. Cattle are the problem. Bring back Grizzlies

Correspondence ID: 5259Project:112008Document:132104
Address: New York, NY 10025
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,31 2023 22:02:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, but that restoration must be undertaken in ways that truly protect both the animals and the area's wilderness.
This may mean relying at least to some degree on a natural recovery alternative, which obviously would take longer than a full-blown human-engineered removal of grizzlies from one area to another.

And it is absolutely not acceptable to remove grizzlies from Montana where they are protected under the Endangered Species Act and place them in the North Cascades under terms that remove them from ESA protection. Grizzlies are simply not sufficiently numerous for that.

Please take a step back and reconsider all proposals with a goal of restoration that preserves ESA protection for the animals and that does not violate the Wilderness Act by harming the wilderness character in the North Cascades.

Please consider and analyze an alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections.

Correspondence ID: 5261Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98501
United States of America

Outside Organization: retired Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 22:07:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

Correspondence ID: 5268Project:112008Document:132104

Address: San Leandro, CA 94579
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 22:27:10

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

This message was sent as part of a public wilderness conservation campaign by Wilderness Watch. I am not affiliated or employed with this organization, simply participating as an individual advocate.

Correspondence ID: 5276Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ladysmith, UN V9G 1V9
Canada

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,31 2023 23:04:24

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a dual-citizen (US/Canada) and avid supporter of non-motorized recreation, I am fully supportive of options B or C. Both work for me. I think it is important to reasonably re-introduce dislocated/removed species back into their native geographies.

I actually read more of the 300+ page EIS than I planned to. My biggest concern was general public objections to B or C, due to fear of bear attacks on humans and livestock secondarily. Having spent months in wilderness areas that grizzlies are a primary species, the only time I have encounter one is from a canoe 100 or more metres away - in all cases, the bears bolted away from me, even up hill. I believe the perceived threat of attack is far greater than the real-life probability. I noted your table in addressing such interactions; thank you.

Your 100-year timeline is interesting. I hope that the spirit and implementation of this effort will meet that guidance.

Good Luck.

Thanks for bringing this option to the NCE. As a lessor visited area, it is on my target list to visit more often as I have only done an 8-day canoe trip in the Ross Lake area. Getting old, so the amount of vertical travel is a challenge, but I am game. Bring the bears back and it will be a good thing.

Thank you.



Correspondence ID: 5288Project:112008Document:132104

Address: San Jose, CA 95129
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,01 2023
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please consider a scientific based grizzly recovery programme. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 5290Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Wyndmoor, PA 19038-7924
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,01 2023
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Fewer than 2,000 native North American grizzly bears remain~ protections are imperative now to ensure their recovery.

Save our nation's grizzly bears they are culturally significant to the local tribal communities of the Northern Rockies and iconic symbols of our American wilderness. The fundamental role they have in our entire ecosystem cannot be overstated. Posthaste protect this vital species in all states while we have time to do so.

Correspondence ID: 5291Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Everett, WA 98201
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,01 2023
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I strongly support the National Park Services preferred Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation.

This plan will both effectively restore grizzly bears in North Cascades National Park and give people the tools they need to thrive in and around grizzly bear country. Grizzlies belong in the North Cascades, as they enhance the park's ecological integrity and contribute to its wildness.

Grizzly bears play a vital role in maintaining ecosystem balance, cycling nutrients, dispersing seeds, and changing the behavior of species around them. Restoring them would benefit the park and the people who use it.

A restored population of grizzlies will boost the park's appeal and attract nature enthusiasts, scientists, and tourists from around the world. This would provide economic benefits to local communities and support the park's mission to protect park resources in perpetuity.

Alternative C, with the 10(j) rule, provides managers flexibility to address community concerns while protecting the grizzly population. It ensures coexistence between humans and bears. While I am supportive of releasing bears under 10(j) rule, I do not support a provision in it: the option for agencies to give conditioned lethal take authorization to a landowner. In this situation, once other deterrence or relocation options are exhausted, I would like to see problem bears handled by local management agencies, not private landowners who may not be supportive of establishing a viable bear population.

Please consider the positive ecological and economic benefits and support Alternative C. Restoring grizzly bears will secure the park's natural heritage and conserve an iconic species for current and future generations.

Thank you for your dedication to our national parks.

Correspondence ID: 5294Project:112008Document:132104
Address: BALTIMORE, OH 43105
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,01 2023 01:00:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support restoring grizzlies to the North Cascades. The restoration process must not violate the Wilderness Act or harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both proposed action alternatives would violate the Wilderness Act. There should be no helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, no placement and use of telemetry installations, and no heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads in relationship to the recovery area or next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without using helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration process. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have "extra" grizzlies to relocate to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies have not yet recovered under the ESA, and grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative is preferable, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests the active repopulation decision may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must be included to reduce the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. Work with British Columbia will ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border which will help to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be considered.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears due to the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 5297Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Irvine, CA 92618
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,01 2023 02:07:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness. I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

Correspondence ID: 5301Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Heidenheim, UN 89522
Germany

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,01 2023 02:45:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

Correspondence ID: 5304Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lynnwood, WA 98036
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,01 2023 02:57:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear NPS:

I know you're under a lot of pressure from farmers and ranchers, and from people who want to go live on the edge of wilderness who get pissed off when they find a bear in the hot-tub of their mountain resort.

But anybody who has ever understood wild animals knows that they are nomadic. And Mother Nature has her own way of regulating fauna populations without the use of poisons, guns, or death-snares.

So I believe that we should let wild animals roam our country, and they should only be trapped and relocated when they come into our communities.

(We truly should stop killing our magnificent animals...)

Correspondence ID: 5308Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Barnstable, MA 02630
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,01 2023 04:13:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears are important to the ecosystem and deserve better. They've lost habitat like many other species at the same time human populations have increased. On this one planet humans need to protect all life, all species. It works in the wild when we don't interfere.

Correspondence ID: 5309Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ny, NY 10024
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,01 2023 04:25:15

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Just stop destroying the lives of all living creatures!

Correspondence ID: 5315Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Corning, CA 96021
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,01 2023 04:46:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

As a native of Northern California, I only saw my first bear in the wild this summer in the Klamath Park area. Imagine, it took 66 years and I am a hiker. Just saying this to emphasize the importance of protecting and encouraging our bear populations.

Thank you for your fine work.

Correspondence ID: 5316Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Brooklyn, NY 11233
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,01 2023 05:23:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

Correspondence ID: 5317Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Norwood, NC 28128
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,01 2023 05:33:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support rearing grizzlies to the North Cascades. I think it's important that the restoration be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

. For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

Correspondence ID: 5318Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Memphis, TN 38104
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,01 2023 05:34:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The National Park Service must reintroduce grizzlies to the North Cascades. However, this must be done in accordance with the Wilderness Act and without violating it or the Endangered Species Act. It is equally important that this type of project is done properly as it is that it is done at all. NPS is on the right track to reintroduce grizzlies to the Northern Cascades, just do it correctly. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 5321Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Daytona Beach, FL 32117
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,01 2023 05:51:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Madam and Sir,

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active re-population. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active re-population urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak on their behalf. We are their human voice.

Correspondence ID: 5324Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Vineland, NJ 08360
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,01 2023 06:10:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hello, Please consider the following points:

I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

Thank-you,

Correspondence ID: 5327Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Anacortes, WA 98221
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,01 2023 06:24:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: NO, NO, NO to grizzlies in the N. Cascades. Why would I ever hike or camp there - they maul and kill people? Of course, not frequently, but I would stay away from areas I would otherwise enjoy.

Correspondence ID: 5332Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Green Cove Springs, FL 32043
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,01 2023 06:52:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 5335Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Philipsburg, PA 16866
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,01 2023 07:03:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: You can make a positive difference!

Correspondence ID: 5336Project:112008Document:132104
Address: hal balzan, NY BZN1081
Malta
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,01 2023 07:06:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I would simply urge you to do all in your power to ensure the survival of these magnificent animals.

Thanks for your time and I appreciate the good work that you do more often than not.


MALTA
EU

Correspondence ID: 5340Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mimbres, NM 88049
United States of America
Outside Organization: n/a Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,01 2023 07:21:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: WILDLIFE / NATURE IS FAR MORE IMPORTANT THAN HUMANS!!!!

Correspondence ID: 5342Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Evergreen, CO 80439
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,01 2023 07:31:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: You MUST protect the wilderness from the capitalistic greed and destruction by those in the US who hold positions of power and those who feel they are above the law because of their wealth. It is your DUTY to protect all things wild from selfishness and egocentrism. To submit to power and greed is to fail. You must not allow those who are driven by profit and selfishness to destroy the wilderness. Choose to protect the wilderness over yielding to greed!

I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears, the Wilderness, and for all our future generations!

Correspondence ID: 5343Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kent, WA 98031
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,01 2023 07:34:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

Correspondence ID: 5346Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Manalapan, NJ 07726
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,01 2023 08:20:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We have the utmost responsibility to protect our majestic wolves and grizzlies for healthy ecosystems and future generations. To allow the barbaric and unnecessary slaughter of these keystone species for the benefit of greedy corporations and special interest groups is not only shameful, it is a national disgrace. The American people are watching. What you choose to save is what you say about yourself. Choose well for our country's iconic and essential wildlife. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 5350Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Evanston, IL 60201-3010
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,01 2023 08:54:21

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzlies are apex predators. It's important to protect them in order to have a healthy ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 5351Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Syracuse, NY 13205
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,01 2023 09:06:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Personally, I am revolted that this is being rushed! Isn't it enough that 'humans' hunt these poor animals? Must we make it so that they're easier to kill for so-called 'human' sport? I'm disgusted. They are protected and should be protected to the highest degree. My guess would be that at least 90% of United States Citizens demand that grizzly bears are left in peace AND NOT HUNTED AT ALL, and that the organizations that represent us not kowtow to special interest groups! Please read the below comments which aren't my own but I agree with 100%:

I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 5353Project:112008Document:132104

Address: East Wenatchee, WA 98802
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,01 2023 09:32:15

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly Bears should be reintroduced to their historic habitats. They are a cornerstone predator in the food chain/ North Cascade environment. They should be protected.

Correspondence ID: 5358Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Dover, MA 02030
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,01 2023 09:59:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Save the Grizzlies. Allow them to migrate from Canada as well. No more oil pollution up there which would ruin water for Native Americans using the river.

Our environment is in sad shape. Green houses gases are going up, not down . Our Earth needs more environmentally safe options so our children and their children can continue to live, and not die of polluting waters, air, and land!!!

Correspondence ID: 5366Project:112008Document:132104
Address: new york, NY 10017
United States of America
Outside Organization: none Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,01 2023 10:43:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: ALL LIFE IS SACRED AND OUR OBLIGATION IS TO PROTECT THEM ALL FROM ANY HARM

Correspondence ID: 5368Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellevue, WA 98006
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,01 2023 11:08:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I've made numerous trips into backcountry settings in Montana, Wyoming, and Canada where I've shared the wilderness with grizzlies. These magnificent animals are an essential and iconic part of our North American ecosystem and they deserve a presence in the North Cascades so that their populations can have the genetic diversity and broad-based habitat/geography necessary for their survival. The Cascades are an excellent location for the bears given their remote, rugged setting and lack of conflicts with livestock and ranching operations. With proper precautions (as should be undertaken with any back country travel), conflicts with humans can be managed and minimized, a small price to pay for the survival of these wonderful animals.

Correspondence ID: 5370Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bristol, UN BS35 3RF
United Kingdom
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,01 2023 11:11:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness. I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection. Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting

Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

Correspondence ID: 5372Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Grand Forks, ND 58203
United States of America

Outside Organization: N/A Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,01 2023 11:26:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To Whom It May Concern,

Please see my comments below regarding Grizzly Bear reintroduction to the Cascades.

Overall, I strongly support reintroduction as this is part of the bears native range prior to colonization of the United States.

I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active re-population. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active re-population urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting

Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 5375Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Burbank, CA 91505
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,01 2023 11:28:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 5382Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Portland, OR 97202
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,01 2023 11:52:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, but the restoration should occur in ways do not harm the grizzlies.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives

thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 5385Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bend, OR 97703
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,01 2023 12:09:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I urge you to approve and initiate the reintroduction of grizzlies to their ancestral lands in the North Cascades (and, mostly everywhere they used to be able to exist).

I also ask that you enact the most positive measures possible to protect grizzlies and their shrinking habitat.

Correspondence ID: 5386Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America
Outside Organization: none Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,01 2023 12:16:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: A bad idea. There is overwhelming negative public comment on the record right now. Grizzly/human interaction means death to both. Initially the bear is going to win, then humans will kill all the bears in the area. Also, this is a horrible waste of tax payers money. How about reducing our national debt?

Correspondence ID: 5387Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Anacortes, WA 98221
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,01 2023 12:23:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Don Striker and Supervisor Brad Thompson,

I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. The proposal would bring up to 25 non-problem grizzly bears into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade and manage them as an experimental population.

Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities. Furthermore, the 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and sometimes respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in

the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Thank you for taking the time to keep our North Cascades wild!

Sincerely,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 5388Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Roscoe, IL 61073
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,01 2023 12:37:41

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

Correspondence ID: 5391Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Everett, WA 98201
United States of America

Outside Organization: Woodland Park Zoo Conservation/Preservation

Received: Nov,01 2023 12:47:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a Washington resident and nature lover, as well someone who works within a conservation-driven organization and recognizes it's critical role, I urge you to recognize the important ecological role grizzlies play in the North Cascades.

Now is the time to reintroduce them to that ecosystem and restore them to their natural habitat. Grizzlies belong in the North Cascades. We must recognize that and take action. We can and will coexist with these wonderful creatures.

Thank you for your attention to this critical matter

Correspondence ID: 5392Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,01 2023 12:48:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm writing to share my support for the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades. It is time they were allowed to inhabit the territory that was once theirs, and it is time for humans to realize we aren't the only beings that deserve a safe place to live.

Correspondence ID: 5393Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Missoula, MT 59801
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,01 2023 12:55:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I fully support all of the following comments. There should be no policies adopted that would put the Grizzly population in the North Western States of the USA. They belong there just like all of the other top predators native to those areas. We as human beings, have no right to choose to annihilate a heritage species, nor should we limit their numbers to a level where they are genetically so inbred that they are no longer viable. The natural evolution of living species in any given area should be protected and nurtured. We should not be a primary cause of the next world wide extinction.

I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 5395Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sammamish, WA 98074
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,01 2023 12:59:45

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not believe the North Cascades is the right place for a grizzly population to be established. There are simply millions of people within a two hour drive of the proposed bears' habitat. Large increases in numbers of recreationists are already been seen in this area and the introduction of bears will just add to unnecessary and dangerous bear-human conflict. We are already seeing this issue with black bears at the urban interface, at my home not 20 miles form Seattle. Bears have to relocated or euthanized at great cost and time of personnel. Money and resources that could be better spent on supporting other desperately needed underfunded projects and parks - Mount Rainier NP is getting trashed from the increased in visitation. Grizzlies belong in areas far away from dense populations. just like they were before Europeans arrived here.

Did the death of the Canadian couple by a grizzly bear, doing everything bear-right), not show conclusively why this reintroduction is dangerous and ill-thought for both bears and humans.

Correspondence ID: 5398Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bethlehem, CT 06751-1721
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,01 2023 13:02:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Thank you for speaking up for grizzly bears AND Wilderness in the North Cascades ecosystem!

Help us protect Wilderness and its wildlife around the country. A generous member has pledged to DOUBLE all first-time donations up to \$30,000 this year.

DONATE
Wilderness Watch
Follow Us

Photo: 

Having trouble viewing this email? [View it in your web browser](#)

P.O. Box 9175 | Missoula, MT 59807 | wildernesswatch.org | [DONATE](#)

[Unsubscribe or Manage Your Preferences](#)

Correspondence ID: 5401Project:112008Document:132104

Address: sarasota, FL 34231
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,01 2023 13:04:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness. I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Correspondence ID: 5403Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Chandler, AZ 85224
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,01 2023 13:09:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears are part of the environment and nature's balance. They should be intergraded in the North Cascade Ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 5404Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98503
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,01 2023 13:09:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Do not introduce grizzlies. If they disperse from other areas naturally then it is meant to be.

Correspondence ID: 5406Project:112008Document:132104

Address: DAVIDSONVILLE, MD 21035
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,01 2023 13:16:45

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support making human-affected ecosystems in the US whole again. Please Proceed with grizzly bear restoration in the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 5410Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Scottsdale, AZ 85260
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,01 2023 14:05:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: True, thriving Eco systems need predators. You should, therefore re-establish Grizzly bears into this area. Allow nature to do it's thing once more. Humans have become a plague, spreading across this whole planet. We need to keep

as much wilderness and natural habitat as we can, out of the hands of developers. In the natural wilderness should be a solid natural system of prey and predator. I believe these bears are an integral part of that healthy environment.

Correspondence ID: 5419Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Blaine, WA 98230
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,01 2023 14:57:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This comment is for the idea of introducing grizzly bears into North Cascades National Park and Area: I oppose the introduction of grizzly bears into this area for one big reason- the huge population of recreationalists now using the area. Did you know that two weeks ago there were 200-300 cars parked to hike at Rainy Pass? This is the new " along highway 20 into the North Cascades- thousands of people and dogs in the area. I have been using highway 20 to camp for the last 25 years and the increase of people is phenomenal! And we know this is true as our beloved Mount Rainier National Park starts a reservation program next year.

I do not want to read where a newly introduced grizzly bear needs to be euthanized due to confrontation from people and dogs.

I believe that if grizzly bears wanted to be in that area- they would come down from British Columbia or Montana to inhabit North Cascades.

Thank you for listening,

Sincerely,

Correspondence ID: 5421Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Pahrump, NV 89061
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,01 2023 15:01:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do whatever it takes for them to have their habitats so they can thrive To live in freedom. They need the accurate Acreage to Survive. Thank you

Correspondence ID: 5422Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lakeside, CA 92040
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,01 2023 15:02:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: save the Grizzlies

Correspondence ID: 5434Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Concrete, WA 98237
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,01 2023 16:22:56

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I applaud the work of the National Park Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and conservation partners to develop a science-based plan to reintroduce grizzlies gradually and safely.

Our generation should jump on this extraordinary opportunity to right the wrongs of previous generations. Washington's North Cascades was once home to a thriving population of grizzly bears. But our predecessors wiped them out through hunting, trapping and poisoning.

Grizzly bears belong here. The ecosystem is incomplete and unbalanced without them. The North Cascades ecosystem comprises vast, remote, and primarily public land. It offers ample secure habitat and food sources to support a stable grizzly population. But wildlife biologists do not believe a natural recovery is possible. It is very unlikely that enough animals of the critically endangered Canadian population will wander the long distance across challenging barriers to establish a functional breeding population in Washington. The bears need our help.

Reintroducing bears on the U.S. side will complement efforts led by First Nations in Canada to restore this sacred, culturally valuable species. Importantly, the new EIS provides for flexible management by wildlife authorities to safeguard people, property, and the bears.

I enthusiastically support the efforts to return this iconic animal to our wild public lands. We may never be lucky enough to see a grizzly bear in Washington's North Cascades in our lifetimes, but we can take pride in returning this key piece of Pacific Northwest's natural and cultural heritage for future generations.

Correspondence ID: 5435Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ellensburg, WA 98926
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,01 2023 16:26:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: In the big picture, the Grizzly bear is hardly endangered. The effort to introduce the bear into the North Cascades is driven by specific ideologies held by people that do not live and work in the affected areas nor are directly impacted by these decisions. I would hope that the concerns of the people living in affected areas would carry much greater weight than those that live hundreds or even thousands of miles away and seemingly care far more about the bear than the local residents. Considering how the Federal agencies are functioning these days, I'm not holding my breath.

Correspondence ID: 5437Project:112008Document:132104

Address: St Thomas, VI 00802
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,01 2023 16:37:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Please do the right thing for the wilderness and our wildlife

Correspondence ID: 5439Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tumwater, WA 98501
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,01 2023 16:49:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am always in support of giving the land back to those it belongs to, plants and animals and indigenous peoples.

Correspondence ID: 5440Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tonasket, WA 98855
United States of America

Outside Organization: Cattle ranch Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,01 2023 16:53:12

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Introduction of grizzly bears in the north cascades is not something the surrounding community's want or need. The grizzly bear is a dangerous predator that can not be controlled. If you really wanna support something maybe taking with the biologist that are heading up the lynx recovery in the northern cascades a call. Not only would their research be in jeopardy but putting more predators on the landscape is not the answer. Our best harvest has already increased to 2 bears a year. They haven't done that with a declining population. These predators are really hard to managed with the controls put on us from ODFW. No more grizzly's please.

Correspondence ID: 5444Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mukilteo, WA 98275
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,01 2023 17:14:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I cannot believe that the federal government wants to bring-in grizzly bears from somewhere else, to build into a population of grizzlies in the North Cascades. This would be extremely dangerous for people who want to relax and enjoy nature in the beautiful North Cascades. I am no expert, but while bear spray (pepper spray) or a medium power handgun both have a chance of stopping a black bear, I've read that it takes a much more significant gun (44 magnum or above) to stop a grizzly. I do not care if grizzlies lived in the North Cascades hundreds of years ago; I care a lot more about not having humans killed by these bears if they are intentionally moved to Washington State. Personally I would never go hiking / walking in the back-country in an area where grizzlies live - at least not without a 44 to 50 caliber handgun on my chest. That's a \$1500 investment that would be needed due to this insane decision and I would still consider the grizzlies a risk to my life.

Correspondence ID: 5447Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Eatonville, WA 98328
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,01 2023 17:29:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am opposed to reintroducing the grizzly bear in the North Cascade Mountain range of the State of Washinton. They have not occupied this area for the last two decades, if the habitat is suitable for grizzle bears, they would have migrated from Canada or northern Idaho and be living there already.
The reintroduction will have grizzly and human conflict as hikers, campers, and people fishing in the lakes use this area frequently and have deadly confrontations.
The grizzle bear can and will migrate into this area on their own if they like or feel the habitat is suitable to support their life. Put the Federal dollars to better use and save the salmon or steelhead in the Pacific and Columbia River systems and remove or allow harvest of the over population of seals that lay and sink boats and docks along the Pacific coast.

Correspondence ID: 5448Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Baton Rouge, LA 70809
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,01 2023 17:45:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Leave the bears alone!

Correspondence ID: 5449Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Baton Rouge, LA 70809
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,01 2023 17:47:21

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Leave the animals alone!

Correspondence ID: 5450Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Colville, WA 99114
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,01 2023 17:56:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Don't need them, don't want them. No relocation. No transplants. Delist.

Correspondence ID: 5453Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Darrington, WA 98241
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,01 2023 18:41:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I choose option A, no restoration of the grizzly population in the Cascades. I don't believe the biologists have done enough studies on the food sources for these animals. I don't believe it is safe to restore an animal in an area where there will be the opportunity for animal/human conflict. The Cascades are used heavily for hiking, hunting, fishing and overall recreation. Every year there are news reports of people being killed by grizzlies in Wyoming, Montana, Idaho and B.C. I take my family regularly into the Cascades for recreation and I don't want to worry about running into a grizzly. We don't have to worry about this with black bears because they are not as aggressive. I live in a community that borders the mountains so I strongly oppose restoring grizzlies into the Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 5457Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Cleveland, OH 44109
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,01 2023 19:15:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to urge you to use your power to protect grizzlies. We have already lost -- or are in danger of losing -- numerous species to extinction. Let's not add grizzlies to that list.

Correspondence ID: 5464Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,01 2023 20:03:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I love wildlife. I love living among wildlife. Twice in the past two weeks I have seen bear in the wild. I see other wildlife even more frequently, and love it. Yet reintroducing grizzly bears would bring more negatives than positives.

Our ecosystem is different than it was when these amazing creatures shared these areas. Food sources have changed, and in some cases, have significantly reduced. Other animals have increased in population. Humans live and work in more and more remote areas.

Reintroducing grizzlies would disrupt our ecosystem. Problems would be inevitable.

This program makes no sense. Please do not spend your time and our money on it.

Thanks for listening.

Correspondence ID: 5466Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tonasket, WA 98855
United States of America
Outside Organization: self Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,01 2023 20:35:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Here we go again. Another federal bureaucracy unilaterally decides that we need grizzly bears in the north cascades, against the will of the people

Fact#1. It is against the law to reintroduce grizzly bears in Washington state. Doesn't this mean anything to you?

Fact#2. This issue was resolved three years ago when the public overwhelmingly rejected reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades.

Fact#3. If you believe in the logic that this is necessary, because grizzly bears, had been there in the past, then you would also have to introduce grizzly bears to downtown Seattle.

Fact#4. Grizzly bears travel, hundreds of miles. If the North Cascades were favorable environment, they would already be there.

Fact#5. How does this proposal affect the Pacific Northwest trail, recently authorized by Congress, which passes through the heart of the proposed introduction. There's no mention in the impact statement.

The notion that introducing grizzly bears will increase utilization of the wilderness area is laughable. I am a frequent user of the Pasayten wilderness. I can state that my utilization will decrease significantly if this proposal is accepted. I certainly wouldn't bring my grandchildren to experience the wilderness if there are 200 grizzly bears in the area.

How many fatalities and life-threatening maulings are acceptable under your mitigation plan?? It is only a question of time before significant life threatening grizzly bear/human encounters occur.

I am emphatically opposed to reintroduction of Grizzly Bears into the North Cascades Ecosystem. I recommend Plan A

Correspondence ID: 5468Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Woodinville, WA 98072
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,01 2023 20:42:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My family and I absolutely love the North Cascades. We love to camp and hike and backpack each summer and work to coexist with the current black bear population. Grizzlies, however, are another story. While recreating in Grand Teton and Glacier National Parks we have experienced closed campgrounds and trails because of grizzly bear activity. It would be one thing if there were a current population in NCNP, but, to me, introducing them would add complications and make the activities my family enjoys more dangerous and less enjoyable.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 5470Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Pinetop, AZ 85935
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,01 2023 20:58:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I want to see grizzlies reestablished in the North Cascades. I used to live in Washington State and I know how wild and beautiful that landscape is. The grizzlies belong there to help keep ecological balance.

Correspondence ID: 5473Project:112008Document:132104
Address: EVERGREEN, CO 80439-7522
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,01 2023 21:35:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Greetings:

- I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and believe that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character.
- Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.
- I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.
- Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.
- A natural recovery alternative should be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.
- For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures should also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This would require work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.
- An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.
- The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures should be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

I will appreciate your consideration in this matter.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 5474Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,01 2023 21:44:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a Washington resident, hiker and camper, please note my support of the second option for the reintroduction and monitoring of a small number of grizzlies to the North Cascades. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 5478Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,01 2023 23:23:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I live on the border of the Wenatchee national forest south of the north cascades national park. My house has no road between the park and my front door. Im not opposed to reintroducing bears. I felt the same for wolves. I will however protect myself and property by all means necessary when the bears get hungry. I will also seek out reimbursement from damages.

Grizzly bears are large, in Alaska they protect their houses with nails and walled windows in the winter. They still destroy homes. I hope you take into account the destruction that will sure result to surrounding communities when they start to get hungry in the fall and spring. I can site many grizzly attacks from Montana and Canada in the last 5 years during these times. Most involved a dog but that's beside the point. They can be aggressive.

Correspondence ID: 5479Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Redmond, WA 98052
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,01 2023 23:27:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am against reintroducing grizzly bear into Cascade for a simple reason that there are too many people who hike and camp in the area. Even though the argument is that grizzly bear attacking people is rare but the fear will reduce or prevent people to go hiking or camping in the mountains. The impact is way outweighed the so called benefits that is not proven. The habitat is also much different from when native grizzly bears were here. The fear factor on people who recreate in the mountains is too much. The population is not very active in general for the population to stay healthy. Hiking and outdoor activities are very important to the health of the community that should be way more important for unproven approaches to recovery of the grizzly bear. There are always not enough of deers and other animals in the mountains, with grizzly bear more of them will disappear. The ecosystem is fine in Cascade mountain as is why you will want to experiment that will destroy the people's recreation opportunities and may even create more unbalanced environments. Again I and a lot of my friends and outdoor people will lose the very important local mountains to hike and keep active. Please please don't do this! Thank you!

Correspondence ID: 5480Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Monroe, WA 98272
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,02 2023
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I disagree with efforts to re-introduce Grizzly bears to the Cascades. There are so many hikers, backpackers, and campers that spend time in our beautiful mountains. Grizzly bears will pose and added threat, and increase the danger potential to all the people who spend time in the mountains.

Correspondence ID: 5481Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Burlington, WA 98233
United States of America
Outside Organization: Individual Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,02 2023
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Absolutely not! Please do NOT re introduce Grizzly Bears to the North Cascades. They are not a peaceful predator and will cause nothing but trouble. This is not Alaska or Montana with plenty of room for them to live and not bother people, livestock, and pets. I would rather not get mauled by a Grizzly while out hiking and enjoying our mountains. I

greatly respect nature and the ecosystem however this is going beyond what is necessary. If grizzly's showed up on their own that would be one thing but to intentionally bring them into such a heavily populated area is just fool hardy and will get people killed.

Correspondence ID: 5482Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sammamish, WA 98075
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly oppose the idea of reintroducing grizzly bears to North Cascades mountains primarily because I love hiking and camping in that area and marvel at the unmatched beauty of nature those mountains can offer. The existence of dangerous and lethal grizzly bears would pose such a threat to human lives that it would ruin all the wilderness recreation fun for me and lots of my friends who share the same passion for North Cascades great outdoors ! We're advised to bring bear spray while hiking and camping, however this has proven to be useless when grizzly bears are encountered. The latest report of two hikers killed by grizzly in Banff NP says it all! North Cascades is more populated now and has become more popular in the United States and the world. Increased bear human conflicts would result in bears being shot and killed too, which is certainly not a good idea to protect them from distinction. Plus human casualties would certainly bring law suits against the agency responsible. Your idea is just looking for trouble, very costly trouble, for yourself. Please please don't impose such a crazy idea on us! Thank you!

Correspondence ID: 5489Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Gainesville, FL 32608
United States of America

Outside Organization: Self Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 03:49:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have hiked, camped through out the northern cascades and only left my footprints--bringing the grizzlies back would continue to bring the ecology back into balance--just common sense as would protecting all predators--even the wolves, cougars and my favorite wolverines--do it for the planet and environmental justice

Correspondence ID: 5493Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Half Moon Bay, CA 94019
United States of America

Outside Organization: The Nueva School Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 05:54:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly

Correspondence ID: 5495Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Wake Forest, NC 27587
United States of America
Outside Organization: None individual citizen Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,02 2023 06:07:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do all you can to bring back the Grizzly Bear to your Beautiful part of America us
Thank you for all you do for parks, wildlife, wilderness, and the environment ,
Bob Moore

Correspondence ID: 5497Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Fort Worth, TX 76135
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,02 2023 06:18:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreational uses.

Correspondence ID: 5498Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Orangeville, IL 61060
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,02 2023 06:54:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Just WHAT are you trying to accomplish?

I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, BUT - the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act.

So, WHY DO YOU WANT TO VIOLATE THE WILDERNESS ACT? What would that accomplish?

STOP THIS CONSTANT HELICOPTER NONSENSE! The alternatives should avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and NO heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

NATURAL recovery measures must be included in both action alternatives.

Correspondence ID: 5499Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Chadds ford, PA 19317
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,02 2023 07:03:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness. I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Correspondence ID: 5500Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Cary, NC 27513
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,02 2023 07:05:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

Correspondence ID: 5503Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Laurel, MD 20723
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,02 2023 07:46:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I fully support efforts to return grizzly bears to the North Cascade Range.

Correspondence ID: 5504Project:112008Document:132104
Address: seattle, WA 98199
United States of America
Outside Organization: university off washington University/Professional Society
Received: Nov,02 2023 07:57:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am entirely in favor of returning grizzlies bears to the cascade mountains including cascade national park.
grizzlies are an important part of that ecosystem. this would also help an endangered species recover.

I am in favor of the number of bears being relocated and the proposed timelines

Correspondence ID: 5505Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Jefferson, NH 03583
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,02 2023 08:10:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan for the North Cascades. I enjoy hiking in the Okanagon NF and North Cascades NP and believe the grizzly bear should be returned to its ancestral lands. I have confidence that the state and federal land and wildlife management agencies would do this the right way as outlined in the proposal.
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this important issue.

Correspondence ID: 5506Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Chattanooga, TN 37405
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,02 2023 08:11:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Yes, I would like to see Grizzly Bears in North Cascades National Park. I backpack there and would love to see those wild creatures there.

Correspondence ID: 5507Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Shoreline, WA 98177
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 08:16:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am against the grizzly bear restoration plan. I have been hiking in north cascade for years and we never really worried about our safety. When grizzly bear are there nobody can go there without concern of their safety even if we follow all the safety procedures. The incidents happened at banff should be a very strong warning to stop this plan.

Correspondence ID: 5512Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Cedar Mountain, NC 28718
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 08:52:41

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please accept this input on behalf of the Grizzly Bears. It was thoughtfully assembled by people who I respect, so I am bringing it to you. I couldn't say it as well myself, but I can sincerely urge you to put doing the right thing for the Grizzlies and the wilderness ecosystem as the top priority in your plans. They are living beings in our stewardship, and they are not replaceable if we do damage to them, their habitat, their future. Think of your grandchildren and what you are safeguarding for them to experience. First, do no harm.

- I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.
- Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.
- I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.
- Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.
- A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.
- For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.
- An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.
- The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Thank you for your consideration.

Correspondence ID: 5522Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Ferndale, WA 98248
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,02 2023 09:11:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Parks Service,

As a National and Washington State Parks member, I ask that you hear my voice on plans to reintroduce Grizzly Bears into The North Cascades National Park. I used the North Cascades National Park. I believe Grizzly Bears are an essential species to this landscape and should be used as a tool for education for respecting wildlife and their habitat.

All my life with family reunions held near Mazama since I was a little girl. For the last twenty years I lived in Canada, on the East Slopes of the Rocky Mountains, near Banff-Canmore area of Alberta. My husband and I brought undergrad business students and MBAs into the wilderness with traditional elders to learn from the land and become closer to themselves. David loved Grizzly Bears and always said he wanted to always live in a world where he could be eaten by a Great One (our respectful name for these honorable species). We lived adjoining Grizzly Bear habitat and never had a problem, as we, and our community, were careful regarding our behavior with garbage and food storage. We knew how to act when we encountered a bear and we respected their space. Two years ago my husband was trail running near our home and encountered a momma grizzly on her way to the summer feeding grounds near Banff. Because he was trail running, he likely did not see or notice her warnings to stop or stay away. This is the problem with any fast focused trail activity. One must keep broad awareness in the bust, especially in the evenings, and especially in April and May when young are being guided out of the winter dens. David raised his arm up to block something touching his back and they both fell off an embankment. David hit his head on a tree on the way down, ending his life. The bear tried to pull him down to the river. She tried to make sense of what had happened, and when she could not, she left quickly. Conservation officers demonstrated she had not been a problem bear and has been peaceful since. She did exactly what she was supposed to do in that encounter. David was in the wrong by trail running in the woods in early May at dusk.

As long as we can negotiate the interface between bears and humans, such that humans do not engage in hyper focused activities like trail running, biking, or off roading, then we must have bears living where humans recreate. The bears must also be healthy bears that do not have a history of reward garbage meals or comfort around humans. As long as humans are educated and act in line with what they know, this will be a great opportunity for humans to learn about wild places and how they can enter them protected, by being prepared.

Thank you for reading this. I will not be afraid of bears, except for what allows for a healthy awareness and prepared actions for a peaceful encounter. It is the ultimate exercise in yielding space, something humans could learn so much more about. Please reintroduce the bears. This is their land.

Sincerely,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 5523Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Anacortes, WA 98221
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,02 2023 09:17:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I fully support the reintroduction of grizzlies. Apex predators are an essential part of a healthy ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 5525Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mars Hill, NC 28754
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,02 2023 09:22:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears should be living where they always have lived and thrived, as part of a system the natural world knows how to make work best. We need them to be there, and now they need us to help restore their presence where they belong.

I strongly support the National Park Services preferred Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation.

This plan will both effectively restore grizzly bears in North Cascades National Park and give people the tools they need to thrive in and around grizzly bear country. Grizzlies belong in the North Cascades, as they enhance the park's ecological integrity and contribute to its wildness.

Grizzly bears play a vital role in maintaining ecosystem balance, cycling nutrients, dispersing seeds, and changing the behavior of species around them. Restoring them would benefit the park and the people who use it.

A restored population of grizzlies will boost the park's appeal and attract nature enthusiasts, scientists, and tourists from around the world. This would provide economic benefits to local communities and support the park's mission to protect park resources in perpetuity.

Alternative C, with the 10(j) rule, provides managers flexibility to address community concerns while protecting the grizzly population. It ensures coexistence between humans and bears.

Please consider the positive ecological and economic benefits and support Alternative C. Restoring grizzly bears will secure the park's natural heritage and conserve an iconic species for current and future generations.

Thank you for your dedication to our national parks.

Correspondence ID: 5526Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Falls City, OR 97344
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,02 2023 09:26:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Don Striker and Supervisor Brad Thompson,

I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

As a former park ranger in Colorado, I was able to see grizzlies in the wild in Wyoming and Montana, and it is a life changing experience to encounter a truly wild species in a glorious landscape.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. The proposal would bring up to 25 non-problem grizzly bears into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade and manage them as an experimental population.

Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities. Furthermore, the 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and sometimes respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in

the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Thank you for taking the time to keep our North Cascades wild!

Sincerely,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 5534Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 09:51:37

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We already have black bears coming into town, getting into things but we don't report them because they will just shoot them now. It will be the same with brown bears. It's not like wolves or cougars that generally want to stay as far away from human as possible. Safety is a huge concern, especially in a place where many didn't grown up around grizzlies. The thought is nice but in reality there just isn't enough space for them. Are we going to reintroduce them and then just shoot them when they get too close? What's the point? Strongly against!

Correspondence ID: 5536Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America

Outside Organization: Select your title Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 09:57:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a long time hiker, fisherman and climber in the North Cascades, I enthusiastically endorse the reintroduction of Grizzly Bears to the area. Many years ago, I identified a grizzly bear track in mud, near the Canadian border along the Pasayten River. It was one of the more exciting moments in all my time in the woods. The thought that these great creatures could once again roam freely in the north Cascades would be a dream come true.

Correspondence ID: 5539Project:112008Document:132104

Address: San Carlos, CA 94070
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 10:07:37

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness. But both of the action alternatives currently proposed would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. The use of existing roads within or next to Wildernesses recovery area could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Further, Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest. A natural recovery alternative must be fully

developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed. The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 5545Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Port Gibson, MS 39150
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 10:35:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

Correspondence ID: 5546Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Minturn, CO 81645
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 10:37:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not bring grizzlies back they endanger outdoor wilderness enjoyment if I am with my family my kids would be at risk I would have to bring guns with me there is a reason they were wiped out in the first place thank you.

Correspondence ID: 5547Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Portland, OR 97213
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 10:39:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Natural migration and recovery of the great Grizzly beings is what your agency should endorse. My goodness, isn't it time to stop practicing target management, whether that is killing or moving wild life from one area to another with the loop hole allowing the "management" of these beings by hunting or trapping and removing?

What is your ethic? You do know the consequences of humans being everywhere because everywhere is ours because we think so and we can kill to make our presence everywhere.

Act with integrity for the creatures who are disappearing.

Correspondence ID: 5548Project:112008Document:132104

Address: EAGAN, MN 55123-1908
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 10:42:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The best management is natural management. I strongly encourage you to remove the use of helicopters and motorized vehicles from any plan to repopulate the grizzly bear into former areas of habitation. It seems counter-productive to simply move animals from one un-recovered location to another. There is no net gain and the animals are subjected to stresses they don't need.

Correspondence ID: 5549Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tonasket, WA 98855
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 10:50:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: There is no need to reintroduce grizzlies to the north cascades because they can already, and do, come down from Canada by themselves. Comparing cohabitations of grizzlies and native Americans is a poor example to use in today's world.. Maybe the population on earth was 1 billion? compared to 8 billion now. There is a reason the majority of grizzlies were killed off- cohabitation was hazardous. There are plenty of examples of grizzly attacks in recent years - if you care to pay attention. There was a fatal attack by wolves in Alaska of a school teacher a few years back (your position is, that doesn't happen).

I have lived in Alaska for many years and cohabitating with a grizzly is no fun. You would not need to rehome the grizzly anywhere, if the human population was reduced in the extreme. By the way- an 'Apex' species means it can eat anything it wants to. A grizzly definitely would eat you if he/she wanted to, and the opportunity presented.

NO to reintroducing Grizzly to the north cascades.

Correspondence ID: 5552Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 11:12:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Firstly, I applaud your stewardship of North Cascades National Park. I hope the grizzly can be restored ASAP--one never knows what support of lack thereof future administrations will offer this reintroduction. I strongly give my support to the National Park Services preferred Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation.

This plan will both effectively restore grizzly bears in North Cascades National Park and give people the tools they need to thrive in and around grizzly bear country. Grizzlies belong in the North Cascades, as they enhance the park's ecological integrity and contribute to its wildness. Seems like a "no-brainer" to me!

Grizzly bears play a vital role in maintaining ecosystem balance, cycling nutrients, dispersing seeds, and changing the behavior of species around them. Restoring them would benefit the park and the people who use it.

A restored population of grizzlies will boost the park's appeal and attract nature enthusiasts, scientists, and tourists from around the world. This would provide economic benefits to local communities and support the park's mission to protect park resources in perpetuity.

Alternative C, with the 10(j) rule, provides managers flexibility to address community concerns while protecting the grizzly population. It ensures coexistence between humans and bears.

Please consider the positive ecological and economic benefits and support Alternative C. Restoring grizzly bears will secure the park's natural heritage and conserve an iconic species for current and future generations.

Thank you for your dedication to our national parks. And help us all in the state of Washington to accomplish what should have been done decades ago. Given that, there's no time like the present!

Correspondence ID: 5553Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sedro, WA 98284
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 11:27:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: At a recent meeting with the Skagit County Commissioners (Oct. 31, 2023), a representative from the US Fish and Wildlife spoke in favor of re-introducing grizzly bears to the North Cascades ecosystem. He claimed that the grizzly disappeared from the region due to hunting pressures, and not loss of habitat. The habitat, he said, was still there, implying that more grizzly bears could be supported in the area. What he fails to realize is that habitat and ecosystem are two different concepts. There might be a few huckleberry bushes in the North Cascades habitat, but the ecosystem in the North Cascades has been altered to the point where it cannot support more grizzlies. That area is not managed for predator-prey ratios and there are few ungulates living there anymore. There is no healthy balance of plants-animals and all that's left is an empty landscape.

Grizzlies already come and go from the region, arriving from Idaho, Montana and Canada. If you were to put in more bears, there would be nothing to support them. Yes, they might eat huckleberries, but before they hibernate for the winter, bears need a supply of protein. Since there are very few deer living in the North Cascades, these grizzlies would go elsewhere for their needs. Landowners, farmers and ranchers would likely provide easy picking for the grizzlies...chickens, calves, pets and other domestic animals being at the top of their list.

We cannot introduce more grizzlies into the North Cascades. This is a dangerous predator, and any human-grizzly interaction has potential for disaster. The ONLY OPTION IS TO DO NOTHING. Do not reintroduce the grizzly into the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 5554Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 11:31:10

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this draft Restoration Plan/EIS. I am in support of the proposed alternative discussed in the EIS. Numerous successful reintroductions of predators to ecosystems in the west (e.g. Yellowstone Wolves) have shown great benefits to those systems following reintroduction. Grizzly bear populations were historically present in the Cascade Mountains, and are an important part of this ecosystem.

Alternative C includes additional protections and management areas which are easily understandable to the public and provide a clear framework for reintroduction and population and range expansion. As someone who is is passionate about the environment, especially in the place where I live, reintroduction of species native to this area is very important to me.

I spend a good amount of my time in the summer backpacking and climbing in the North Cascades and I think reintroduction of Grizzly bears is a key part of the mission of the NPS in protecting and preserving this environment. This ecosystem evolved with Grizzly bears as a part of it, so their reintroduction is a crucial part of preserving it for the future.

Correspondence ID: 5557Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Oak Harbor, WA 98277
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 11:40:08

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I would like my comments to be taken into consideration.

We are outdoor people and enjoy camping and hiking, I see this reentering of Grizzlies a disturbing problem from many different viewpoints.

Saying Grizziles have been here for so many years and coexisted with humans, etc. At that time the population was no where near the current population. We now have thousands more humans, dogs etc. using hiking trails, or just enjoying the forest areas.

A good example of monitoring/controlling bears is to look at the increase of back yard visits of the black bears - WA state is unable to control their population. The idea of eventually having 200 grizzly bears is out of the question as far as I'm concerned. How can you guarantee the grizzlies will stay where you put them? Really?

How long before they begin to drift into the lowlands,etc.

I don't understand how you came to the numbers of livestock that would be killed as an estimate. How many humans are in your depredations calculations?

As an alternative - reintroduce them into the National Parks, like Yellowstone or larger and take the wolves with you.

I hope you will think very carefully as you continue to evaluate what the people of this state want to happen. And I hope giving our opinion is not for naught and that you haven't already decided what you are going to do.

This shouldn't be a "feel good" type of request - let the people have their say, BUT this is how it's going to be as an example.

If I haven't made my point - I vote a resounding NO for reintroduction of Grizzly bears anywhere in WA state.

Correspondence ID: 5560Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lynnwood, WA 98036
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 11:56:58

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I would prefer to allow grizzlies to introduce themselves into the north cascades. I am not for human intervention in the form of actively introducing grizzlies into the north cascades.

Unfortunately, humans have shown they cannot responsibly recreate in bear country, as evidenced by the continued problems at Colonial Creek CG and Cascade Pass.

If black bears are a problem in these areas, just think what would happen if grizzlies were to start habituating these areas!

I think reintroduction is a recipe for disaster. If grizzlies come in on their own then so be it.

Sincerely,


Hiker, climber, skier

Correspondence ID: 5561Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Conconully, WA 98819
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 11:57:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My family has a cabin located at the edge of the proposed release area; it is located 3 miles North of Conconully on FS road 38. We spend almost all summer at this location and spend a lot of time in the Tiffany Lake area

which is on the border of the Pasayten Wilderness. Many hours and days are spent hiking in the area. Our cabin is just 33 miles from the proposed release site around Mazama.

I would like to object to any implementation of any plan except Alternative A which is NO ACTION to reintroduce grizzly bears to the North Cascade ecosystem.

The problems with any of the other 2 plans are troubling in many aspects. Below I have listed the most concerning.

The Eastern release site and the area proposed for this release has been devastated by wildfires over the last 15 plus years. I suggest anyone proposing this area for release actually place boots on the ground and visit this area. Take FS 38 North from Conconully and travel North to National Forest Road 39 and take this back to Winthrop. This follows closely the Southern border of the Pasayten Wilderness. Take road 9140 from Mazama North to the end, most of the Eastern side of this road was also devastated by wildfires.

This area has over the years been absolutely devastated by wildfires. In many areas the fire was so hot that it burned the topsoil down to rock and barely supports the growth of anything, much less food for bears. The grass has barely begun to grow back, there are very few trees left and those that are left are just solitary burned trees that support no life.

With Grizzly bears having a range of up to 109 miles and can travel up to 40 miles a day this places that whole area surrounding our cabin within their range. None of the residences in the area are prepared for this, none of the cabins or home have been bear proofed and many cannot be. Humans use this area quite extensively for hiking, hunting, woodcutting and visiting the forest. With the proposed release site just some 33 miles away it places these cabins and home directly within the rage of these released bears. As the area North of where our cabin is located devastated by wildfires this makes our cabin one of the first stops these grizzlies will make in their effort to feed themselves. I personally do not want ourselves, our children and our pets to be placed in danger to effect reintroduction of an animal that has been proven to be harmful to the lives of all.

Thank you for your time.

Correspondence ID: 5567Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Lyman, WA 98263
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,02 2023 12:37:19
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in favor of Alternative A: No Action and NO release of grizzly bears into the North Cascades ecosystem. The radio collar technology is not adequate for the job of keeping track of these grizzlies. For one, it does not provide real-time data, as Wayne Kasworm admitted at the Skagit County Commissioners' meeting October 31, 2023. There is no way to keep track of the bears' immediate movements, no way to predict where they will go, and the collars do not last forever. In addition, not all grizzly bears are collared. So there's a 48 hour delay in keeping track of the bears that are collared...how far can grizzly bears travel in 48 hours? How quickly can the US Fish and Wildlife respond to bear movements and threats to farmers, ranchers and landowners?

It is pretty obvious that you cannot prevent bear-human interactions, as example, consider the recent grizzly bear encounters north of Colville in the last month. A grizzly ate some chickens and was moved to the Selkirk recovery zone. This is a reaction, not a proactive response. Grizzly and human interactions do not turn out well for the human or for domestic animals (cattle, sheep, goats, barnyard birds, etc.)

With all the emphasis on the 10j rule and the detailing of all its benefits in terms of management tools available, I have a feeling that this decision has already been made in favor of Alternative C - moving grizzly bears back to the N. Cascades under the 10j rule. I do hope I'm wrong, and that my comments will be considered.

If grizzly bears are moved back to the N. Cascades under the 10j rule, this will be an expensive experiment ... \$100,000 - \$400,000 per year, much of which will come from taxpayer money. This is not a good use of our money, it puts peoples' lives and livelihoods at risk for an experiment that will undoubtedly fail anyway. The N. Cascades ecosystem is not capable of

supporting more bears; they would already be there if that were the case.

Do not move grizzly bears into the N. Cascades ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 5568Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98144
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,02 2023 12:41:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am commenting in support of grizzly bear reintroduction in the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 5570Project:112008Document:132104
Address: seattle, WA 98109
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,02 2023 12:43:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a life-long Washingtonian, humans were responsible for removing grizzlies from the North Cascades and it's our responsibility to bring them back home. As a conservationist from UW, I understand grizzly bears provide important ecological services, like distributing seeds and aerating alpine meadows to the North Cascade ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 5571Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Monroe, WA 98272
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,02 2023 12:46:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Reintroducing grizzly bears into the Pacific Northwest is a misguided and potentially dangerous endeavor that poses significant risks to humans, wildlife, and property. While proponents argue that it would be beneficial for the environment, there are strong reasons to oppose such a move.

Human Safety: Grizzly bears are larger and more aggressive than black bears, and their reintroduction increases the risk of bear-human conflicts. The Pacific Northwest is a densely populated region with numerous communities, and the presence of grizzlies could lead to more dangerous encounters. These bears are known to be territorial and may venture into human-populated areas in search of food, potentially putting human lives at risk.

Wildlife Threat: Grizzly bears are apex predators, and their reintroduction can disrupt the balance of local ecosystems. This can have a detrimental impact on other species of wildlife. Their presence may lead to declines in deer, elk, and other prey species, affecting the populations of these animals and potentially causing a cascading effect on the entire ecosystem.

Property Damage: Grizzly bears have been known to damage property, especially in search of food. This includes livestock, crops, and even vehicles. Reintroducing grizzlies could result in significant economic losses for local farmers and landowners, who may be forced to invest in protective measures or even face the loss of their livelihoods.

Brown Bear Attacks vs. Black Bear Attacks: Advocates for grizzly reintroduction often claim that brown bear attacks are not significantly more common than black bear attacks. However, the severity of attacks is a critical consideration. Grizzly bears are much larger and more aggressive than black bears, making attacks more likely to result in severe injuries or fatalities. Dismissing this important distinction is a disservice to public safety.

In conclusion, while environmental conservation is crucial, the reintroduction of grizzly bears into the Pacific Northwest

should be approached with caution. The potential risks to human safety, wildlife, and property should not be underestimated, and the arguments in favor of such a move must be critically examined. The Pacific Northwest can explore alternative ways to protect and preserve its unique natural ecosystems without jeopardizing the well-being of its human residents and the fragile balance of its environment.

Correspondence ID: 5572Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America

Outside Organization: Woodland Park Zoo Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 12:48:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Through research, we know the important roles that large mammals play in their native ecosystems. By reintroducing grizzlies to the North Cascades, we have an opportunity to support not only their recovery, but that of the entire ecosystem and all of the plants and animals it supports. I support Alternative C to ensure flexibility and adaptability to the plan based on on-the-grounds conditions as the plan proceeds. In such a large area, the total number of restored grizzlies would have minimum impact on humans who also use the landscape. There are known mitigation strategies to avoid human-wildlife conflict between outdoor recreators and bears and many in the Western U.S. are already familiar with those practices. Through proper signage, ranger support, and public education, we can ensure that people know how to safely share the landscape in ways that support ecological recovery. Thank you for your consideration of this comment.

Correspondence ID: 5576Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sedro Woolley, WA 98284
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 12:58:10

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Alternative A is the best course of action for the possible reintroduction of the grizzly bear to the N. Cascades ecosystem. **DO NOT MOVE GRIZZLY BEARS INTO THE N. CASCADES ECOSYSTEM, FOR THESE AND MORE REASONS:**

-too expensive to run this program

-program will likely fail due to current poor management of the N. Cascades ecosystem

-habitat may be there, but the ecosystem has been destroyed

-grizzly bears cannot be supported by the remnants of the ecosystem that remain

-there are already grizzly bears that enter the N. Cascades from elsewhere, but a large, sustained population does not exist because the ecosystem cannot support them

-any introduced bears will run out of food and seek out other sources of protein, which means likely encounters with landowners as the bears search for food

-human-grizzly interactions do not turn out well for the human or their domestic animals

-no way to predict where a grizzly will go, so all actions by the government will be re-actions, not pro-active

-the radio collar technology is inadequate, as it does not provide real time data

-all grizzlies are not collared, and even if one is collared, the collars do not last forever

-this is a dangerous idea for the private landowner in the vicinity of the North Cascades ecosystem

-the management flexibility of the 10j rule do not justify the risks associated with re-introduction of this dangerous predator

My vote is NO to more grizzly bears being introduced into the N. Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 5577Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Burlington, WA 98233
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 13:05:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am not in favor of bringing grizzlies back to the north Cascades. It would make backpacking and hiking less relaxing knowing I could be attacked and possibly killed out in the mountains. I'm fine with them coming back naturally but I don't see a value in their reintroduction. Trails would have to be closed if there were bears as they are in Jasper national park. Also it would hamper people hiking on their own.

Correspondence ID: 5581Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Fox Island, WA 98333
United States of America

Outside Organization: National Park Service NPS Employee

Received: Nov,02 2023 13:21:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzlies belong in the North Cascades. As a keystone species the ecosystem needs them. It is only because of humans that they don't currently exist in Washington State, and it is therefore our responsibility to reintroduce them and learn to live alongside them.

Correspondence ID: 5583Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Manson, WA 98831
United States of America

Outside Organization: Lake Chelan Bach Fest Business

Received: Nov,02 2023 13:23:37

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please let the grizzlies IN!

Correspondence ID: 5588Project:112008Document:132104

Address: LEAVENWORTH, WA 98826
United States of America

Outside Organization: Wenatchee Outdoors Recreational Groups(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,02 2023 13:46:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm writing in support of Alternative C for the Grizzly Restoration in North Cascades Ecosystem. The NCE represents a very large area of good habitat for grizzly bears, and they should be returned to this ecosystem. By implementing Alternative C and designating the introduced grizzly bears as a 10(j) experimental population, it allows for the maximum of management tools to both aid the survival of bears in their ideal habitat and discourage grizzly bears in the areas that are deemed poor habitat and host larger human populations. The plan via Alternative C is a science-driven and conservative approach, introducing bears a few at a time each year. With monitoring and placing bears in their ideal habitat so they don't need to roam toward population hubs, this reintroduction can be done safely for the sake of the bears and the neighboring humans. Grizzly bears deserve protection as well as a chance to return to one of their historic ranges in the NCE.

Thank you,


Wenatchee Outdoors Board Secretary

Correspondence ID: 5589Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lakewood Ranch, FL 34202
United States of America

Outside Organization: Select Title Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 13:47:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Here are 5 good reasons to do this:

North Cascades National Park and the surrounding ecosystem have more than enough open space to successfully recover

grizzly bears

This would be a major step in restoring the species across its historic range.

Grizzlies provide ecological benefits and will improve the ecosystem's health

We're giving grizzly back their home and people WANT that

The public process includes new tools to reduce the potential for conflict with local landowners and communities.

This would be the first step toward bringing balance back to the ecosystem and restoring a piece of the Pacific Northwest's natural and cultural heritage.

Thank you for helping our wildlife

Correspondence ID: 5590Project:112008Document:132104

Address: seattle, WA 98144
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 13:58:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing in support of the no action alternative. While I understand the importance of a balanced ecosystem and the historical significance of the Grizzly population in the North Cascades, I have also witnessed significant issues, including loss of life, that accompany active, assertive, aggressive reintroduction.

I spend almost half of my time in Jackson Hole Wyoming at the foot of the Grand Teton Range. The grizzly population in that valley has increased even faster than the population has increased - both dramatically in the past 25 years. Despite the actions of the NP Service, Fish and Wildlife, DNR and others, human negative interactions with grizzlies continue to increase. Just one grizzly, "399," has mothered 18 cubs and dozens of grand-cubs. Her territory now includes much of Jackson Hole and all of Grand Teton National Park. She especially enjoys backyard ponds, garbage cans and feeders. She, her offspring, and fellow grizzlies have demonstrated decreased fear of humans and increased aggressiveness. This is especially true throughout hunting season, when local hunters have been killed by grizzlies over newly harvested elk and deer.

But the main impact that I have observed and personally experienced is increased reluctance to explore, hike, climb, bicycle and generally recreate in our local outdoors. At a time of increased stress, depression, obesity, and isolation, recreation in the outdoors provides everyone - no matter their background - an equal opportunity to experience rejuvenation, peace, and happiness. Reintroduction of grizzlies would result in fewer people getting outside and experiencing our unique precious public lands.

Correspondence ID: 5591Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Athol, ID 83801
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 13:59:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzly bears to the North Cascades by National Park Service according to Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation.

This plan will both effectively restore grizzly bears in North Cascades National Park and give people the tools they need to thrive in and around grizzly bear country.

Grizzlies belong in the North Cascades, as they enhance the park's ecological integrity by maintaining ecosystem balance,

cycling nutrients, dispersing seeds, and contribute to its wildness.

A healthy population of grizzlies will boost the park's appeal, attract nature enthusiasts, scientists, and tourists from around the world. This would provide economic benefits to local communities and support the park's mission to protect park resources in perpetuity.

Alternative C, with the 10(j) rule, provides managers flexibility to address community concerns while protecting the grizzly population. It ensures coexistence between humans and bears.

Please consider the positive ecological and economic benefits and support Alternative C. Restoring grizzly bears will secure the park's natural heritage and conserve an iconic species for current and future generations.

Thank you for your dedication to our national parks.

Correspondence ID: 5597Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America
Outside Organization: None Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,02 2023 14:29:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Howdy

I am against grizzly reintroduction.

I believe that you will have serious problems in your efforts. Washington state has a large human population and some estimates suggest an expected 1.4 million to 2.0 million person increase in population in next 20 to 25 years. Quite a number of these new folks are expected to see thousands of new houses built within or next to the Recovery area. I am still reading the EIS draft, but so far I do not see a reasonable plan as to how you are going to avoid serious human/bear conflicts considering the great number of humans in the area.

More comments to come as I digest your Draft.

Reply requested.

Thank you

Correspondence ID: 5598Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Chapel Hill, NC 27516
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,02 2023 14:32:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I oppose any plans or proposals that strip any grizzly bears relocated to the North Cascades of their protection under the Endangered Species Act. I oppose any plan that includes helicopter landings directly into the wilderness or hovering over it disturbing wildlife. I oppose both plans that have been presented. Superintendent Striker has said that grizzly bears may migrate to the North Cascades naturally on their own and if they do, they are under the protection of the ESA. I support the natural migration if a proposal or plan that doesn't strip the grizzlies of their ESA protections and with no helicopters near the wilderness cannot be reached.

Correspondence ID: 5601Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Leavenworth, KS 66048
United States of America

Outside Organization: personal Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,02 2023 14:55:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness. Grizzlies are very important to North Cascades and need to be protected from harm. The Grizzlies should never be harmed by people or anything that people do. They are important to the ecosystem and are needed.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. No helicopters or any equipment should be used. These items will harm the environment plus harm the innocent Grizzlies and other animals that live in the Wilderness. Use the many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness. Helicopter noise is cruel and inhumane to the ears of all animals, including the Grizzlies, that live in the Wilderness and under no circumstances should they be allowed to even fly over the Wilderness. The helicopters must go around the Wilderness to get to any roads that will be used.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection. Do not remove any Grizzlies from any other state. The ESA states that all Grizzlies must stay in their home and not be move to any other place. It's like removing a small child from the parent and never, ever allow them to meet. Grizzlies are family animals and should be left where they are in their family and own home land.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest. The climate is different from Montana and other places. Moving an innocent Grizzly from Montana to another location would be detriment to the Grizzly health and wellbeing and violate the EPS.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive. Leave all Grizzlies where they are. Don't move them any place.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred. The Grizzlies health and wellbeing should be top propriety and not what people want the Grizzlies to do. They are smart animals. Leave all of them where they are and don't be moving them to any other place ever.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 5602Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Toutle, WA 98649
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,02 2023 14:56:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have reviewed the Grizzly Bear Reintroduction EIS and submit the following comments.

First, I strongly support the no action alternative and do not support grizzly reintroduction in any form. However, I recognize

that this is a political process, and may be a 'done deal' so I will provide specific concerns with sections of the EIS.

One major concern that is virtually ignored by the EIS is the difference between the diet of grizzly bears in the North Cascades with the source population of bears, especially those around Yellowstone and in parts of the Northern Continental Divide area. These Rocky Mountain bears can have (according to the EIS) up to 70% of their diet consisting of meat, while the N.C.E has bears that only eat about 10% of their diet as meat. It cannot possibly be safe or smart or humane to take bears used to eating protein rich bison carcasses, elk calves, gut piles and other sources of protein and calories and dropping them off into an environment where they are supposed to become virtual vegetarians overnight. Any grizzlies that are relocated into the North Cascades should come from areas where 90% of their diet is already plant material, like they will be expected to eat in the N. Cascades. The historic grizzly population from the 1800's and earlier no doubt relied heavily on salmon in lowland rivers. It is unreasonable to expect robust numbers of bears without them accessing this source of protein. The EIS says little about the potential of grizzlies to seek out salmon streams in the valleys and the resulting potential increased conflict with people. The EIS expects bears to stay in high elevation areas without an abundant rich protein source--this is unreasonable. Yes, a very low population can survive in the high mountains, but anywhere grizzlies have a robust population (Yellowstone, Alaska) there is a source of protein and bears aren't just eating plants. Consequently, in BC and parts of Canada that are similar to the North Cascades, grizzly populations are struggling or are low, even though the habitat is protected wilderness. These areas of the NCE simply do not have enough food resources to support that large of a grizzly population. Grizzly bears have never been relocated from two such different food situations, and doing so now is a giant experiment that places bears and people in jeopardy. If the NCE was great habitat, the bears would be there already or would have migrated into the region.

Socioeconomic:

I find the EIS is grossly incomplete and outdated, especially when covering socioeconomic issues. The EIS relies on recreational use data from 1993 and 1994, well before the Pacific Crest Trail became a mecca for young hikers from all over the world. There are no statistics about the use on this trail, and the Pacific Northwest Trail. One proposed release area (West Paysayten) is directly on top of one of the busiest sections of the PCT and PNT where they meet. I have hiked through this area and it is a literal freeway of thru-hikers that have started in California and have no idea of how to operate in grizzly areas, nor do they have the ability to obtain bear spray, bear proof containers, and other safety items. This section of the EIS needs updated to cover the risks to these hikers on the PCT. Any potential release site must be far away from the Pacific Crest Trail.

The Socioeconomic section also failed to include the increased costs and dangers of working in the recovery area. My daughter is a wildland firefighter in Okanogan County. She has already has to worry about cougars, wolves, rattlesnakes and other dangers on the job. Now wildland firefighters will be operating in grizzly country. Foresters, conservation officers, geologists, timber cruisers, farmers, biologists--all those who work in the field, will need to be trained and provided with safety equipment to work in a grizzly area. Agency liability could become an issue if training and resources are not provided. Bear spray is heavy and firefighters already have a 45 pound pack. The costs of training and education for people working in the woods must be incorporated in the analysis .

The increased costs to the state of Washington and the federal land management agencies is ignored. I have hunted in Montana in grizzly country and know that the Forest Service employees there spend a great deal of time 'managing' for grizzly bears. These employees drive around and check campsites for unattended coolers or bags of horse food not raised 10 feet off the ground. How many new employees, or diverted resources, are now going to bear/human management instead of fire management or trail maintenance or cleaning bathrooms. Multiply this over each agency that manages land in every state with grizzly bears. Bear management and education will cost the tax payers at the state and federal level forever, at the expense of other priorities.

The potential costs to farmers and orchard owners is underestimated and glossed over. How much would it cost to place electric fences around every orchard in the recovery area? The EIS should look at the costs in similar communities of Montana or Idaho that must deal with grizzly bears. I just returned from Ovando, Montana where a mountain biker was killed by a grizzly bear in town. I spoke to a game warden while I was there, and he said that the grizzly activity was concentrated between a campground (at the edge of the Bob Marshall Wilderness) and the town of Ovando, in the agricultural area--NOT in the Wilderness itself. Is this a trend? Bears will go where the food is, and there are always more sources of food around people. Montana warned that grizzly numbers and 'negative interactions' are increasing as bears expand both

west and east. If the North Cascades is a great island of bear habitat, the bears will find it eventually as they expand out.

Cumulative impacts of predators on prey in the North Cascades has not been studied. Mule deer numbers are down significantly, especially since Washington state outlawed hunting of bears and cougars with dogs or bait. There are so many cougars in some parts of Washington now that one farm I know of has killed two cougars that were killing goats in the front yard in the span of a few months. Now wolves are moving in. The state of Washington, whose policies are dominated by urban Puget Sound, will never manage predator populations as Montana and Idaho do. Consequently, game populations will remain low, and not contribute to the food base for grizzlies. The state is in no position to ever 'manage' grizzlies or wolves.

In summary, do not release grizzlies into the North Cascades, and if you do it anyway, pick bears from Canada that are used to eating only plants and do not put any near the Pacific Crest Trail. The federal government should then provide funding for all the extra training and resources needed to manage bear/human conflict.

Correspondence ID: 5603Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Pasco, WA 99301
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 15:08:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I pack in to the wilderness areas of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana, for 60 years. In that time I have observed many black bears. From my own observations, black bears perform all of the beneficial functions for the e, sited as reasons for introducing grizzly bears. There is NO true benefit, to local residents or visitors, to justify the risks and expenses of introducing grizzly bears to the North Cascades. Use the money to restore the trail systems in the wild forest areas.

Correspondence ID: 5604Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellevue, WA 98006
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 15:14:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I oppose to the grizzly bear restoration plan. I am an outdoor person and love to go hiking in the area. This plan will discourage people to go hiking and participate in the outdoor activities to enjoy the nature that beautiful areas offer. Safety is always the top priority for us outdoor lovers, introducing grizzly bears in the area would significantly increase the safety concerns. So I strongly oppose the plan for grizzly bear restoration

Correspondence ID: 5605Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Baltimore, MD 21206
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 15:23:48

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears

from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

Correspondence ID: 5607Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Middleville, MI 49333
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 15:24:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness. For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Thank you for your consideration.

Correspondence ID: 5613Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Yelm, WA 98597
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 15:54:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Commenting as a private citizen with over 25 years experience working closely with all agencies as a stakeholder and employee of partner organizations or agencies. In my career I've worked closely with USFWS on restoring habitat for T and E species and specie reintroduction.

It's concerning that this plan is being proposed as USFWS has a great number of other T and E species that should be a higher priority for their scant resources. The track record of moving species off of the T and E list is not great. With Grizzly bears naturally moving from Idaho and BC why not put those resources to land protection, habitat restoration and grants to improve the recovery of other species?

If this plan is enacted where will be grizzly bears be relocated from? What is their history? Are these "problem bears" being relocated to WA? My expectation is that WA receives no bears with a "problem bear" history if this plan is enacted.

As a citizen who has worked closely with USFWS in the past, I just do not have faith that the agency can properly manage a reintroduction of this species to NCNP, and surrounding lands, when the agency has not met the bar for removing species from the T and E list ie Lycades melissa samuelis or Picoides borealis.

Correspondence ID: 5614Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Montville, NJ 07045
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 15:54:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I fully support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades and urge you to do everything possible to accomplish this. The restoration must be accomplished in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's

wilderness character. This is good practice for bears and the wilderness in general.

Both alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act and should be revised. Modifications stating that helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness will be avoided, the placement and use of telemetry installations will be avoided, and in no way involve heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness. The disruption of their everyday lives should be avoided.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. It's ethically wrong; if implemented, grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protections.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred. Any alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives.

All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Protecting these bears is paramount and all measures to do so should be taken.

Correspondence ID: 5616Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sammamish, WA 98074
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 16:03:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a professional in the animal care and conservation industry, I think it is imperative that we continue to protect the habitats of our native species. The decline of any animal species can have far reaching effects on the environment and our ecology. I urge all involved to make the habitat of grizzlies an important part of the North Cascades Ecosystem plan.

Correspondence ID: 5617Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Erie, CO 80516
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 16:06:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to

avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection. A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 5622Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826

United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 16:35:10

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Washington state currently does not allow for any effective management of predators. Our game departments commissioners are handpicked by a far left governor and are working and succeeding at eroding the ability for outdoorsman to participate in population control. Ungulates, along with small predators like bobcats, are declining rapidly. Meanwhile, wolves, cougars, black bears, and other predators such as the Fisher, which have been released by the game department, are exploding in population at an unchecked rate. The addition of another large predator at the hands of human intervention will further exacerbate this problem. Additionally, Washington is an extremely crowded state, and gets more so by the day. These bears well quickly find their way into orchards and farmland. They will also find their way into heavily used hiking and backpacking areas along with rural areas. It will take almost no time at all before there are serious, and life-threatening interactions with bears and humans. The people that live in this region generally share the same sentiment, if the bears find their way back here on their own we will be OK with it. Government intervention on behalf of the bears, and to the detriment of the people that live here is the last thing we want.

Correspondence ID: 5623Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sedro Woolley, WA 98284

United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 16:44:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My first concern is that since we have lived without a grizzly population for so long, would citizens even know how to deal with an encounter in the wilderness. Grizzlies aren't like black bears. Many documentation has shown them to be much more aggressive. Black bear are fairly docile in comparison. Many people may carry bear spray, which hasn't always proved affective. Especially against 1200lbs grizzlies. How would we keep our hikers and those who enjoy the outdoors safe from a potentially greater threat than what most are currently accustomed to? And will the department be responsible for any injuries or deaths that may occur from reintroduction?

My second concern is community safety. We have been seeing more and more wildlife coming into human occupied territories. We have a large herd of elk that regularly roams through farms and ranches as they go back and forth between their food sources and water supplies and other habitats. As more and more game animal come into our communities looking for food and water, that has been displaced due to climate change, it is also going to coax the grizzlies to follow their own food supply into our surrounding communities. The potentially puts our livestock, pets, ourselves, and our children at greater risk of an attack. Again, will the department be responsible and financially compensate all those whom may end up harmed or damaged by this reintroduction?

This would be great if we could guarantee a separation between these animals and people. Most outdoors people would know how to take care when venturing through such territory. But many in Washington State are devoid of personal safety and being aware of your surroundings when out in the wilderness. Many take their own safety for granted, mainly because most of their life they have never had to worry about their safety. But reintroducing grizzlies back into the population changes that dynamic. And we could end up with a lot of eaten backpackers who were just unaware of what else lives in those woods and are too naive to carry the tools necessary to guarantee stop a bear from killing them should the need arise.

Again, will the department be responsible?

Correspondence ID: 5626Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Las Vegas, NV 89183
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 17:23:08

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I fully support recovering a healthy grizzly bear population in the North Cascades, but the effort must be done in a way that protects and enhances the area's wilderness character and that also minimizes the human handling and harassment of grizzlies.

Neither of the current action alternatives, involving translocating bears from other regions, is compatible with Wilderness. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness and the placement and use of telemetry installations. The plan should steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should be analyzed and adopted.

Correspondence ID: 5627Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 17:25:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: There is already a predator problem in Washington state, we do NOT need to introduce Grizzly Bears. Can we focus on the black bears, cougars, and coyotes before introducing more predators? The black bears, cougars, and coyotes are moving into towns and preying on pets and getting into garbage's on a regular basis. Once they have a taste for the easy food they stick around for the free meals. With cities and towns expanding into their natural territory its just a matter of time until this becomes a bigger problem. There is no reason to introduce grizzly bears in the state. If they wander in from Canada so be it but placing them into areas where people hunt, hike, and camp seems like a very poor decision.

Correspondence ID: 5630Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Edmonds, WA 98020
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 17:32:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The American Bear Foundation of Washington has always championed the well-being of bears. However, we firmly oppose the reintroduction of grizzly bears into the North Cascades. It's evident that grizzlies are already finding their way into the region, with recent incidents like the young grizzly in Stevens County. We believe in natural migration and proper management. The existing challenges with the black bear, cougar, and wolf populations in Washington highlight the need to avoid adding more pressure on our wildlife.

Correspondence ID: 5632Project:112008Document:132104

Address: San Anselmo, CA 94960
United States of America

Outside Organization: Natural Resources Law Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 17:40:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, a cause that, in my view, must be pursued in a manner that upholds the principles of the Wilderness Act while safeguarding the area's untrammeled character. This approach not only benefits the grizzly bears but also preserves the pristine wilderness.

Regrettably, both of the existing action alternatives, as they currently stand, would transgress the Wilderness Act. They entail activities such as helicopter landings and flights within the wilderness, the installation and use of telemetry devices, and intensive bear management strategies. Yet, there are numerous roads that traverse or approach the recovery area, which could serve as suitable release sites without the need for helicopters within the wilderness.

I strongly oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration efforts. This would imply that grizzlies, which are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana, would be uprooted from their native habitats and transplanted into the North Cascades, thereby forfeiting their previous protection.

Montana lacks an excess population of grizzlies to spare for relocation to the North Cascades. Montana's grizzlies are not yet fully recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from places like Glacier or Yellowstone are essential for the natural recovery of regions like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

It is imperative that we thoroughly explore and analyze a natural recovery alternative, even if it may take longer than active re-population. Recent information from Superintendent Striker suggests that the urgency in pursuing active re-population may have more to do with preserving agency discretion than genuinely safeguarding the wilderness and creating the best possible environment for grizzly bears to migrate, thrive, and flourish.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, both action alternatives should incorporate measures for natural recovery, thereby reducing the necessity for activities that could harm the wilderness, ultimately proving detrimental to the bears. This also requires collaboration with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to traverse the international border, preventing the North Cascades grizzly population from dwindling over time and becoming inbred.

Furthermore, an alternative approach that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should be subject to comprehensive analysis.

The no-action alternative presents several commendable Bear Smart components that address how communities and individuals can coexist harmoniously with grizzly bears. These coexistence measures should also be integrated into both of the action alternatives. It is paramount that all conceivable measures are taken to prepare residents and visitors for potential

bear encounters, especially considering the rapid growth of the human population in the region and the escalating recreational pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 5635Project:112008Document:132104

Address: University Place, WA 98466
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 17:54:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am strongly opposed to reintroducing grizzly bears in Washington State .Those are vicious killer animals and should be kept as far away from civilization as possible. No grizzly bears in Washington State.

Thanks,

██████████./

Correspondence ID: 5638Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Vancouver, WA 98684
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 18:13:48

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I and other outdoor users and friends are Stridently Opposed to grizzly re-introduction. There are many reasons for this, including but limited to: safety of public/recreationists/hikers etc. And impacts on tourism and impacts to agri-business also. I could write a book of comments based on 60+ years as an avid outdoorsman but am choosing not to. Please only consider grizzly enhancements to areas like Yellowstone or Glacier NP which are far to very far removed from people and agri-businesses.

Correspondence ID: 5639Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Granite Falls, WA 98252
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 18:16:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am not an educated man. But I do watch a lot of nature flicks. I have never commented on anything before. But I am extremely concerned about letting grizzly's go in the North Cascade area. First of all, the government spent a lot of money building trails up there. And fair parking lots. On a sunny day there are more cars parked along the road than you can count. People by the thousands hiking in the woods. I like grizzly's. And I think they got a raw deal over the years. Just like the Indians did. But introducing grizzly's into the North Cascades with that many people already there, is asking for trouble. I doubt anybody will heed these words but I had to tell somebody.

Correspondence ID: 5640Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 18:31:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to request the suspension of efforts to reintroduce grizzly bears into the North Cascades Ecosystem. The main reason I object to this plan is because of the dangers inherent in interactions between humans and grizzlies. As stated in the Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration plan negative interactions between humans and grizzlies do occur. The Draft details the status of grizzlies in other US ecosystems. The metropolitan areas which are close to the other US ecosystems have significantly smaller human populations than the North Cascades. The population of the Seattle metropolitan area is over 4,000,000 and is the 15th largest metropolitan population in the US. In comparison, the Missoula, MT metropolitan area had a population of 118,000 in the 2020 census and the Billings, MT metropolitan area had a

population of 185,000. The North Cascades have experienced an exponential increase in the amount of human recreation in the last few decades. Currently, and for the entire 50 years in which I have been utilizing the North Cascades for recreational purposes it has been a relatively safe place for people of all skill levels. A family with young children can safely hike on trails adjacent to the three potential release sites documented in the Draft. There has been no need to carry bear spray or weapons for protection; no need to carry bear cannisters in which to store food. The Draft states that safety measures for black bears and grizzlies as being comparable. The "safety measures" may be comparable but the level of aggressive behavior and risk of injury to humans is not comparable. The US ecosystem areas which do contain grizzlies have developed infrastructure over time to address the human/grizzly interface which occurs as a result of human visitation to those wild areas. The North Cascades has, in contrast, grown to accommodate and be frequented by large numbers of human visitors without any of that infrastructure.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 5644Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Youngsville, NC 27596
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 18:45:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

On a personal note, I am definitely afraid of Grizzlies, but they deserve the right to live in their habitat as well as I do. They help our environment in the wild and make nature what it should be. All I hear these days is the killing of animals. I am sickened by the thought. Instead of killing or not protecting lets encourage and let live so that our future generations know what an animal in the wild does and how they live. All animals are Mothers and Fathers too. These creatures were here living off the land before us. By rights it is theirs.

Correspondence ID: 5647Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Anacortes, WA 98221
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 18:53:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not introduce more GRIZZLY BEARS into the North Cascades.

There is a reason they are called Grizzly...they are killers of humans, as well as everything else in their way.

I have NO CONFIDENCE that any government agency will be able to control this situation.

The government can't even control the ELK in Skagit County. The ELK are dying a horrible death from

hoof rot decease, passing it on to farm animals and destroying crops. For 20 years this situation has

been getting worse and worse. What has our government done.....NOTHING!!!

Correspondence ID: 5649Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Issaquah, WA 98027
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,02 2023 19:06:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzly Bears - No, No, and No.

My wife and I are backpackers, trail runners, mountain bikers, and I also flyfish and bowhunt. Love the outdoor and wilderness and spend much of my recreation time in WA forests and trails.

There has not been a credible Grizzly sighting in WA for decades. The ecosystem seems to be doing just fine without them. re-introduction of Grizzlies creates so much potential for dangerous or deadly human and bear interactions.

The WA population is growing rapidly and trail and outdoor use will certainly continue to grow rapidly in years to come. Adding Grizzlies to the mix is a toxic idea and also completely unnecessary and unwanted by almost all regular outdoor users.

There are healthy populations of Grizzlies in other areas of the US and Canada.

Please do not pursue this terrible idea.

Respectfully,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 5650Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Ocean Park, WA 98640
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,02 2023 19:08:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Introducing grizzly bears to the Cascades is about the stupidest thing I have ever heard of. What is the matter with you people?

Correspondence ID: 5651Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Anacortes, WA 98221
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,02 2023 19:23:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I'm a resident of Skagit county in the North Cascades and I ****do not**** support reintroducing grizzly bears to the North Cascades.

Sincerely,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 5652Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Anacortes, WA 98221
United States of America
Outside Organization: Concerned citizen Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,02 2023 19:34:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears are DANGEROUS animals. They run 8 to 12 ft tall and can weigh 800 lbs or more. Ten feet for your perspective, is the height of the basketball rim. Grizzly's can run 30 to 40 mph for short distances, up to maybe 50 feet. Can you? Grizzly bear paws can decapitate humans with one swipe of the paw. Humans, unless they are well armed, always lose every interaction with Grizzly bears, and most don't survive. If they do they're guaranteed serious medical bills not to mention serious pain and likely life long harm. If they survive. Do the men who choose to introduce Grizzly bears into Washington State live in Washington state? If not, they have NO right to an opinion. Will the men who choose to introduce Grizzly bears into the North Cascades be held personally liable for all the humans who will die from this stupid idea? They should be. Will the men who choose to introduce Grizzly bears into the North Cascades be held liable to pay for all those who will be injured by bears? They should be. How many human deaths by Grizzly does the Federal government think is acceptable? Grizzly bears have been long gone from the North Cascades in Washington. Hundreds of thousands of dollars to introduce bears into Washington where the overwhelming majority of citizens living in the affected areas are opposed is morally wrong. Grizzly bears kill and dine on humans because humans are prey, food for the top predator. The only way to be safe in the Cascades after Grizzlies are introduced is for humans to be armed with high caliber arms; and be knowledgeable in their use. The Cascades have many wonderful hiking trails enjoyed by many humans; very few carry weapons. I don't want to carry rifles or pistols just to go on a hike or backpacking trip in the mountains. Grizzly bears are completely unpredictable. And very very dangerous. Please permit common sense to prevail and please do not do something extremely stupid like introducing grizzly bears into the North Cascade mountains in Washington.

Correspondence ID: 5653Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Darrington, WA 98223
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 19:36:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am not in favor of grizzly reintroduction. Grizzly bears cannot be introduced without them intersecting human activity. There WILL be people killed, in a horrific way, if they are brought back.

Correspondence ID: 5654Project:112008Document:132104

Address: new york, NY 12561
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 19:48:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in agreement with reintroducing the Grizzly Bear into its previous and long standing habitat.

Correspondence ID: 5655Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98273
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 19:52:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm SO against this because it is so dangerous and there's no reason that makes sense to bring grizzly bears here. This only increases the chances for deaths. DO NOT BRING THE GRIZZLY BEARS HERE!

Correspondence ID: 5657Project:112008Document:132104

Address: East Wenatchee, WA 98802
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 19:57:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am against for bringing the grizzly bears to the North Cascades. I am an avid hiker and feel this is dangerous to all outdoors people whether they hike, climb, bike, etc. This will not bring extra revenue to the North Cascades.

People, like myself, will not be able to enjoy the back country of the North Cascades with the threat of a grizzly bears. The threat of grizzly bears is going to turn people away from enjoying nature and providing income to the small towns around the North Cascades like Twisp, Methow, Mazama, and Winthrop. I often go to eating and retail establishments when I go hiking. Since I will not hike with the threat of grizzlies, I will not be visiting these small towns.

Correspondence ID: 5658Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98273
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 20:04:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Do you truly believe It's in the best interests of the people of Washington State to spend \$400,000 to subject them to the danger inherent in reintroducing grizzly bears? If the State has that money burning a hole in government's pocket use it to help the homeless or those with mental health issues! It may not go far toward those problems, but it certainly can do no harm and is better than deliberately choosing to harm the citizenry and their animals!!

What benefit would be gained for the people living in the affected areas? Surely anyone with wisdom would take into consideration the jeopardy this action would bring!

I say NO GRIZZLIES, period!!

Correspondence ID: 5659Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Stanwood, WA 98292
United States of America

Outside Organization: Retired Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 20:13:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Introducing Grizzly Bears to an area that they have not be around is a very bad idea. Grizzly's are far more unpredictable than the black bears and is much more of a concern when it comes to humans and domesticated animals. We have hikers that frequent the Cascades and the re-introduction or introduction of these animals will be a nightmare. Not to mention possible lawsuits.

Correspondence ID: 5660Project:112008Document:132104

Address: phoenix, AZ 85016
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 20:21:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades but it must be done in a way that is compatible with wilderness values and that means no helicopters or motorized vehicles. Alternatives must be explored even if it takes longer. The NPS must also work with Canada to create corridors for bears to move freely between the 2 countries, The 2 alternatives must also have some plan for preparing local communities how to interact with bears in a safe way.

Correspondence ID: 5661Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Anacortes, WA 98221
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 20:31:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I vote for number 1: no change. Keep WA state a place where hu
Mans can u destined and enjoy the northwest forest land. We do not need another dangerous threat for our communities and the northwest to be threaten by! We moved to the northwest to enjoy the forest and appreciate the existing animals that reside here. Washington is one of the few states left where we can truly respect the natural environment around us.

Please do not take this away by introducing grizzles to our state! Too many famines with young children could be at risk. Grizzles are wild and you can not predict the devastating out-come that other options would introduce.

Do not let other States dictate our natural beauty and ecosystems that we live in.

One tragedy is one too many! Protect our environment by voting NO Change!

Correspondence ID: 5662Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lyman, WA 98284
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 20:34:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support alternative A in this proposal to restore grizzly bears to the N. Cascades Ecosystem. Introducing grizzlies to this environment would be expensive, as it requires helicopter trips, radio collar technology, personnel, and who knows how many road trips, meals, conferences, in-person and phone/zoom meetings. Will new government employees be hired? New vehicles bought?

The plan to reintroduce grizzlies will fail, so the expense will all be a waste of money. Why will it fail? The ecosystem cannot support more bears. Grizzlies can already enter and leave the area from Idaho, Canada and/or Montana. If the N. Cascades environment could support a population of 25 bears, they would already be there. They aren't there. So why not? Why don't you address this in your meetings with the public?

This proposal is another expensive government program that will fizzle out. These bears are dangerous, and if they can't find what they need where they are dropped off, they will go elsewhere: back yards, farms, ranches, eating chickens, pets, calves, goats, sheep. The boundary of the N. Cascades ecosystem extends to just east of Lyman, and includes many of those farms, ranches and lots of landowners' back yards. Do any of the people proposing this re-introduction live within the boundaries of the N. Cascades ecosystem? I doubt it. Would they be so eager to re-introduce these dangerous predators if the bears were put in their back yards? Probably not.

I support NO ACTION: do not re-introduce grizzlies to the N. Cascades. Skagit County farmers are already hosting an uncontrolled government animal: the Washington Fish and Wildlife department introduced elk into east Skagit County years ago. These animals, that are not dangerous, have driven a number of farmers out of the valley. What's going to happen with another government animal, and a dangerous one at that? This is not how to increase the population to get them off the endangered species list. Why not introduce them to Olympia or Seattle or Mill Creek? Oh, that's right. That ecosystem is gone. Lawmakers and government employees don't want these dangerous animals in their own back yards. Instead, they want to put them where farmers and ranchers grow our food. Leave us alone!

Correspondence ID: 5664Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Arlington, WA 98223
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 21:06:41

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Alternatively A all the way! Stupid, dangerous idea. My kids and grandkids live in that area and all ready have black bears keeping around their property. They est the fruit from their fruit trees and they're even being fed up top of their property but it doesn't seem to satiate them. We/they don't need unpredictable, dangerous, man eating grizzlies in the area as well. I had thought of moving to Skagit County but you can forget that if the grizzly bears are brought in. I don't know what you're thinking. You're NOT THINKING. You all who are involved in this evil scheme need to search your hearts and have a little talk with Jesus. I'm absolutely not kidding.

Correspondence ID: 5666Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Anacortes, WA 98221
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,02 2023 21:11:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Strong NO! My family enjoys hiking and camping in the north cascades. The introduction of Grizzly bears which are not natural to the area show no beneficial value to the wilderness. It's a good way to endanger human life as well as the transplanted bears when the enviable interaction between the species and other native animals happen.

Correspondence ID: 5667Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Acme, WA 98220
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,02 2023 21:17:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: A, no grizzlies to be introduced into our area. It will put our lives and our children's and our animals lives in danger.

Correspondence ID: 5668Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Coupeville, WA 98239
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,02 2023 21:21:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do NOT reintroduce grizzlies into the Cascades. Life has changed since the bears last lived in this area.

Although we do not live on the mainland, bears can swim very well and I certainly do want to have to worry about children, pets, or livestock should the bears decide to swim to Whidbey. We have horses and, although I would not like to but would not hesitate to shoot any wildlife threatening my horses, we also live in close quarters with other rural families and farmsteads. If I should miss, I could accidently shoot someone else's livestock, buildings--or a person.

Whoever came up with this foolish and dangerous idea has obviously dismissed the high cost in money, material, and public wellbeing.

Vote NO. Do NOT reintroduce grizzlies into our mountains.

Correspondence ID: 5670Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,02 2023 21:41:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We advocate for grizzly bear restoration. As a keystone species for the North Cascades, grizzlies have impacted this area for hundreds or thousands of years!

The forest system benefits from their existence within it, which is beneficial for other animals, vegetation, ground disturbance, seed distribution and many unnoticed other effects.

Grizzlies contribute to the ecosystem biodiversity in a major and complete way. Those of us who love the forests encourage grizzly restoration within the vast wilderness ecosystem of nearly 10,000 sq. miles.

Because North Cascades Institute brings significant numbers of people to the ecosystem to take part in conservation education programs, we have looked into issues of safety and risk management with peer organizations that operate in grizzly country. Yellowstone Association Institute and Teton Science Schools have worked with tens of thousands of school children, families and adults for over 40 years in the Yellowstone backcountry. If grizzlies were restored to the North Cascades, the additional protocols we would put in place, in addition to standard "bear aware" practices that we already require from all participants, is a minimum group size of four, with group leaders carrying bear spray. These protocols are basic for anyone visiting wilderness areas that contain large carnivores.

Correspondence ID: 5671Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Darrington, WA 98241
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 22:00:24

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm an enrolled tribal member of the Sauk-Suiattle Tribe who objects to the release of Grizzlies into the North Cascades. Personally believe they not only threaten our U and A (protected by treaty rights) but also burden our natural resources that we're already losing due to environmental conditions and mass logging in the cascades, seemingly destroying the delicate natural balance of nature. Throughout the seasons, we are hunter and gatherers to sustain ourselves, storing, canning and freezing indigenous foods, fabrics, gathering herbs, medicines that are essential to our existence and well-being. We also seek spiritual work in the mountains to heal our hearts, minds and for our community, wholistically. I urge our government leaders to cancel the release of Grizzlies into the Cascade Mountains and find a zoo or other conservation group to take the Grizzlies that we all love and adore. Personally believe more environmental impact research needs to be done, in our already diminishing resources, by science. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to express my concerns.

Correspondence ID: 5672Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Anacortes, WA 98221
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 22:02:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly support the National Park Services preferred Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation.

I grew up in the shadow of the North Cascades and have been eagerly awaiting this vision of reintroducing grizzlies to the ecosystem coming to fruition.

This plan will both effectively restore grizzly bears in North Cascades National Park and give people the tools they need to thrive in and around grizzly bear country. Grizzlies belong in the North Cascades, as they enhance the park's ecological integrity and contribute to its wildness.

Grizzly bears play a vital role in maintaining ecosystem balance, cycling nutrients, dispersing seeds, and changing the behavior of species around them. Restoring them would benefit the park and the people who use it.

A restored population of grizzlies will boost the park's appeal and attract nature enthusiasts, scientists, and tourists from around the world. This would provide economic benefits to local communities and support the park's mission to protect park resources in perpetuity.

Alternative C, with the 10(j) rule, provides managers flexibility to address community concerns while protecting the grizzly population. It ensures coexistence between humans and bears.

Please consider the positive ecological and economic benefits and support Alternative C. Restoring grizzly bears will secure the park's natural heritage and conserve an iconic species for current and future generations.

Thank you for your dedication to our national parks.

Correspondence ID: 5673Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Anacortes, WA 98221
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,02 2023 22:17:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Do not re-introduce grizzlies to the North Cascades.

US Fish and Wildlife stated that the grizzly disappeared from the N. Cascades ecosystem due to hunting pressure, and that the habitat was still there. The habitat may still be there, but the N. Cascades ecosystem has been so mismanaged, that the "ecosystem" doesn't really exist any more. Without an ecosystem, introduced bears are not likely to survive without seeking their nutrition elsewhere. And any human-grizzly interactions do not turn out well for the human or their domestic animals: the grizzly is a dangerous predator and will eat people!

Correspondence ID: 5677Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98273
United States of America
Outside Organization: None Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,02 2023 22:31:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Common sense: grizzlies have a huge habitat environment . If they haven't wandered into the east. s axes on their own, they don't like it. Why relocate them into a non- preferred area??
Also, there is poor elk management in that same area causing much destruction to farm land. Why add additional burden to them?

Correspondence ID: 5679Project:112008Document:132104
Address: issaquah, WA 98027
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,02 2023 22:40:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The ONLY people to decide returning grizzly bears are those who reside in the chosen area. People on Mercer Island and the whole west side of the state should have NO voice

Correspondence ID: 5680Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mount Venon, WA 98273
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,02 2023 22:44:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: These predators were eliminated because they killed people and domestic animals. They were not, and are not, warm fuzzy things, unless made into rugs. Only those who follow their pipe-dreams could support this plan; their pipe-dreams should not be allowed to endanger others.

Correspondence ID: 5681Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98273
United States of America
Outside Organization: Citizen Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 23:08:08

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Sirs and / or others,

I am not in favor of the reintroduction of Grizzly Bears back into the Cascade ecosystem.

They have been gone for a while now. The last sighting of a female Grizzly Bear with a cub, was in 1991. In the time period between then and now, no loss of human life has occurred from Grizzly Bears in this ecosystem.

Your statistics show that in the last period of time. .4 people have had a physical encounter every year, with these animals, in the lower 48 states.

Because you deal with these bears, they become your focus, and you want to promote them, just like others professionals promote their product.

I as a member of the public don't want them back into the Cascade Ecosystem!

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

Correspondence ID: 5682Project:112008Document:132104

Address: anacortes, WA 98221
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 23:18:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not introduce grizzlies to the North Cascades.

Grizzlies are an APEX predator and have no natural enemies.

My biggest concern is that the grizzlies, if introduced to the Northern Cascades, will find their way to areas that are now inhabited by elk with hoof rot disease. These elk are numerous and are absolutely NOT being managed by any government agency. These elk are not able to outrun a grizzly and will be easy prey for the bears, The bears will quickly realize where the easy source of food is, which includes farmers' fields on the west side of the Cascades.

The hoof rot disaster in our elk, that is currently being ignored by the DFW, will then be compounded by this 10(j) designation from the NPS.

This is a disaster waiting to happen. Please do not let this happen.

Correspondence ID: 5686Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Big Lake, WA 98274
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023 23:58:41

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Are kidding me? No, no, a thousand times no!

It is absolutely not acceptable to do this. I will be making note of every single politician and proponent who backs this proposal and vote against them for their future endeavors.

I am a senior citizen who has children, grandchildren, elderly neighbors, pets, garbage cans, and a recently re-done salmon culvert. Sounds like grizzly bait to me...

Correspondence ID: 5687Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Aberdeen, WA 98520
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I vote for Alternative C - bring back grizzly bears!

Correspondence ID: 5688Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Helena, MT 59601
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To those who will make a decision on what restoration plan to implement:

I am writing from my personal experience with grizzly bears in the NCDE and Glacier National Park in particular. My experience has been that of bear management seasonal ranger at Many Glacier RS in Glacier over a period of more than 30 years. The comments are from my observation and are NOT in any manner given, nor should they be taken, as representative of an official Glacier Park statement. I speak as a private citizen whose seasonal summer work in Glacier has afforded me some insight.

I agree that your "preferred alternative C" is the direction to go. The 10(J) option.

With this Alternative C you will have the most flexibility to meet the concerns of surrounding stakeholders, that is, people who live, work, recreate and hunt adjacent to the North Cascades National Park and within the Forest Service and other public lands which comprise the re-introduction area.

Bear management involves people management as well as trail warnings, research captures and tracking or occasional removal of "problem" bears. And the greater part of people management is constant education about how people living near bears can be more "bear aware," be alert to issues of food storage and attractants that can take grizzlies down the continuum from habituation to food conditioned and "removal." With Alternative C you would have the most options at hand to work not just through federal agencies but through Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife and tribal agencies to assist people in understanding how to be more safe in the presence of bears. Obviously, bears will roam outside the political boundaries of the recovery area. And some people in those areas are going to be worried. You need the tools to meet the needs and concerns of residents and ranchers and business owners alike....who will have concerns and sometimes, issues, with bears.

Working with surrounding communities in the Glacier setting is essential to help preserve a new presence of bears moving outside and back into the Park. We have the Blackfeet Reservation on our east and various combinations of public land and, to the point, private landholders and communities to our south and west. Montana FWP works constantly with adjacent communities, as does the Blackfeet Tribal FWP on the reservation, to educate people regarding best practices in bear country. This may include the elimination of a bear from time to time, if that bear has "crossed the line"....predation against livestock or troublesome encounters with residents.

People will more likely "buy into" a plan to reintroduce grizzlies in the area if they know that resources are in place to assist them if necessary. And part of the agency's function will be to minimize the need for active management by reason of educating large numbers of folks as to how they can co-exist with grizzlies.

I wish you well in your efforts to re-introduce grizzlies in the wild country that can support them. It seems to me that Alternative C will be your best option.

All good wishes!


Helena, MT

Correspondence ID: 5689Project:112008Document:132104
Address: ANACORTES, WA 98221
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023

Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Another family killed by grizzly bears!! Vote NO on grizzly bears here!!!

<https://people.com/couple-killed-by-grizzly-bear-in-canada-sent-distressing-final-text-in-final-moments-family-reveals-8348434>

Correspondence ID: 5693Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sun City, AZ 85351
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

Correspondence ID: 5697Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Boston, MA 02128
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 01:47:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Subject: I support Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation.

With due respects,

Lady or and Gentleman.

I strongly support the National Park Services preferred Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation.

This plan will both effectively restore grizzly bears in North Cascades National Park and give people the tools they need to thrive in and around grizzly bear country. Grizzlies belong in the North Cascades, as they enhance the park's ecological integrity and contribute to its wildness.

Grizzly bears play a vital role in maintaining ecosystem balance, cycling nutrients, dispersing seeds, and changing the behavior of species around them. Restoring them would benefit the park and the people who use it.

A restored population of grizzlies will boost the park's appeal and attract nature enthusiasts, scientists, and tourists from around the world. This would provide economic benefits to local communities and support the park's mission to protect park resources in perpetuity.

Alternative C, with the 10(j) rule, provides managers flexibility to address community concerns while protecting the grizzly population. It ensures coexistence between humans and bears.

Please consider the positive ecological and economic benefits and support Alternative C. Restoring grizzly bears will secure the park's natural heritage and conserve an iconic species for current and future generations.

Thank you for your dedication to our national parks.

The beauty of the country and Nation is the forests, the wild green places , the lands , the mountains , the wilderness , the ocean,the wild animals.

Parks are very especial. It means so much to everyone even painters, children the older people.

The animals love freedom and so do I.

The beauty of Nature must be protected instead of destroying it; it should be help to create it more beautiful.

For me a Forest itsa a dream that many can not reach to see it and live the magic of the colors, river and more.

Please don't take away the animals that put more beauty and life. Don't let grizzly bears disappear during our lifetime and out new generations.

Protect them and help protect those who do not follow park rules, that can protect them both.

Thank you for your time and consideration and the work it is been done.

Sincerely,

██████████ 11-3-2023

██████████

Boston, MA. 02128

██████████

Correspondence ID: 5702Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98107
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 04:57:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not do this, introduce black bears if anything but do not put hikers and local citizens at risk. Hiking in WA without fear of grizzlies unlike Yellowstone and other areas is a highlight of the state and would be a shame to introduce these wonderful although violent apex predators.

Correspondence ID: 5704Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Towson, MD 21286
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 06:02:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears belong in the North Cascades and their populations should be restored there in ways that are concordant with the Wilderness Act. They and their environment need full protection. A well researched and developed natural recovery option is the best option.

Correspondence ID: 5705Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mount Vernon, HI 98274
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 06:03:56

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have talked to 15 -20 people, some hunters, some hikers. Not one of them are for releasing these large bears to the north cascades. The weekend amount of hikers on a nice day on highway 20, and highway 2 is quite large. People are taking their children hiking. The bears will pose a threat to these hikers. Please reconsider your decision on releasing these large bears in the cascades. Thank you Michael Barth

Correspondence ID: 5709Project:112008Document:132104

Address: shoreline, WA 98133
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 07:33:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm thrilled to see all of the work toward restoring the natural ecosystem of the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 5711Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tacoma, WA 98405-3032
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 07:41:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As avid hiker I strongly recommend the No Action option. Moving bears into this area will put people's lives at risk and reduce recreational options in the north Cascades. This could hurt the livelihood of the citizens that live in the area. No one wants these bears and there is a reason they were hunted and removed from the area. They are dangerous and will kill people. If you reintroduce these bears you will be directly responsible for killing people, hurting the economy of the state, and reducing recreational area. There are No positives to having grizzly bears in this area, do not reintroduce the bears.

Correspondence ID: 5713Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kent, WA 98030
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 07:52:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a concerned Washington resident who treasures the state's natural beauty, I implore officials to reconsider the idea of reintroducing grizzly bears. While conservation is vital, the potential risks to our safety during hikes cannot be ignored. My family and I, along with countless other outdoor enthusiasts, relish our hiking adventures. Introducing grizzlies brings the unsettling prospect of encounters with these powerful predators. Balancing conservation efforts with human safety is crucial. We must explore alternative approaches to protect our wildlife while allowing families to continue enjoying the great outdoors without the constant worry of grizzly encounters.

Correspondence ID: 5714Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98102
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 08:01:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not reintroduce grizzlies. I moved to Washington to get away.

Correspondence ID: 5715Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Marina del Rey, CA 90292
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 08:05:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly oppose reintroducing grizzlies to the North Cascades ecosystem.

These vicious bears are a hazard to human life and were long ago extirpated for this reason.

Having them return to the ecosystem would introduce a potentially fatal hazard to hikers and campers.

Please keep the grizzlies out of the North Cascades ecosystem.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 5716Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 08:26:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As an avid outdoorsman I oppose this plan. These are dangerous predators that have little to no fear of humans. You will reintroduce them and have to cull them within a decade.

Correspondence ID: 5717Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 08:31:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please don't reintroduce grizzlies to WA state. Human / grizzly conflict is inevitable and will increase as more people use the north cascades as population increases. Grizzly introduction will ruin the outdoors for a large segment of the population that is risk averse. I for one know my wife and kids would never camp or backpack in an area with grizzlies.

Spend your energy on useful things, like improving trails and road access to trailheads. People shouldn't need high clearance vehicles to access trailheads.

Correspondence ID: 5718Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Royal Oak, MI 48073
United States of America
Outside Organization: Royal Oak High School Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 08:36:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I think that the reintroduction of bears is a good idea. They will greatly help the entire ecosystem within the Cascades and even the surrounding area. We can see evidence of this with the similar reintroduction of wolves to Yellowstone. Grizzlies help with plant growth, not only by spreading seeds but also by aerating the soil just by moving around with their large claws. Finally, we are the reason that grizzlies can't be found in the Cascades anymore, and we should fix that.

Correspondence ID: 5719Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Royal Oak, MI 48073
United States of America
Outside Organization: Royal Oak High School Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 08:38:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The Bear Reintroduction Plan is a great idea. The positives they would pose to the environment outweigh any possible negatives their reintroduction would bring. The opposition's main point is keeping families safe but they are being reintroduced to a national park, not our front porch. I especially think it's a good idea to take it extremely slowly and introduce only 3-7 bears a year, that way if there are any issues there aren't any crazy adverse effects. But the environment would prosper under the reintroduction of grizzly bears and I think it's an incredible idea.

Correspondence ID: 5720Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Royal Oak, MI 48073
United States of America
Outside Organization: Royal oak High school Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 08:39:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I agree with the plan to create more space within protected land in order to save the grizzly bear population. I think it will be very beneficial to not only the Grizzly bears but also to the ecosystem. It could have major

benefits to create a thriving ecosystem. However, I would also say that it should be handled with care. If the bears eventually over populate it could have negative effects on the ecosystem as well.

Correspondence ID: 5721Project:112008Document:132104
Address: royal oak, MI 48073
United States of America
Outside Organization: Royal Oak High School Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 08:39:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Bears are essential to the ecosystems that once had them. They are a keystone species, and have a big impact on wherever they are, spreading berry seeds in their droppings, being at the top of the food webs, being a major predator for many species, and helping contribute to the balance of each ecosystem that they are apart of.

We have seen in other studies that a slow reintroduction, and then letting nature take its course, is the best way to reintroduce a species, and this plan follows those guidelines well. With the Wolves in Yellowstone, we saw them come in and immediately have an impact on the ecosystem, as they would kill the grazing animals, and then there would be more green grass available to graze on, as well as strengthening the river banks, and overall just starting a domino effect that impacted the entire ecosystem, just by reintroducing the one species.

Correspondence ID: 5722Project:112008Document:132104
Address: royal oak, MI 48073
United States of America
Outside Organization: royal oak high school Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 08:39:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I believe that Grizzly bear restoration is very important to the North Cascades ecosystem. The bears may disrupt at first, but considering they aren't still in the Cascades now because of human interference, it only seems right to bring them back. Some of the concerns of local citizens are that the bears will disrupt their land, however, it has been said that they will be given special tools to protect their land from the bears.

Correspondence ID: 5723Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Royal Oak, MI 48073
United States of America
Outside Organization: Royal Oak High School Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 08:40:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I believe that we should reintroduce Grizzly Bears back into the wilderness of the North Cascades ecosystem because they are a fundamental role in acting as a natural fertilizer for plants and a predator for the other species in the ecosystem. With small doses of this introduction I believe that these bears will thrive, though with monitoring these species we can prevent them from destruction of the cattle of farmers, whom have expressed concerns about their livestock being take. This can be prevented through caution with the animals and keeping watch of them as they adapt to their new environment.

Correspondence ID: 5724Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Royal Oak, MI 48073
United States of America
Outside Organization: Royal Oak High School Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 08:41:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The Grizzly Bear reintroduction should continue forward. The Grizzlies have many great effects on the ecosystem. First of all, they are at the top of the food chain, so they regulate other species populations. Think about when wolves were reintroduced to Yellowstone National Park, it was very beneficial and allowed for more biodiversity. Another

reason Grizzlies should be added is because they are great at digging, which may sound weird but they aerate the soil which helps with growth of many different plants. Again, increasing the biodiversity.

Correspondence ID: 5725Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spokane, WA 99207
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 08:42:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I oppose this plan and the reintroduction of Grizzly Bears in areas where they are currently absent from. This is a dangerous course of action which is likely to result in the unnecessary deaths of Washington residents and tourists who enjoy our natural resources.

Many Washingtonians and tourists take advantage of the beauty of our state through engagement in outdoor activities. Camping, hiking, hunting, trail-riding, skiing, and other activities are undertaken by many in the area proposed for reintroduction. Placing a lethal predator in these areas makes it an inevitability that there will be dangerous interactions between humans and the reintroduced populations. Grizzly are historically dangerous to humans. In fact, that is one of several reasons why the populations have been extirpated as they have.

There is no sufficiently compelling reason to warrant the reintroduction of these dangerous predators in areas near population centers, nor areas which provide the opportunity for so many to enjoy the outdoors in our state. Families, especially including ones with children, will be at greater danger if this plan is implemented.

I urge you to abandon this goal. It is simply not worth it.

Correspondence ID: 5726Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Royal Oak, MI 48073
United States of America

Outside Organization: Royal Oak Schools Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 08:44:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Bears play a vital role in their ecosystems and help our national parks and other wild places grow and survive, and it would be greatly beneficial if we reintroduced them back into the Cascades. They are able to modify the environment around them, they help maintain populations of deer and other prey species through predation and are important links in food webs, as well as other things like spread plant and berry seeds as they eat them. Their reintroduction would be similar to that of the gray wolves in Yellowstone. They would greatly help the environment just by doing things like regulating the prey populations and spreading plant life. Human activity is also the main reason for the bears decrease in population, and we should not be worried about being safe or not since they would be reintroduced to the parks, and not neighborhoods.

Correspondence ID: 5727Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Salem, OR 97301
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 08:44:48

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: In general, I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, but want to express the importance of executing a restoration plan that does not violate the Wilderness Act, nor should it put undue stress on, or harm the area's wilderness character. Currently, both USFWS action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. Additionally, I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act

(ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection. A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive. For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred. An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed. The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 5729Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Royal Oak, MI 48073
United States of America
Outside Organization: Royal Oak High School Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 08:45:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The plan to reintroduce grizzly bears into the North Cascades is a terrific idea. The plan will ensure the safety of the species, saving them from extinction, while also bringing numerous benefits to the local ecosystem. When gray wolves were reintroduced into Yellowstone National park in 1995, it lead to a complete trophic cascade which helped the environment thrive and grow. If the reintroduction of grizzly bears in the North Cascades is anything like the wolves in Yellowstone, then the plan will be a massive success.

Correspondence ID: 5730Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Royal Oak, MI 48073
United States of America
Outside Organization: Royal Oak High School Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 08:47:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Reintroducing grizzly bears into the North Cascades could have a positive impact on the environment. The reintroduction of an apex predator can significantly alter the wildlife and plant life in its habitat. The reintroduction of wolves into Yellowstone is an example of this, where they changed the number of elk and the flow of the river. By reintroducing bears into the North Cascades, they can reduce the population of other species, which could allow for other animals and plant life to thrive more. This could greatly improve the park's environment and make it more attractive to visitors. While bears pose a threat to humans, with proper care, caution, and instruction, the risk of injury from bears would be very low. Additionally, measures are being taken to address what would happen if bears go after livestock. Therefore, the harm of bears to humans would be minimal.

Correspondence ID: 5731Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Royal Oak, MI 48073
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 08:48:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As we are confronted with the issues of climate change and various other environmental/ecosystem issues, I would like to say that I support the Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan in the North Cascades. The Grizzly Bear is an important species in the North Cascades ecosystem and I believe that reintroducing them to the region would benefit the overall ecosystem as they would help to regulate the populations of their prey and keep forests healthy by dispersing seeds

and berries. Like the wolf reintroduction in Yellowstone, I believe that the reintroduction of the grizzlies can achieve a similar effect where a chain reaction can cause the ecosystem to flourish in ways that wouldn't have been possible without the reintroduction efforts. Furthermore, the grizzly bear is a threatened species because of overhunting and habitat loss by humans. We created this issue and now we must fix it. Lastly, the restoration plan would be carefully curated as it spans a long period (60 years to a century) and because conflict with local landowners and communities is being considered with the process through the 10 (j) experimental population designation.

Correspondence ID: 5733Project:112008Document:132104

Address: royal oak, MI 48073
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 08:50:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I believe that Grizzly Bears should be reintroduced because they are crucial to the environment. Just like with the reintroduction of the wolves in Yosemite, bears will also change the ecosystem for the better. The bears graze mostly on berries and fish and with those berries that they eat, they spread the seeds around causing more berry plants to grow. Consequently, the other animals also thrive off of these berry plants. I believe it would be best to gradually bring back bears in the Cascade Mountains even though farmers and ranchers might complain or oppose the idea. Farmers and ranchers' main argument against the reintroduction is that the bears will eat and kill their livestock. This is a rational reason, but it could also be said that the farmers and ranchers are also at fault because they won't section off some of their land; they know that there are animal predators that may eat their livestock but are not trying to do anything to protect their animals. You can also see this whole ordeal as hypocritical. Just as Americans are emotional over their homes, why are they (not all, but some people) trying to get rid of and displace bears from their homes? Many studies have shown, that if an animal is suddenly moved from their home they will be anxious, scared, and sometimes aggressive.

Correspondence ID: 5735Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kirkland, WA 98034
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 09:24:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Humans aren't known to survive grizzly attacks. Though the majority of a grizzly diet is roots and berries, humans live in Washington State too. Grizzlies will be attracted to the low hanging fruit of hiker and camper trash and will end up not having a natural diet. There will be grizzly attacks and the bears will need to be shot because they can't stay away from humans.

Correspondence ID: 5736Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Anacortes, WA 98221
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 09:31:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We should help our ranchers and farmers to feed our population. And not hinder them with carrying guns around all day to protect themselves from grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 5737Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Omak, WA 98841
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 09:51:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am opposed to the Grizzly restoration in the North Cascades since there is not sufficient food sources for them.
"NO" we do not want them!!!

Correspondence ID: 5738Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sedro-Woolley, WA 98284
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 10:12:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not reintroduce the Grizzlies to the North Cascades, those of us who live in the area are already plagued by the WSDFW "non-Management" of the overpopulated Elk herds, the overabundance of Coyotes, and the increasing presence of Cougars venturing into territory where they haven't been prevalent in over 50 years.

That same territory happens to be where my neighbors and I live, farm, and try to raise families.

It is bad enough that I don't venture outside at night without a gun for caution of the wildlife already; please understand I've lived in the same house in eastern Skagit County my whole life. My parents have lived in the area for over 60 years. None of us have ever felt this was an issue until about ten years ago as increasing elk populations began to encroach on the area we live; bringing the hoof rot bacteria, property damage, as well as predators looking to make elk a meal and finding easier prey in the lowlands.

I urge you to not reintroduce a species you don't understand and have no way of knowing how it may interact with the population of people who already occupy the area it used to roam.

Correspondence ID: 5739Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bremerton, WA 98337
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 10:23:52

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As someone who recreates in the NCE every year, typically in the wilderness areas and in the backcountry, I strongly oppose Options B and C (particularly Option B). Reintroducing grizzlies in Washington will almost certainly result in death for some number of people recreating in the area. We have seen this in every state that has stable grizzly populations. It is reasonable to hypothesize that with the large number of Washington residents recreating in the backcountry in the state, that there will be human-grizzly conflicts that will eventually result in the death of some number of outdoorspeople due to grizzly encounters.

As we have seen in Montana and Wyoming, even when grizzly numbers are recovered, there is strong resistance from outside interests in preventing the states from managing grizzly populations as they do with other species (such as black bear, deer, elk, etc). This has resulted in a robust and increasing population of grizzlies that kill some number of people every single year in those states, and injury even more. I appreciate the benefit that grizzlies bring to the ecosystem, but I think it is outweighed by the strong probability that they will eventually end up killing humans who are trying to recreate in nature.

Correspondence ID: 5740Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98273-6907
United States of America

Outside Organization: Private citizen Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 10:38:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Why are you putting the people living in the "North Cascades" at risk by bringing in predatory animals? The people who live in the area have enough problems with the Elk that were brought in. Grizzly's are known to attack and eat people, which includes small children. Who will be liable for damages from the attacks and deaths that will inevitably happen after bringing Grizzlies into the area. I think this proposal is at the very least STUPID. I'm opposed to introducing any predatory animals into a primarily populated environment.

Correspondence ID: 5741Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Holiday, FL 34691
United States of America

Outside Organization: - Select - Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 10:44:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: After reading what is proposed all I could think was Oh my God, how appalling. I know that doesn't sound very professional, however, it is absolutely outrageous that anyone would consider such a plan that does more harm than any good. We need to minimize any and all mechanized equipment into a "wilderness area" and to list these bears as experimental so that you get around endangered species rules/protections is unconscionable. To also consider installing tracking equipment, collars, multiple sampling is harassment of the bears and is not really "wild". Please stop considering this plan and others like it. I am absolutely against this plan. If this is the best we can do we are serious trouble.

Correspondence ID: 5742Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sedro-Woolley, WA 98284
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 10:44:37

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I would highly recommend NOT implementing this program.

I recently attended an informational presentation that was given, concerning the program to re-introduce Grizzly bear into the North Cascade Range. This presentation, for me, left more questions than answers. There was not the opportunity for those gathered at this presentation to ask any questions. The Grizzly bear requires large territories to roam and are solitary animals, each requiring up to 500-600 square miles each. Grizzly bears are considered apex predators, needing an eco-system that would support them. The relocated bears would be collared, but the monitoring of these bears would not happen in real time, their travel is recorded and transmitted every 48 hours via satellite. This does not allow for fast trapping and removal should a bear move into a populated area, or have a conflict/interaction with people. Washington State, and especially the North Cascades, is a beautiful place. Hiking, camping, and fishing streams, are a large draw for many people throughout the year. This would greatly increase the possibility of bear/human interaction, which could be very dangerous. Within this program there are specific "zones" that would be focused on for relocation of the bears. One boundary of the main zone falls just east of the town of Lyman along Highway 20. In this area are farms with livestock, houses with families/children, an Elementary school, and other businesses. The Washington Dept. Fish and Wildlife are currently partnered with local agencies, and are responsible for managing the elk population that are in the area. The elk population are not being managed well. There is a portion of the elk that are diseased, and dying a slow death. They move among homes, have been known to chase homeowners when they are in their yards. They are also inhabiting some towns within the city limits. The hoof rot disease that a portion of the herd carries can be transmitted to deer, cows, sheep and goats. It is a very painful way to die for the animals. If this is an example of how the Grizzly bears will be managed by the same agencies, then I have no confidence in the Washington Dept. Fish and Wildlife's ability to manage this program or these apex predators.

I would highly recommend NOT implementing this program.

Correspondence ID: 5743Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Milton, WA 98354
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 11:00:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the grizzly bear restoration plan as currently drafted.

Correspondence ID: 5744Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98502
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 11:06:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is a very dangerous proposal. The Grizzly bear is an apex predator and there needs to be more time consulting the land owners that this proposal will affect. Please don't shove this down the property owner's throats without more time to consider their needs and opinions. If anything is given it will be a fact that these bears will kill livestock eventually and with human deaths and other casualties. Today is not 2000 years ago when only natives coexisted with the Grizzly bear. The landowners opinions must be prioritized above the desires of the tribes and environmentalists. Do not make another of your infamous mistakes again. I implore you to consider the land owners desires and needs above the rest.

Correspondence ID: 5745Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sedro Woolley, WA 98284
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 11:07:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Who came up with this idea and why suddenly is this a priority? I have yet to see anything that this government touches that works well, ie: our lovely health care system. If this ecosystem is so conducive to bears why aren't they already there? I don't believe that you really care about public comments, nor pay attention to them. Although, like all government agencies, now you can start a new department, hire more staff and then hire administrative personnel. This is a bad idea!

██████████

Correspondence ID: 5746Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98512
United States of America

Outside Organization: Washington Dept of Fish and Wildlife State Government

Received: Nov,03 2023 11:13:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Overall, I support grizzly bear recolonization of the northern Cascades. To give time for the state, federal, and tribal entities to prepare the parks, natural areas, and private lands for grizzly bears, I believe that natural recolonization is the best way forward. If we begin introducing grizzly bears into the ecosystem before preparing the people and places within (i.e., bear safe parks, neighborhoods, camping areas, etc.), it could put undue stress on the people in the area, on the conflict staff that will have to respond to problem bears that are trying to disperse, and on the bears themselves.

Correspondence ID: 5747Project:112008Document:132104

Address: West Richland, WA 99353
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 11:16:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I would like this to be decided by the experts, not by people scared about what they don't understand.

Correspondence ID: 5748Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sedro Woolley, WA 98284
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 11:17:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: There are many reasons not to reintroduce grizzlies into the North Cascades.
These are just a few reasons:

I don't feel that public safety of campers, hikers, bikers, hunters etc. has been address.
Live stock and pets are an easy food source.
Farmers will suffer even great hardships.
The elk alone is an example of how poorly things have been managed.
The elk have learned to "live" close to people with very little fear for an easy food source. That will bring the grizzlies even closer to populated areas.
Money is being spent to bring back the salmon runs, grizzlies eat fish causing even less salmon in the streams.
You can't manage something that is unmanageable and in the end that is what grizzlies are.
Please DO NOT allow grizzlies back into the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 5749Project:112008Document:132104
Address: WINTHROP, WA 98862
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 11:18:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I strongly support the reintroduction of grizzly bears into the North Cascades ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 5750Project:112008Document:132104
Address: TWISP, WA 98856
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 11:19:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To Whom It May Concern,

I fully welcome and encourage the reintroduction of Grizzly Bears into the North Cascades,

Living only 14 miles away from the eastern boundary of the NCNP, I have no concerns regarding reintroducing an apex predatory into the North Cascades and understand the added benefits it's reintroduction will have on benefiting the environment.

Thank you

Correspondence ID: 5751Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Tieton, WA 98947
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 11:24:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Introducing grizzly bear has no good side to it and is against the wishes of the people of Washington state. Follow the will of the people

Correspondence ID: 5752Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Eau Claire, MI 49111
United States of America
Outside Organization: Becht Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 11:24:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hon Newhouse:

Introduction of the grizzlies to the cascades is going to hurt the economy for central Washington. It will drive casual tourists away as well as hurting the farming and ranching communities.

Can you work with congress to cut funding for the introduction? Also was the regulation prepared under the Technology Transfer Act of 1995? That requires consensus standards to be used as part of the regulation and office of Management & Budget to approve the regulation.

Also, maybe introduce the grizzlies to Seattle. It would show the impact of grizzlies on individual homeowners.

I lived in W. Richland and still receive your newsletter. I support many of your initiatives and believe you are doing a fine job representing the people of central Washington.

Correspondence ID: 5753Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Pasco, WA 99301
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 11:26:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I was in Banff when the very experienced couple were camping. Report that they did everything right yet the Grizzly maled them in their tent. Those bears are like pitt bulls, many may avoid conflict but if they ever attack the sheer strength will kill or mame the victim. They have no business being introduced back into areas that have been populated by humans. They belong in the Rockies wilderness. We saw a black bear and it got many galkers stopping along the side of the road with their phones out taking pictures. This is the world we live in now. Grizzly may have become irritated. Not to mention if there is not enough berries and food for them. Please do not bring grizzlies back to central Washington unless you want carnage.

Correspondence ID: 5755Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 11:28:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As an avid outdoors person who visists the North Cascades ecosystem every year, I FULLY SUPPORT the reintroduction of grizzly bears. This is our moment and opportunity to restore a healthy, vibrant, and abundant population that is on the verge of extirpation. Humans and wildlife can and must coexist.

Correspondence ID: 5756Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 11:29:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Park and Fish Leaders,

I appreciate your concern for the grizzly bear population. But at a time when our national parks are deteriorating, I find it ironic that we want to direct funds to projects that endanger people from experiencing the wilderness of the North Cascades. Grizzly bears will scare more people away from the North Cascades for their spiritual experience than bring people to this area. Maybe you want to scare people into a spiritual experience.

There are better uses of the funds that won't put people's lives into danger. NO Grizzly bears in the North Cascades, please.

Concerned Hiker,



Correspondence ID: 5757Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Grandview, WA 98930
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 11:30:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Don't introduce Grizzly bears into the Eastern Cascade mountains. Grizz use a very large territory in which they forage. They're big, they're dangerous and unpredictable. The huge furry creatures would have a huge impact on farm workers, children, and crops. There is no need to return the environment back to the 1850's.

Correspondence ID: 5758Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kennewick, WA 99338
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 11:31:15

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please keep Grizzly bears out of our state. It is reckless and senseless to reintroduce the species back into our state.any outdoor enthusiast lives will be placed in danger if this proposal comes to fruition. Our community is seeing an increase of other unregulated wild animals, cougars and black bears, wonder through neighborhoods, which causes an increased risk for all citizens. Our state does not need another unregulated wild animal becoming over, populated and placing the lives of our citizens at risk.

Correspondence ID: 5759Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Toppenish, WA 98948
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 11:31:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Regarding the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the cascade mountain region, it has become clear that the organization/agency behind this terrible idea has no basis in scientific data. There is a reason why these ferocious press were largely eliminated from Washington and surrounding regions. That reason is, of course, that they are a very real threat to human habitation in the area. Grizzly bears need hundreds of square miles to roam and find their food sources, and with the population of this state and the northwest continuing to grow, it seems both **ILLOGICAL AND IRRESPONSIBLE** to push this idea on an unwilling population of rural homeowners, farmers, ranchers, and outdoorsmen.

Correspondence ID: 5760Project:112008Document:132104

Address: OTHELLO, WA 99344
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 11:31:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: DO NOT bring in grizzlies. You will endanger lives as well as upsetting the environment.

Correspondence ID: 5762Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Yakima, WA 98901
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 11:33:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Regarding the Grizzly bear restoration circus. Let us restore these bears in the activists backyards and see how they get along with them before putting them in the North Cascades!

Correspondence ID: 5763Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Selah, WA 98942
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 11:36:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The question is not how we manage these bears once they're here, it's whether or not to introduce grizzly bears to our region at all.
What are the agencies' plan for dealing with crop loss and livestock depredation that is inevitable from the introduction of these predators? What is the timeline for issuing lethal permits? And how much will citizens have to lose before they can defend themselves from this predator in their backyard?
I think lawsuits are in order. Too bad they cannot go against the individuals making these insane rulings. The lawsuits end up going against the taxpayer. In other words, you bunch of nasty bureaucrats suffer nothing for your bad decisions. Must feel good. Maybe you should consider what God thinks.

Correspondence ID: 5764Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Riverside, WA 98849
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 11:38:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am against releasing Grizzly bears in Washington. For years we have lost habitats due to extreme fires. With these fires loss of life to our animal populations, i.e., food chain, that would be needed to support these bears. The bear will follow the food chain which means coming onto farmlands to eat livestock and anything that appeals to them which can and has included human life. We, the citizens, have strongly stood during public comment periods and voiced our opinion which was, "No". There are plenty of fires in neighboring Canada which does have Grizzly bear. The bears will migrate into our state and probably already have. That, we can do nothing about from happening.

Correspondence ID: 5765Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Okanogan, WA 98840
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 11:38:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Mr. Newhouse,
I am from Okanogan County and do not want more grizzlies introduced into the North Cascades. Many of us know that there are a few already here. If they migrate on their own that's one thing but being put here by unelected bureaucrats that don't even live in the area is wrong! I'd like to know the names and addresses of these people so I can send them my thoughts. Thanks for fighting for us but I'm still upset with you for voting to impeach President Trump.
Sincerely,
██████████
Okanogan

Correspondence ID: 5766Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Pasco, WA 99301
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 11:38:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not see a need to introduce grizzlies. Lets listen to our farmers!! They provide the needs for HUMAN life to survive and yet here we are wanting to introduce the grizzly that WILL prey on livestock. After spending 18 yrs in Montana, I see what grizzlies do. They are not to be messed with especially before hibernating. 20 miles from a place I love in Montana, this summer, and runner and mother was killed by a grizzly. She was on a well run path and had her dogs with her. She didn't stand a chance. Don't be a fool to think grizzlies will stay where designated.

Here is a copy of what I found on WA State Standard news article:

"For example, livestock owners in certain areas, under specified circumstances, and after getting government approval, would be allowed to kill grizzlies that attack or threaten livestock.

And people would be free to "haze, disrupt, or annoy" bears that approach homes and other structures."

You can't be serious. This is the best you have for one NEEDING to protect themselves and livestock. Why don't you just tie their hands? A grizzly attacks to kill. But a farmer can only protect once a grizzly starts an attack?? Are you going to pay for that farmers cow that that grizzly just killed? The grizzly YOU brought back.!

If a Grizzly approached me or my family, you think annoying a bear is the best solution. It's a GRIZZLY.

Listen to the farmers. They provide food for you!! Yes grizzlies can be good for replanting seeds and other things but grizzlies don't put food on you your table like farmers do. Please listen to common sense.

Correspondence ID: 5767Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Chelan, WA 98816
United States of America
Outside Organization: Tax Payer Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 11:42:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Scott and Kathy Schulte and our family are totally against bringing Grizzly Bears into Washington state. They don't want to come. If they come naturally Okay. They will hang out by rivers and creeks to eat Salmon and other fish. That is where the people are. Cattle will be desert.

Correspondence ID: 5768Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Prosser, WA 99350
United States of America
Outside Organization: Valley Publishing Business
Received: Nov,03 2023 11:42:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have a small place of 10 acres in Prosser. I think it is great you are introducing the grizzly into the North Cascades. A place in our state for wildlife to exist. I support you in this endeavor.

Dan Newhouse and the Mega nuts are implying no one had in put etc. Guess he would know about how that looks as the Republicans do it all the time. Frankly, Dan Newhouse hasn't gotten his hands dirty in a long time other than his support of a really bad, no-support-of-wildlife ex-president. That is the real threat to public lands, livestock, farm land, and humans.

Carry on and thank you for all you do.

Correspondence ID: 5769Project:112008Document:132104

Address: East Wenatchee, WA 98802
United States of America

Outside Organization: none Unaffiliated Individual(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,03 2023 11:46:03

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Your anti-grizzly statements have been a 'stretch' to say the least. ' Destroying crops, killing people, and being an overall endangerment to people' are so close to lies. The Wilderness areas are so far away from your farm... Those kinds of statements are just made to elicit Republican nonsense once again. Just stop it! People who go into the wilderness areas should know that danger lurks...and 99% of them do. If your crops and herd animals are being trampled and killed, then you are farming where you don't belong. If you are farming where you don't belong, then you are not a good farmer...

Correspondence ID: 5770Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ellensburg, WA 98926
United States of America

Outside Organization: Doctor Trombone Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 11:55:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I fully support the reintroduction of grizzly bears in Washington. I think the opinion of wildlife biologists outweighs the opinions of uninformed and paranoid private individuals.

Correspondence ID: 5771Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Shoreline, WA 98133
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 11:59:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My family enjoys roaming and exploring the North Cascades and want the ecosystem to thrive. However, grizzly bears are known for their relatively aggressive natures, especially during mating seasons. An experienced pair of hikers was mauled to death by a grizzly in Montana less than a year ago. I have a pre-schooler who is learning to love and protect the outdoors -- he would be maimed or killed in an inopportune encounter with a grizzly. That knowledge would chill our willingness to explore the North Cascades, and ultimately would reduce our engagement with and support for the educational programs at the park which we have always loved. For these reasons, I am opposed to the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 5772Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Camano Island, WA 98282
United States of America

Outside Organization: Retired Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 11:59:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I agree keep up the good work

Correspondence ID: 5773Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bow, WA 98232
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 12:00:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I would like to offer my support for alternative C.

Correspondence ID: 5774Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Quincy, WA 98848
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 12:01:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: You are overstepping the US Constitution. I demand you cease this action. I am in full support of my congressman to stop funding your department. I do not pay taxes to be ignored by unelected officials.

Correspondence ID: 5775Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Richland, WA 99354
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 12:05:01

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am firmly opposed to the plan to introduce Grizzly bears to the North Cascades ecosystem. This dangerous predator jeopardizes public safety and private property and should not be introduced into central Washington.

Correspondence ID: 5777Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Chesww, WA 98844-9407
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 12:10:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Do not release grizzlies in our state and my back yard. Grizzlies can move Canada to the Okanogan Highlands already so this "Reintroduction" is a waste of money, resources, and time but even more importantly; this plan is a danger to the people of Washington State as we as a danger to crops, livestock and wildlife.

This is a great plan for people to poach the bears if needed to stop this idiocy.

Again, my wife and I are against this plan.

Correspondence ID: 5778Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bothell, WA 98021
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 12:10:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The natural beauty of the Pacific Northwest is what makes it special. In order to preserve our temperate rainforest climate we must be stewards of the land, which includes caring for the creatures that inhabit it. Grizzly bears, wolves, and other predator animals are essential to our ecosystem and we must allow them to thrive so that we can too! Please save and restore these beautiful animals now!

Correspondence ID: 5779Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Burien, WA 98146-3333
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 12:12:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Bring the Grizzlies back to the north cascades. They are an essential part of our diverse ecosystem. We were the ones that took their territory and we should be the ones to bring them back!

Correspondence ID: 5780Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Rockport, WA 98283
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 12:13:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We do not want grizzly bears in Washington!

We already have enough problems with the elks, coyotes, and cougars in our area as it is.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 5781Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Chelan, WA 98816
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 12:15:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I would like to see Grizzly bears reintroduced to the North Cascades under the 10(j) rule (referred to as Alternative C in the prepared Environmental Impact Statement). I hike in the North Cascades multiple times per year. If grizzly bears are reintroduced, I will have increased psychological trepidation, but would likely be at less risk than encountering a rattlesnake which is common. I spent 12 years in south west Alaska and routinely explored wilderness areas where brown bear are common. They were always more interested in blueberries than us.

I agree that allowing active management would increase community acceptance but would caution against leaving those decision in the hands of state sport/game managers and prefer such decisions made by agencies with a conservationist perspective.

I know that bears typically eat vegetation and insects, but wonder if there would be sufficient alternate sources of food such as fish. I suspect that historic populations of fish are far less than when grizzly bears were last present in the area.

I also request that the park or forest service consider installing either bear resistant food boxes or fixed elevated food hanging cables at camp sites along high use hiking trails such as pacific crest trail to reduce potential bear-human interactions. I know it is mostly in wilderness, but such things may reduce bear encounters and increase community acceptance of the reintroduction program.

Correspondence ID: 5782Project:112008Document:132104
Address: wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 12:17:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am strongly in favor of the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades. I feel it is our duty to our kids, grandkids and great grandkids to assist in restoring the finer that have roamed these areas for thousands of years. I think it is very shortsighted to I have previously exterminated these wild animals, and it is our duty to bring them back to our special ecosystem.

I have spent time hiking in grizzly country in Montana, and Alaska And I think it only adds to the overall experience. I think the current national park service plan for close follow up and careful study is a safe and responsible way to proceed with rehabilitation of some of the wildest areas in our great nation.

Correspondence ID: 5784Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Pasco, WA 99301
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 12:23:37

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I know that this is a very bad idea. There is a reason these animals are no longer in the areas that they want to reintroduce them to because they came into contact with human inhabitants which forced them out of the areas due to agricultural damage and human safety. Reintroducing them will just cause damage to the agriculture in nearby areas and their ultimate demise once again. Let's keep with the conservation of the habitat that these animals are already in than re introducing them into areas that are dangerous for our agriculture, human and the animals lives as well. In the end you're going to end up with the same outcome, the destruction of these poor animals just to make a few unfounded people's feelings justified.

Don't do this for the animals' sake.

Correspondence ID: 5785Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Royal Oak, MI 48073
United States of America

Outside Organization: Royal Oak High School Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 12:25:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The grizzly bear being reintroduced to the north cascades would substantially benefit the surrounding ecosystems. When the bears dig, they churn the dirt which allows for more plant growth. They will also help with keeping the wildflowers under control, by digging. Yes, they might kill a couple of animals and some livestock, but that is a minor drawback to the improvement the bears would cause to their surrounding ecosystem

Correspondence ID: 5786Project:112008Document:132104

Address: royal oak, MI 48073
United States of America

Outside Organization: ROHS Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 12:27:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think bears should be re-introduced to the North Cascades because bears hold a very important role in nature and can provide a lot of ecological benefits, such as controlling other animals' populations and even encouraging wildflower growth with their digging. Bears should be brought back also because bringing them back is restoring their species and continuing with population growth. However, if bears start getting too comfortable and close to humans, appropriate measures should be taken.

Correspondence ID: 5787Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Solana Beach, CA 92075
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 12:28:10

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please reconsider your approach to Grizzlies in the Cascades.

I fully support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, but the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer

clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I completely oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection. Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest. This is not an ethical or humane alternative!

Therefore, a natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Thank you for your consideration of these suggestions.

Correspondence ID: 5788Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Royal Oak, MI 48073
United States of America

Outside Organization: Royal Oak High School Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 12:29:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I believe that the Grizzly should be reintroduced to the north cascades. Reintroduction would have good effects on the environment because it is delivering a top level predator that has already been apart of that ecosystem back to where it belongs. The Grizzly is a part of that stable environment and without it changes occur and maybe some are yet to come that change the dynamic of the ecosystem. I also think that the inclusion of the 10j section is very important because it will allow ranchers and people who live in that area to conduct their lives in a way barely affected by the reintroduction, people should not have to give up their lively hoods.

Correspondence ID: 5789Project:112008Document:132104

Address: royal oak, MI 48073
United States of America

Outside Organization: royal oak high school Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 12:30:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think reintroduction for grizzly bears is a good thing. i believe it will help the environmental factors and help the bears themselves. we are no longer keeping the species at risk for extinction and we are bringing them back to their former homes. there will still be risks for having that many bears back to humans and their livestock/crops but if they were to harm humans or their belongs humans should be able to use self defense and protect themselves, that being said i don't think hunting or anything along the lines should be allowed to keep them protected.

Correspondence ID: 5790Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Royal Oak, MI 48073
United States of America

Outside Organization: Royal Oak High School Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 12:31:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The grizzly bears being reintroduced to the North Cascades would benefit the surrounding ecosystems exponentially. When the bears dig, they mix around the dirt which allows for more plants to grow. They will also help with keeping the wildflowers and other plant life under control by digging. They might kill a couple of animals and some livestock, but that is a very small negative to the improvement the bears would cause to the ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 5791Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Steilacoom, WA 98388
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 12:33:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing in support of the re-introduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades. Grizzlies are an important part of the ecosystem and the North Cascades provide habitat and protection where the bears will have a chance to survive and thrive. As a keystone species, they play a very important part of this amazing natural system. As you know, grizzly bears occupied the North Cascades for thousands of years as an essential part of this ecosystem. They helped in the distribution of native plant seeds and kept other wildlife populations in balance. I support the restoration of this balance.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Correspondence ID: 5793Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Royal Oak, MI 48073
United States of America

Outside Organization: Royal Oak High School Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 12:34:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Although there may be some concerns regarding the reintroduction of the grizzly bear--such as potential problems with private property and livestock--it is of utmost importance we protect our environment and reintroducing grizzlies is a great place to start. I also believe it is fair to allow owners of private land to get the bears off said land (without killing the bears) should they become a nuisance. Bears will rejuvenate the soil as well as allow for more sparsely planted berries, overall improving the health of the ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 5795Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Royal Oak, MI 48073
United States of America

Outside Organization: Royal Oak High School Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 12:36:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The grizzly bear being reintroduced into the north cascades would 100% have a benefit to all the surrounding ecosystems. There are many pros that come with these bears being reintroduced. For an example these bears love to dig and they do it a lot, in doing so they turn dirt which initiates plant growth among many plants. These bears will kill animals which doesn't sound the greatest however in doing so these bears are adding to our land by regulating population. However, I understand the live stock portion may not be ideal. We are facing a potential 6th mass extinction and with reintroducing these bears we can prevent another animal going on that list.

Correspondence ID: 5796Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Astoria, OR 97103
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 12:40:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I believe option 2 which would restore approximately 200 grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem is the best option. Grizzly bears are key stone species and the entire ecosystem will be better off with a genetically stable population of grizzly bears.

Correspondence ID: 5797Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Langley, WA 98260
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 12:41:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears should not be intentionally reintroduced. This is a bad idea. I spend a lot of time doing outdoor recreation in the NCE. I backpack, hike, and fish in many of these places. I am accustomed to the fact that there are already large predators in those areas, black bears and cougars specifically. Those animals are less dangerous to people than grizzly bears. Black bears are quite timid around people and will almost always flee if they smell or hear a human approaching. Cougars are indifferent to people. We are not a food source for them and they are not seeking the food we carry. Grizzly bears are different. They want to eat the same things we eat, and they are not timid of people in the same way that black bears are. There will be fatal encounters with people such as the horrible incident that recently happened in Banff. That couple did every responsible thing they could do and were still mauled to death by a dangerous animal. I am not a gun owner and I do not want to have to carry a gun to feel safe when in the woods. This will directly impact my ability to enjoy these areas for outdoor recreation. It is only a matter of when, not if, someone gets seriously injured or killed as a result of this decision.

Correspondence ID: 5799Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Naches, WA 98937
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 13:00:37

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I applaud the work of those who are trying to improve our outdoor spaces for future generations.

I completely disagree with the plan to reintroduce grizzlies back into the North Cascades Ecosystem. Unfortunately, when (not if!) a bear does something egregious to a human or animals belonging to humans, the bear will suffer. That is inevitable and understanding this, it's entirely unfair to place such a species in this position.

If it were possible to eliminate the possibility of such human encounters then I would fully support the move to reintroduce. But it is only a matter of time before a negative encounter occurs and the consequences will fall on the bears, not the humans.

Think it through more fully. There are more and more people venturing into the wilderness so the chance of encounters that end poorly for the bears will only increase.

Sincerely,

, PhD Biology
University of Washington

Correspondence ID: 5800Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98506
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 13:08:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support Alternative C, which I feel is needed and would benefit the health of grizzlies, humans and the natural environment. I feel that the release rate and release numbers appear to be more conservative than I would recommend, which unfortunately will delay and slow down grizzly occupancy rates and population sizes and the associated ecological benefits somewhat. Great plan overall with plenty of space for humans and grizzlies to coexist and support each other.

Correspondence ID: 5801Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Yakima, WA 98901
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 13:09:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please reintroduce the Grizzly bear to Washington.

Correspondence ID: 5802Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Prosser, WA 99350
United States of America
Outside Organization: ██████████ Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 13:10:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The premise for reintroduction of grizzly bears seems to be that they once occupied certain areas therefore they have rights to graze their native lands. That being the case, it seems to be a flawed plan with an inhumane perspective. The grizzly bears have moved on to bigger and better frontiers that more adequately support their comfort, safety, and ability to protect themselves and their families. This includes protection from humans who have weapons to protect themselves, and rightly so against such a fierce foe. Another way to consider this is that if the extinction of the Grizzly bear would be appropriate if the alternative was just one human life was to be lost. The answer is a resounding yet, a human life is more precious and valuable than all the Grizzly's in the world.

The true scenario is, however, more complicated. First, it would be difficult to irradicate all apex predators such as the Grizzly and it is unnecessary given the natural tendencies for wild animals to stay within their natural habitat. There is no fence of protection but one is not needed because the potential for crossing paths is statistically invalid.

Introducing these bears into a region that may not have them, however, leads to unknown results. For example, we have no understanding of where the animals may go, what other predators they may encounter, how they determine their "home turf" of if they naturally do not being born there. The bottom line is that this argument has been presented in the past and the answer, as long as we prioritize human life, remains constant.

The Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan & Environmental Impact Statement produced by the Nation Park Service, US Fish & Wildlife, and the US Dept of Interior, seems to be mainly interested in injecting mayhem into the otherwise normal lives of the grizzly bears and into the affected lives of many humans that would be negatively impacted by such a move.

Plainly, downtown Seattle used to be owned, cohabited, and grazed by mountain goats, mule deer, grizzly bears, and others. Using the professionals' logic confirmed in the Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan, it would make most sense to release each of these species back into their homeland of downtown Seattle.

Never mind the fact that actual humans have worked for nearly 200 years to occupy, build shelter, provide security, enable transportation, and create spaces for human recreation and enjoyment. I'm sure that the grizzly bears could attend classes to ensure that they would work and live within the structure of what humans have since created for themselves in the Seattle area.

If you think this is parody then please read the report which boldly instructs, as part of its adaptive management plan, to re-educate the human population to ensure the lives of the grizzly bears are protected.

There is no human benefit to reintroducing grizzly bears into Washington State. It is arguable is there is any measurable or known benefit at all.

If the grizzly bears wanted to live in this region then they could naturally migrate here. We here in America have wide open borders so they could simply walk across the Canadian border and they could freely occupy whatever territory they see fit to take. As an apex predator, they could probably take just about any space they wanted and could make it their own.

Introduction of grizzly bears into Washington would be harmful to the existing wildlife that has developed a habitat that does not include this fierce predator.

The North Cascades National Park has a limited budget and is already stretched even without the additional load of managing a grizzly bear population. Additionally, Don Striker, Superintendent of the North Cascades Park on one hand wants to increase the number of passes into the park to increase revenue (increase revenue through passes is the story but the real reason is to leverage the number of visitors to justify additional funding politically) while on the other hand admitting that increased visitors to the park adds stress to the management and park services. This becomes particularly pointed when dealing with major medical responses and search and rescue situations.

Reintroduction of the grizzly bear would only serve to increase the already out of control regulation on Washingtonians in regards to their movement, use, and enjoyment of public lands. The Federal Land Policy & Management Act (FLPMA), 1976, has a multi-use provision which means every American including a hiker, camper, cattle rancher or energy producer has a place on public lands. The introduction of an apex predator to public lands that are otherwise relatively safe for human flourishing is counter to the human narrative. And, the introduction would open the door for even more regulation in the future when an actual human wants to use public lands for something productive because the bureaucrats will claim they need to protect the natural habitat of the Grizzly bear.

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) 1969 does not include a mandate to restore grizzly bears to the North Cascade ecosystem. At best, it provides a recommendation for such consideration to be evaluated. Assuming that this suggestion is to be implemented at great cost, risk or at the cost of human flourishing is a grand overreach of anything ever intended by the 1969 Act.

Up to 500 grizzly bears may already exist in Washington state according to individual reports and official reports from Washington Dept. of Fish & Wildlife (WDFW). Therefore, the grizzly bears are currently existing, likely thriving and at least surviving. Introducing more grizzly bears to the mix would endanger both the existing and the introduced bears due to territorial issues and it would embolden people to hunt the grizzly bears. They would not be welcome by other predators and human intervention cannot be contained through the written intentions or ideas of others.

One of the stated goals of the project is to support the recovery of the grizzly bear such that it can be removed from the Federal List of Endangered & Threatened Wildlife. The issue with the current plan is that it only confirms that the grizzly would never be removed from the list because the political & charity system in the US creates an environment where funding becomes more important than the original goal of supporting a species. Because that financial opportunity is furthered by the inclusion of the species on the endangered list, species are essentially never removed from the list. Until this problem is fixed, we cannot and should not support efforts to introduce additional grizzly bears to the PNW without a plan to also protect the consumers from capitalistic efforts of charities to further themselves or of bureaucrats using the grizzly bear situation to further their political goals.

Correspondence ID: 5804Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Manson, WA 98831
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 13:18:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I oppose the introduction of grizzly bears into the North Cascades ecosystem. As a frequent user of the North Cascades National Park system and surrounds I am worried about my safety if there are grizzly bears around. What is the goal here? Appease the environmental zealots who want the North Cascades to look like it did before human habitation? No thanks. Not interested in a grizzly bear encounter. You can bet that visitors in grizzly bear country will be armed to the hilt.

Correspondence ID: 5805Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 13:22:24

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello,

I would prefer you not reintroduce grizzly bears. For what is worth, it seems like a dangerous thing to do to reintroduce grizzly bears into such a well visited and populated state.

Correspondence ID: 5806Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Coupeville, WA 98239
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 13:26:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please, no reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades. There is no common sense to it at this point in time. Also very expensive. Grizzly bears go wherever they want, whenever they want. A reintroduction will just create problems between the bears and people, also salmon runs (they will find them), and people's livelihoods. The time has long past for grizzlies in that area.

Correspondence ID: 5807Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98107
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 13:29:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Humans were responsible for removing grizzlies from the North Cascades and it's our responsibility to bring them back home. If we don't take action now, we risk losing grizzly bears from the North Cascades forever.

Correspondence ID: 5808Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Vancouver, WA 98685
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 13:30:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in favor of alternative C. It provides an opportunity for grizzly bear recovery in Washington while providing more options for protecting people. As an experienced hiker and backpacker, I appreciate the thoughtfulness of this plan.

Correspondence ID: 5809Project:112008Document:132104

Address: spokane, WA 99258
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 13:35:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To whom it may concern,

I recently read the Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/Environmental Impact Statement for the North Cascades ecosystem and have a few concerns I would like addressed. First, I appreciate that there are so many positive aspects to reintroduction that would improve indigenous peoples' relations and how the reintroduction would restore ecological interactions. However, is there any plan in place to help protect these grizzly bears from human impacts like roads? Would it be possible to implement some wildlife crossings in areas where a major road intersects wild lands? I believe that it is necessary to implement a wildlife crossing to help protect grizzlies for the long term. As the population continues to grow and expand into new territories, roads are a major threat that could lead to grizzly bear mortality. These wildlife bridges could help bears thrive in their ecosystem and not be as impacted by human activity.

Additionally, by introducing bears into the area, there seems to be a higher likelihood of humans interacting with these bears. How do you plan to manage these inevitable interactions? I do not think that everyone knows what they need to do when they are in bear country. There will need to be a different standard for trash, food, and household pets. Will there be free public education on what to do if you encounter a grizzly bear and how to manage the aforementioned things? While I understand the numerous benefits of bringing grizzly bears into this area, I believe that the safety of the bears and the safety of humans need to be addressed before any introduction can occur.

Correspondence ID: 5811Project:112008Document:132104

Address: RICHLAND, WA, WA 99352
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 13:51:08

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do believe that restoring grizzlies to North Cascades is a GOOD THING. Apex predators are necessary for a healthy ecosystem. I do have concerns that ranchers may inflate any cattle losses, so I hope that that is also considered after introduction.

Correspondence ID: 5812Project:112008Document:132104

Address: East Wenatchee, WA 98802
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 13:57:31

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The risks to recreation in our wonderful North Cascades is higher than the environmental benefit grizzlies will add. I and my friends and my children love hiking and backpacking in our wilderness, and our safety will be impacted by the reintroduction of grizzlies. PLEASE do not do this. They just aren't necessary here.

Correspondence ID: 5813Project:112008Document:132104

Address: East Wenatchee, WA 98802
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 14:00:21

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is a terrible idea. Which will become clear when people start dying. There are too many people using our lands to introduce an animal designed purely for killing. I hope the originations supporting the reintroduction are also responsible for the deaths that will be caused.

Correspondence ID: 5814Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Blaine, WA 98230
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 14:01:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Although I am a huge Sierra Club supporter and wilderness advocate, I do not support reintroducing grizzlies into the North Cascades. My sons and husband hike there all the time. It makes me really nervous.

When we go to grizzly areas in Montana, we can't hike. We refuse to bring guns with us.

The recent attack deaths in Canada and some of the recent deaths of hikers in Montana, are very sad. I am not sure if all areas are great to reintroduce grizzlies.

The North Cascades are being used more and more by PCT young hikers without guns. By all the younger adults moving North into the Bellingham area. All of us love getting outside. Black bears and grizzlies are totally different, and I think we need to just keep things the way they are.

Correspondence ID: 5815Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Coupeville, WA 98239
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 14:07:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of grizzlies into the North Cascades with 10(j) regulation. I have lived and camped/hiked in grizzly country and have determined humans and grizzlies can coexist. I have also raised livestock in wolf and grizzly country. It can be done. Thank you

Correspondence ID: 5816Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98119
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 14:14:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think it's so important for the ecosystem to be restored to be more in line with how this region evolved. Grizzly bears are an important part of the ecosystem and I would love to see them thrive in this region again. Bring them back and do whatever plan is best and most effective to help them survive, thrive, and reproduce!

Correspondence ID: 5817Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Chimacum, WA 98325
United States of America

Outside Organization: BCHW Non-Governmental

Received: Nov,03 2023 14:24:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I recreate and have residences in both western and eastern Washington. I've backpacked and ridden in the proposed reintroduction area. I'm very disturbed that the proposals don't take into account keeping access open for recreation. So, the only proposal that I can support is "no action";

Correspondence ID: 5818Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Yakima, WA 98903
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 14:32:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I Oppose this. Thank you

Correspondence ID: 5819Project:112008Document:132104

Address: West Richland, WA 99353
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 14:36:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am not just saying "no" to introducing grizzlies to central and north Cascades, but as an avid backpacker am expressing my concern for those who enjoy backpacking in the back woods of the state of Washington. My husband and I have backpacked all of the Pacific Crest Trail in Washington, about a third of Oregon, and sections of the PCT in the Sierra Nevada Range. We also have hiked in the Blue Mountains of Oregon. We have specifically stayed away from backpacking in Glacier National Park primarily because of grizzly bears on those backpacking trails. By introducing grizzly bears to the Cascade Range, many people who would love to hike the Pacific Crest Trail might not choose to hike the PCT if it is known that they might encounter grizzlies. Even with bear spray, grizzlies are known to still attack and kill those trying to protect themselves. If grizzlies wanted to be in our Cascade range, there is nothing preventing them from "crossing the Canadian border"; This is asinine to purposely place them in an area that many, many people weekend hike and backpack. Leave well enough alone!!!

██████████

Correspondence ID: 5820Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Richland, WA 99352
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 14:36:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To the Committee considering Restoration of Grizzly Bear in the North Cascades Ecosystem, I am fervently against the reintroduction of Grizzly Bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem.

They have been known to harm people, and people are more important than the hypothetical restoration of given species to an ecosystem. Human needs and wellbeing are more important than the needs of any given non-human species, especially one eliminated by humans because of the danger they pose to humans. Perhaps consider introducing other human-centric measures to replicate the ecosystem functions of the grizzly bears, such as bounties or contests to induce human behavior with similar ecosystem functions.

Respectfully,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 5821Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Orondo, WA 98843
United States of America
Outside Organization: Schwantes, Inc. Business
Received: Nov,03 2023 14:46:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do not bring grizzly bears to our area. The US Fish and Game already has enough to deal with. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 5822Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Colville, WA 99114
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 14:47:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do NOT support introduction of Grizzly bears in Washington State. They pose a real danger to me and my family. Do not spend tax dollars on endangering Washingtonians.

Correspondence ID: 5823Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Ferndale, WA 98248
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 14:50:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: There is room for all creatures, including bears in our PNW. Please protect these bears, bring them back, this is their home too.

Correspondence ID: 5824Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 14:54:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Like Oregon, you've already totally mismanaged the predator population over the past multiple decades. Banning of hounds for both black bear & cougar hunting has caused a massive increase in both species. This has caused a very high level of damage to both the deer and elk populations. It's easy enough to see if you spend any significant amount of time in the woods. Then the wolf experiment started. And as an outdoorsman, I can tell you that the wolves have expended FAR beyond what most state 'officials' are willing to admit. As a result, their impact on the deer & elk populations has been devastating. They are indiscriminate killers and, as such, need to be controlled MUCH more actively. The plan to add grizzly bears will only make matters far worse. Not only due to their impact on the deer & elk populations, but on HUMANS. Washington state residents spend a LOT of time in the wild areas of our state and introducing grizzlies is a recipe for disaster for those of us who spend a lot of time out in the wild areas, off the beaten path. DON'T DO IT!!!

Correspondence ID: 5825Project:112008Document:132104
Address: GOLDENDALE, WA 98620
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 14:54:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a 40 year resident of Alaska with 37 years spent living on a remote homestead and employed for most of that time in the guiding business, I can speak with certainty that introduction of grizzly bears to Washington State is not in the best interest of the citizens of Washington or the bears. It will only be a matter of time before disastrous human and bear encounters occur as bears become habituated to human generated food sources.

The land area of Alaska is over 9 times that of Washington, 600,000 square miles more than Washington. Even with that difference in area and living as remotely as we did ourselves and our "neighbors" had Grizzly encounters on a regular basis, even having to shoot one in my daughters sandbox. Believe me when I say that the power of these animals is, unless witnessed, is beyond comprehension and they will defend their young and food sources in a way that has to be seen to be believed. DO NOT introduce Grizzlies to Washington.

Correspondence ID: 5826Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wauconda, WA 98859
United States of America

Outside Organization: n/a Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 14:59:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My wife and I have raised our kids and grandkids here since 1988. We have had black bear come into our house. Had it been a grizzly we would not be alive today. It has been made clear to the Federal Government that the people who live here don't want this dangerous and unpredictable bear introduced back into our woods, residences and towns where the public will have no choice but to kill them to protect themselves and their families. When will this government ever be run by the People again?

No to the Grizzlys in Washington State.

Correspondence ID: 5828Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Cle Elum, WA 98922
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 15:05:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Honorable Federal Official(s):

Please hear and understand my opposition to the notion of Grizzly Bear re-introduction to the Washington Cascades.

It is an established fact that these huge predators pose a threat to people directly, as well as to livestock and other beneficial activities of civilized society.

It is also well known that that these predators will have a major impact on deer and elk herds. It seems only too obvious that when you increase predators, you will wind up with fewer prey, namely deer and elk.

While many citizens, probably including yourselves, think it proper to "set the clock back" and fondly try to return ecosystems to a perceived "pre-white settlement" condition, understand that your manipulation will fail to set the clock back, because the people are not going away. And they vote.

The most classic single failure of "setting the clock back" is the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972. Citizens are increasingly seeing the folly of this Act of Congress, though made with good intentions, has resulted in the decimation of our salmon runs. Although under reported in the news, all you need to look at is the reverse curve of salmon vs seal populations from 1972 until today. I was fishing prior to 1972, and believe me, the seal populations have exploded since then. Do the math. How many pounds of salmon do seals eat per day- vs how many seals do we have eating them? Seal depredation is the obvious factor decimating the salmon, NOT the things of civilized society.

Please do NOT place grizzly bears into the Washington Cascades. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

██████████
Cle Elum, WA.

Correspondence ID: 5829Project:112008Document:132104

Address: BLAINE, WA 98230
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 15:05:55

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I often hike and camp in the North Cascades backcountry. I do not support introducing grizzlies because it increases the danger to people. Unfortunately, people are sometimes attacked and killed by grizzlies. Also, more people will carry guns for protection which also increases risk to other visitors.

Correspondence ID: 5830Project:112008Document:132104

Address: East Wenatchee, WA 98802
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 15:06:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I lived in Stehekin, at the head of Lake Chelan, for several years, beginning in 1958. I hiked the high trails of what is now the North Cascades National Park and the Lake Chelan Wilderness Area. Never once in all of the time I spent in the North Cascades did I see signs of grizzly bears. It is preposterous to locate the bears in this area. If it is done, be prepared for attacks on hikers and residents, livestock, and pets. It appears that Washington, DC, has made up its collective mind about this issue. You will find that we will again make our wishes known at the ballot box.

Correspondence ID: 5831Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Granger, WA 98932
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 15:11:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am aware of the Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan to the Cascades. You must become familiar with history and the predatory nature of the Grizzly bear. In past history people were taught about the bears, what to do when encountering them, had guns to protect themselves (see Lewis and Clark journals as to the nature of the Grizzly) and tried to stay away from areas they were in. There were many instances of individuals being killed by the bears (which happens once in awhile today). I want to see the population of bears be strong but they should not be introduced back into areas proposed as we are a state of hikers, the Pacific Crest Trail brings visitors to our state and we are a state of campers as well as other outdoor activities. Too many people today don't respect wild animals and encounters have occurred (let's take a cute photo of myself and the bear). It is just not safe to reintroduce them here and they will roam where they wish. In the Yakima Valley we have had numerous encounters/sightings in the last 10 years and several bears have been killed by automobiles/trucks. It is not safe for the bears and it is not safe for the population and Grizzlies will end up migrating along the Cascade Range following the food chain which also moves around the range. Rats and cockroaches were native to many areas at one time but I don't think your panel would want them reintroduced to your home area. Rethink this please.

Correspondence ID: 5832Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Yakima, WA 98908
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 15:12:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We are thoroughly appalled by this current administration that completely disregards the will of Washington state residents who will endure the results of the ill advised plan to release grizzlies to bring nothing but harm to people, livestock and crops. We have to wonder if the people making these decisions live anywhere the grizzlies will be released or if they're safely hundreds of miles away. This is one more reason to rid ourselves of a totally incompetent administration.

Correspondence ID: 5834Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98102
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 15:19:56

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Bringing grizzly bears back to the North Cascades is a good idea as long as they are tagged and monitored

Correspondence ID: 5835Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Oroville, WA 98844
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 15:21:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The grizzly bear was honored, not worshiped by the Okanagan Indian People, so don't use us and tradition in the same sentence. The grizzly bear kills sometimes just to kill, it does not just eat vegetables like the environmentally conscious believe. It has a 500 mile home range and there is no place in this State with that much land with not people on it, anywhere. The bears can not read or write and signs do not detour them from going where they danmed well please. You should put them into King and Pierce Counties where the politicians who want grizzlies. We the people on the Sunny side of the Cascades are only 15% of the population on 85% of the land in this State. All that we say and do to protest this goes to a place called "no where". The cattlemen, farmers, sheep men, hikers, bikers, recreationalist will all thank the 85% of the population living on 15% of the land, for "Giving us the Grizzly Bear". I am Arnie Marchand, an Okanagan Indian and a Member of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation.

Correspondence ID: 5836Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Riverside, WA 98849
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 15:21:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Have you people lost your minds? The bears will come down. and could be a disaster and there will be people defend them selves.so you are out to make criminals out of the otherwise law abiding citizens yet again as this state is known for just bully the people around and tell them what is going to happen to them. weather it is the game department or some other state department you people could give a crap about what your peasants think.

Correspondence ID: 5837Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Moses Lake, WA 98837
United States of America

Outside Organization: Rocky Mt. Elk Conservation/Preservation

Received: Nov,03 2023 15:24:12

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly Bears are known predators of livestock, pets, and people. There are already enough predators in the area without introducing an alpha predator into the area for citizens to contend with.

Correspondence ID: 5838Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Oroville, WA 98844
United States of America
Outside Organization: UNITED STATES CITIZEN Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 15:25:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am against the reintroduction of Grizzlies to the State of Washington. I oppose reintroduction of Grizzlies due to lack of habitat, threat to livestock, threat to humans and lack of scientific study about how the reintroduction of wolves have impacted our ungulate populations. Every year I read about negative encounters between grizzlies and livestock/humans. As a lifelong Washingtonian and a member of a rural volunteer fire department I do not want to have to respond to a medical call where a fellow Washingtonian is barely alive because of being mauled by a grizzly. Aldo, as an avid hunter I have had encounters with wolves and grizzlies in the Sinlahekin (GMU 215). I am sure that our local ranchers will suffer catastrophic losses if grizzly numbers are increased due to reintroduction/relocation. I have video and photos to share.

Correspondence ID: 5839Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Blaine, WA 98230
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 15:27:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a private citizen I am writing to comment on this Grizzly Bear Restoration issue. As a lover of all wild life and supporter of bears, mountain lions, and elk, et el; and love seeing all of them in their own habitat, it occurs to me that our eco system might not be able to support the reintroduction of these bears into our Cascades. Where I live we are already experiencing the concern of brown bears, especially a. momma and her cubs roaming our neighborhoods that are not so ' rural' and hear that euthanizing them was an option to rid us of their threat, did not make sense. In fact it infuriates me. Surely there are other ways to move these animals away from the cities. SO how does bringing in Grizzly bears help us and the threat they would bring to any and all wild life to say the least the threat we are to them once they do damage to us??? This is ludicrous, as in foolish and unreasonable, on any and all levels. So I opt for Plan A; do not reintroduce these animals to our woods.

Correspondence ID: 5840Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Richland, WA 99352
United States of America
Outside Organization: none Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 15:31:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We dont live very near the proposed re-introduction site(s) but we frequently do hiking and walking in the general areas where reintroductions are proposed. Sometimes it is rather scary to think about predators already in the areas. Just imagining what might happen if we encountered a grizzly bear is almost too much for us who are both part of the over 70s crowd. So not too fast on our feet. In addition, we fear for those farmers and livestock raisers that would have to invest in extra protection for their charges and on whose safety depends their livelihood. We are also imagining that many cash crops would look like an easy feast for a hungry bear. AND you must be aware

So, we say: "just say no" to re-introductions of grizzly bears in WA cascades areas. It is a foolish idea and you can be sure there will be unhappy events if the plan actually proceeds. Do you want those unhappy events on your conscience? Again, JUST SAY NO.

thx,

██████████, PhD

██████████

████████████████████

Correspondence ID: 5841Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Coulee Dam, WA 99117
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 15:33:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This animal will further Kill livestock, elk deer and even squirrels. Then move on to Humans in their yards and out in the woods. The wolves already have killed countless animals in this area with basically no control of an Apex Predator. The Grizzly will further kill and destroy animals in pastures, . Their strength size and speed is unbelievable. We do not want to be worried @ Grizzlies and wolves in our area.

Correspondence ID: 5843Project:112008Document:132104

Address: West richland, WA 99353
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 15:38:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I wholeheartedly support the reintroduction of all brown bears/grizzlies into Washington state. As a lifelong Washingtonian and avid outdoors person, I have no concerns over reintroduction. Historically, humans have negatively affected the environment with removal of native species. It is now our job to try to restore the balance. The arguments against the Grizzly reintroduction are exactly those (ill-advised) arguments of the groups who have opposed the reintroduction of wolves into previously wolf-inhabited spaces. But wolf re-introduction has been a resounding success in almost every instance- the balance of nature NEEDS these predators.

The earth and nature do not exist for the sole purpose of supporting humans. Humans are just one of many species which need to live in balance in order to promote healthy ecospheres. Reintroducing grizzlies is one small step we can take toward recreating balance. Please release the bears.

Thank you,


Correspondence ID: 5844Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Denver, CO 80249
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 15:40:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Beats are an incredibly important animal for our mountainous climates. Please keep them in the wild.

Correspondence ID: 5845Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bronxville, NY 10708
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 15:46:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing in support of the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades. The restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness. I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred. An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

Correspondence ID: 5846Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Richland, WA 99352
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 15:49:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My family do not want Grizzly bears planted in our state. We do not need the extra burden of risking our food chain. We the people are speaking. No means no! Look at the problems this will cause. We can barely make ends meet now. Help us and quite throwing money on a project that has very little known successes. Time to think about the citizens and our needs.

NO GRIZZLY'S!

Correspondence ID: 5847Project:112008Document:132104

Address: E wenatchee, WA 98802
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 15:50:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Totally crazy waste of money to introduce an animal that is going to maul and kill people. People who do this should be held liable responsible for this terrible action

Correspondence ID: 5848Project:112008Document:132104

Address: West Richland, Washington 99353, United States, WA 99353
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 15:54:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Instead of releasing Grizzly Bears in the north cascades release them on the west side of Snoqualmie Pass just east of Issaquah. Let the west side of Washington deal with the problems.

Correspondence ID: 5849Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Petoskey, MI 49770
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 15:56:56

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support grizzlies returning to the North Cascades. They are an amazing species. Unfortunately when they they do appear in an area, the first thing that states do is allow a killing them. They are NOT a recovered species and need to be listed as endangered.

Correspondence ID: 5851Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 16:01:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am against any plan to reintroduce the Grizzly bear in the North Cascades. We should take action to be sure that all species have the opportunity to thrive without human interference but the proposed plans go to far by physically moving the species. The plans are unnecessary since the species is doing well in other areas. The plan itself admits that it could result in long term problems such as the overpopulation in Yellowstone. Let nature thrive on its own. No more human intervention is needed!

Correspondence ID: 5852Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kennewick, WA 99338
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 16:09:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Another ill conceived plan by a bunch of educated idiots. Have any of you ever spent times in the woods. I own several hundred acres of timber land and have seen firsthand the devastating impacts to wildlife from your previous decisions to release non native wolves. It's clear you don't have a clue what you are doing and/or you don't care as long as you satisfy your political base.

Correspondence ID: 5853Project:112008Document:132104

Address: west richland, WA 99353
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 16:19:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzlies were here long before humans destroyed their habitat and recklessly killed them for human enjoyment, ie trophy. Grizzlies are an important part of the ecological environment and science should prevail, not the whims of some ignorant, greedy people who think of nothing but their own selfish needs at the expense of America's heritage. Grizzlies need to be protected and assisted by human intervention to restore them to the land they once considered their home.

Correspondence ID: 5854Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98102
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 16:21:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a Washingtonian who loves to camp and hike, and who cares about wildlife and ecosystems, I want to see grizzlies reintroduced to the North Cascades region. I am originally from Eastern Idaho, and have seen first-hand that grizzlies can co-exist with humans as they do in Yellowstone and the Tetons. Humans removed grizzlies from the North Cascades, and we can also bring them back. The grizzlies have lived in this region since time immemorial, and they deserve to live here again. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 5855Project:112008Document:132104

Address: MOSES LAKE, WA 98837
United States of America

Outside Organization: Gwyn Farms Inc. Business(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,03 2023 16:22:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am strongly opposed to the introduction of Grizzly bears into the North Cascades Ecosystem. Dan Gwyn

Correspondence ID: 5856Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 16:24:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This planned reintroduction seems inevitable. It is ill conceived and makes no sense to anyone living in non urban areas of Washington. This is another feel good plan conceived by people that live in western Washington cities where they will not be affected by this plan. There are already plenty of these bears living in areas that have them. We do not need this. I suppose that if we could bring the dinosaurs back these same feel good people would want them living in areas that does not affect them. It makes no sense to take a chance that these bears would kill people and livestock if confronted by them. Enough said.

Correspondence ID: 5857Project:112008Document:132104

Address: West Richland, WA 99353
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 16:25:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have hiked in Washington since 1975 and have lived here most of my life. Grizzly bears have been in the Cascades since at least the early 1990's when a close friend was almost attacked on White Pass. He reported it to the Forest Rangers and they admitted knowing that Grizzlies ranged even further south. There has been and continues to be an active population of Grizzly in the Cascades. Adding bears will upset the balance that currently exists. Please don't bring in non native Grizzlies. It's a bad idea and unnecessary.

Correspondence ID: 5859Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mazama, WA 98862
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 16:33:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My name is Steve Oien and I am writing to voice my support for Alternative C in the Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Environmental Impact Statement, North Cascades Ecosystem NCE. However, I do have some concerns regarding the 10(j) rule. The rule recognizes the need for federal, state and tribal agencies to manage Grizzlies should conflicts arise, but I would like lethal take to be limited to local management agencies and not private citizens.

I am a fourth generation native born Washingtonian. When my ancestors first arrived in Washington, Grizzly bears existed in abundance and were part of the ecosystem. I would note too that the original native inhabitants of Washington coexisted with Grizzlies from time immemorial. I have also been an avid backpacker, day hiker, and cross-country in the NCE for over 50 years. Finally, I own a home in Mazama, Washington.

I feel it is essential to restore Grizzlies to the NCE where feasible. It is necessary to make this ecosystem whole once again. The North Cascades contains some of the best habitat for the bears in the lower 48. The ecosystem includes over 9500 square miles of mostly public land that is ideal for restoration. It is highly unlikely that Grizzlies will return to this ecosystem in suitable numbers on their own to rekindle a viable population. Proactive reintroduction is required. I would note too that all evidence indicates the NCE will continue to be excellent habitat for Grizzlies even under changes that are likely to occur in the coming years from climate change.

I understand the concerns that some may have regarding potential conflicts between humans and Grizzlies, as well as potential conflicts with agricultural land owners. In fact, for many years I was opposed to reintroduction of Grizzlies because of my own concerns for conflict. However, after studying the issue and also doing some hiking in Glacier National Park I came to realize that conflicts are extremely rare and that there are steps that can be taken to minimize the possibility of

conflict. Put bluntly, Grizzlies have a natural aversion to human contact. By following basic guidelines that have been time tested, recreationists and agricultural interests can avoid conflicts. And in situations where conflicts become too problematic, the 10(j) rule provides adequate leeway to address Grizzlies that may become habituated and dangerous.

I am hoping proactive action will be taken very soon to reintroduce Grizzlies to the NCE.

Correspondence ID: 5860Project:112008Document:132104

Address: CLE ELUM, WA 98922
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 16:36:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Our state is becoming Way Too populated for save roaming of these bears. Just in our area; the developers are pushing for RV parks, camping areas - all with trail systems. We are rural and this type of development will quickly become unsave for folks to use these trail systems; much less the decades old USFS trails.

These animals deserve their piece & quite - there privacy - with out being pushed around by population growth.

Correspondence ID: 5862Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Omak, WA 98841
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 16:39:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We just ask for more trouble by introducing grizzly bears into the North Cascades. I have seen the fear and

safety provisions that Alaskans have to take in areas where there are grizzly bears. It far exceeded normal safety needs. Please don't do this to residence, vacationers and our wonderful state.

Correspondence ID: 5863Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Pasco, WA 99301
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 16:43:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We camp and hike a lot as a family and with friends. So now I will be required to carry a bear gun with me?

This is crap. I pay taxes that supports the land in WA state and I expect to be able to have free access to it.

Biden is an idiot and the Republicans need to stop his absolute BS on this matter and all the others. If not people will see you folks as weaker than they already do and vote some other way. This is only one thing that you need to stop.

Oh and by the way. You voted to impeach Trump last time. Bad move. That is exactly what we need.

Trump economics not Bidenomics. It isn't working for anyone. Hope you can convince your folks at the top.

Correspondence ID: 5864Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mazama, WA 98275
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 16:46:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a part time resident and property owner near Mazama, Washington, I am concerned about the Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/Environmental Impact Statement. We enjoy hiking, skiing, mountaineering, and mountain biking in the release areas designated in the proposed reintroduction area. We have a deep appreciation and respect for

wildlife and the ecosystem that sustains it.

There is concern about the necessity and cost benefit of the program in general. It is documented that Grizzly bears are currently migrating into this area from British Columbia and Idaho. Though the growth rate of the Grizzly population may not be as quick as some would prefer, we do not believe the cost of the reintroduction plan a wise use of tax revenue.

In reviewing the plan for Capture, Release and Monitoring, helicopter transportation is recommended but if not available, the bears would be transported by vehicles and released on or near a road. This is contradictory to the site criteria being described as "Being more than 1 mile from any maintained designated trails or roads" on page 28. Additionally, there are very few (if any) roads in any of the three proposed release areas. Based on this limited access to the backcountry, these roads tend to be frequented by recreationalists. Any bears released near a road would likely encounter humans after the area closure is lifted.

This area is popular for backcountry recreation. Many miles of the Pacific Crest Trail run adjacent to or directly through the proposed reintroduction area. There are many campgrounds near the area that are typically full of campers from Spring - Fall. The plan states that the bears would not be released within one mile of a campground. This does not seem nearly enough of a buffer to prevent human interaction with a bear.

We don't believe the plan is needed nor can it be successfully executed.

Correspondence ID: 5865Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Dryden, NY 13053-9711
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 16:47:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Do not mess with the Wildlife Protection act.Prepare for adaptation to climate change.

Correspondence ID: 5867Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 16:55:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am against any plan to reintroduce the Grizzly bear in the North Cascades. We should take action to be sure that all species have the opportunity to thrive without human interference but the proposed plans go to far by physically moving the species. The plans are unnecessary since the species is doing well in other areas. The plan itself admits that it could result in long term problems such as the overpopulation in Yellowstone. Let nature thrive on its own. No more human intervention is needed!

Correspondence ID: 5868Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Moses Lake, WA 98837
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 17:01:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am opposed to the reintroduction of grizzly bears into Washington State.

Correspondence ID: 5869Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Shoreline, WA 98155
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 17:03:48

Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Humans were responsible for removing grizzlies from the North Cascades and it's our responsibility to bring them back home

Correspondence ID: 5870Project:112008Document:132104
Address: kennewick, WA 99337
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 17:10:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support Alternative A: No Action. I oppose Alternative B or Alternative C. Nothing is blocking Grizzlies from re-entering the proposed area. Forcing relocation into this area when they are not relocating naturally doesn't make sense and does not bode well for the Grizzlies located into the area.

Correspondence ID: 5871Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 17:13:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am in favor of re-introducing grizzly bears into the North Cascades. I live full time in the area and we need them back in our ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 5872Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Yakima, WA 98908-9002
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 17:18:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Do not reintroduce grizzly bears to Washington State.

Correspondence ID: 5874Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Moses Lake, WA 98837-9447
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 17:25:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Pre-Covid I would have advocated for not re-introducing Grizzly Bears into Washington State habitat. Post-Covid I have found that our States wonderfully wilderness areas have been discovered by much of the quarantined population of our larger cities, Our back country has become overcrowded with un-neighborly people and my persona outdoor experience has been degraded.
I think Grizzle Bear Restoration would help reduce the overcrowding.

Correspondence ID: 5875Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Deming, WA 98244
United States of America
Outside Organization: Brett Brown McCandlis Conner Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 17:31:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support Alternative B.

Correspondence ID: 5876Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Moses Lake, WA 98837
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 17:32:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Releasing grizzlies into the Cascades is a bad idea. Grizzlies weigh upto 700 pounds, are 6.5 feet long, and jaw strength able to "crush a bowling ball... or a human skull" that is 1160 pounds per square inch. People live here. Lots of people. What if you put the grizzlies in Virginia or Connecticut? People LIVE here. It's a bad idea. Please don't do it. Please.

Correspondence ID: 5878Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Fircrest, WA 98466
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 17:37:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears should be welcomed in the state of Washington. Bears improve their environmental surroundings in many ways. There is enough wilderness for them to roam free without being a bother to the people or farm animals in the area, mostly because they keep to themselves in an environment which has nourishment for them. Such environments abound in Washington.

Welcome grizzlies to Washington.

Correspondence ID: 5879Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Riverside, WA 98849
United States of America

Outside Organization: The Farm Plan Business(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,03 2023 17:49:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Okanogan County is blessed with deed backcountry that is already the home of substantial wildlife. Natural lands have been attacked by many forest fire from which recovery is very slow. Fire damaged trees are diseased and permits to log out the damaged timber are not issued. Mother Nature is struggling to support the existing animal base.

I attended the Grizzly Meeting this week in Okanogan. That meeting was advertised to begin at 5:30 and end at 8:30. The moderator announced the meeting would not begin until 6pm, that speakers were only allowed 2 minutes and the meeting would end at 8pm. A full hour of the scheduled time was taken.

At 6pm 2 politicians and one wildlife worker were allowed to speak. The Department of Wildlife did not state their position or present information to the group with the exception of a row of pre-printed brief informational signs.

The targeted wilderness areas are bordered by the farms and ranches that feed you. I live very close to border of the northern target area. My family has watched the massive reduction to wildlife when wolves were moved in as well as the loss of livestock.

This county is yelling NO to grizzly bears. As am I. NO.

Correspondence ID: 5880Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Everett, WA 98208
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 17:49:56

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/Environmental Impact Statement.

I do not support efforts to reintroduce grizzlies into the North Cascades. Wilderness experiences involve risks of harm, yes, but almost entirely of our own making, such as hypothermia and falls. These are largely controllable by thoughtful planning and good judgement, offering a terrific learning environment for adolescents, in particular. Grizzlies, on the other hand, are not controllable and all encounters are unpredictable.

Wild temperate evergreen forests were my second home as a young adult. I spent weeks at a time travelling the magnificent wild spaces of Washington, in roles including search and rescue, guiding group trips through the North Cascades, igloo-building, cross-country ski trips, and more.

These trips provided multiple opportunities to share my vicinity with black bears. All meetings, happily enough, have been mutually respectful.

My closest encounter was when I was alone on a trail near Ross Lake (in the heart of the North Cascades), and I am extremely grateful he was not a grizzly. That day, I was hiking with two younger companions circling Hozomeen Mountain, a ten-mile trip, while the rest of our group canoed the section of Ross Lake between our campsites.

I was alone when I met the bear because I had been stung by a hornet an hour before, about two miles from our destination. I was concerned that the sting might incapacitate me since, in the months just prior to this trip, I had been stung multiple times and was experiencing progressively worse reactions with each one. The most recent sting caused severe swelling of the entire limb, together with nausea and chest tightness. As a developing condition for me, I had not yet considered the possibility that I might be stung on a hike, far from medical care, until it happened. After this Ross Lake trip, I got a prescription for an anaphylaxis kit which I carry with me to this day.

The two people with me that day were not fast hikers, and certainly could not carry me, so I left them to follow as quickly as they could and hiked rapidly to close as much of the gap between me and the campsite as possible, where help could be reached if needed.

After rapidly hiking most of the way out, it was clear that I would be able to reach the trailhead under my own power, so I stopped to wait for the others in the silent forest. Some minutes later, a large black bear came walking up the trail towards me, completely unaware of my presence. When he was about thirty-five feet from me, I yelled with all the volume and assertiveness I could muster. He paused and lifted head up, sniffing the air to locate me. We both stood still, and my heartbeat grew very slow and very strong, filling my body with adrenalin as I mentally considered my next step. I knew I could not outrun him. I knew I could not outclimb him. I had nothing but a comb in my hand and no coat to make myself appear large and powerful. I could threaten him by advancing on him, but my legs mutinied, absolutely and unequivocally refusing to move closer.

I yelled again, and still he stood there. It was only when my hiking partners higher up the trail heard me and yelled back that the bear finally decided to exit stage right. I watched him bound effortlessly up and over the side of this steep ravine in a display of awesome power. After we rejoined our companions at the lake that evening, their response to our story was that "We had all the fun."

Interestingly, epinephrine shots for stings are a synthetic form of adrenaline. After the bear-provided adrenaline burst, I experienced none of the massive swelling that followed prior stings. (Hmmm. Could a first aid option - of very last resort and where no other help is available - for a person who is experiencing anaphylactic shock be to absolutely terrify them?)

If this bear or any of the others whose paths I have crossed had been a grizzly, a somewhat amusing story could very possibly have had a darker end. The fear alone of grizzly attacks could dissuade people, especially younger people, from experiencing the mental and physical well-being offered by wilderness.

The forests of Washington are crisscrossed by trails. Thousands of responsible recreators find health and joy and spiritual recreation in those spaces every year. The odds of grisly encounters between grizzlies and humans are likely. Let us learn from the attacks occurring now in other states.

There is enough pain in this world already. Why would we knowingly increase it by introducing grizzlies into Washington state? Please spend our limited public funds on other worthy wilderness activities. Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on the North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/Environmental Impact Statement.

Correspondence ID: 5881Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Moses Lake, WA 98837
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 17:51:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I wholeheartedly agree with the proposal to reintroduce grizzly bears to the Northern Cascades in Washington State.

The bears were here LONG before colonial settlers came through and drove them out / killed them off. Just because an animal has the potential to do harm doesn't mean we have to right to eradicate them from the land. They are an invaluable member of the ecosystem just like wolves and other predators. They evolved here and have every right to live in their natural environment.

Also, many other communities to the north live with bears and other dangerous wildlife at much closer quarters, and they are all managing to coexist. There is no reason to think Washingtonians can't accomplish the same feat, especially considering how long it would take after introduction for a significant bear population to develop. Plenty of time to educate farmers and the communities close to the mountains how to properly engage with wild bears they might encounter.

Correspondence ID: 5882Project:112008Document:132104

Address: RIVERSIDE, WA 98849
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 17:56:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I don't think any one has really thought this through yet. Like the wolf introduction to Washington state they are ow everywhere here in okanogan county an they are a constant threat to our community up the tunk creek area.and they do kill live stock an the deers population has been devastated. I don't think the grizzly bear will stay in the cascade range for long term,but will expand it's territory on it's own and I don't have any faith that the government will deal with the problems that it will cause,, but would only worsen the problem they have created.

Correspondence ID: 5883Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Selah, WA 98942
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 18:03:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Madness

Correspondence ID: 5884Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Carlton, WA 98814
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 18:04:08

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: In light of recent attacks on people in areas where Grizzlies have been biologically reintroduced, I want to formally express my opposition to this plan. I don't see any reason to put a type A predator in our backyard. I don't see any

logical reason to move forward with this plan. I also don't understand why my opinion and others are not considered in this decision. I strongly oppose this plan!!

Correspondence ID: 5887Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Union Gap, WA 98903
United States of America

Outside Organization: homeowner Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 18:53:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dangerous grizzlies do not belong in areas where encounters with unsuspecting citizens could occur. Leave them where they are in their current habitation. No one can predict where they will roam after they are released into the North Cascades ecosystem. Please thoroughly think about this plan before it is implemented.

Correspondence ID: 5888Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Yakima, WA 98902
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 18:58:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: If you love the Grizzlies so much, why don't they turn them loose in Delaware. Put them in Biden's back yard and let them eat his little dog or maybe his grandkids. Turning the Grizzlies loose in Washington State is beyond STUPID. The Washington DC bureaucrats are so out of touch with reality it boggles the mind. Just one more INSANE decision made by people with no sense of consequences.

Correspondence ID: 5890Project:112008Document:132104

Address: OTHELLO, WA 99344
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 19:04:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think it is extremely important that we restore biodiversity to Washington's wildernesses. Grizzlies are no exception. We need Grizzlies in the North Cascades to help stabilize the ecosystem and right our previous wrongs of human caused extirpation from this ecosystem. These large predators should not be disallowed due to inconvenience for hikers, rancher, hunters, farmers or anyone else; no animal should be disallowed in its natural environment due to inconvenience. Yet we see us due this to wolves, bears, elk, bison, beavers, and other native animals. As a hunter, fisher, hiker, and advocate for wild places; I want it to be clear that true sportsmen and women are in favor of wild things living in wild places without exception and don't pick and choose which ones. As a hunter I do not have a vendetta against animals, but rather reverence for their importances and what they provide. Please help restore North Cascade grizzly population through augmentation.

Correspondence ID: 5891Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 19:18:45

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not reintroduce grizzly bears to the North Cascades of Washington. I enjoy hiking, biking, and four wheeling in the North Cascades with my family. It is a beautiful and rugged area that presents many risks without adding grizzly bears to the list. I would not want to worry about the safety of hiking and biking in grizzly bear territory, especially with my kids. We love visiting Yellowstone specifically to try and see grizzly bears and I am always grateful once we leave their territory and I no longer have to worry about running into one on a trail. It is especially scary to be mountain biking at high speeds with the risk that a grizzly might be around the corner. As an avid mountain biker, this would pose a significant

risk. I see no reason to reintroduce the grizzly to our area as there is little to no benefit to the ecosystem at this moment in time. With PCT hikers, an active outdoor community that is delving into the wilderness year round, and small communities in the area it will only result in more human to bear interactions that put lives at needless risk. Please do not put grizzly bears back into this region.

Thank you,

Correspondence ID: 5892Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Electric City, WA 99123
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 19:21:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do not put grizzlies into the State of WA. They are; and will always be a threat to humans, all wildlife and all farm animals.

Correspondence ID: 5894Project:112008Document:132104
Address: East Wenatchee, WA 98802
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 19:37:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I have been hiking and climbing over 30 years and was a long time member of the Mountaineers where I led scrambles and climbs. I have seen my fair share of black bears and while encountering any bear is exciting we as hikers know how to react to black bear sightings. Grizzly bears on the other hand are incredibly territorial and aggressive. Grizzly bears are to be avoided at all costs. I've done my fair share of hiking in Canada as well and I can tell you that the rangers there actively patrol the trails and when a Grizzly bear is in the area the trails are closed.

Allowing Grizzly bears in the Cascades will put hikers in danger and will also add to the cost of the National Park Rangers and the State Park responsibilities to ensure Grizzly bears are tracked and that the trails are closed when there is a Grizzly bear in the area. The cost will be high to both potential loss of life and to Rangers responsibilities and work assignment. I don't think we can afford for either eventuality and I would respectfully ask that you reconsider introducing Grizzly bears to the Cascades.

Respectfully yours,

Correspondence ID: 5895Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Houston, TX 77025
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 19:44:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please return grizzly bears to their native habitat. Please do it in such a way that it does not harm the bears, the people who will accomplish this procedure or those who will visit the parks after the bears have been returned. The present population of America, as well as future generations of both people and bears will thank you.

Correspondence ID: 5897Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Moses Lake, WA 98837
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 19:52:45

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm delighted to see that grizzly bears will be reintroduced to WA state. The Department of Fish & Wildlife cleared our state to be available for grizzly bears to be brought back. Your cries about any risks to livestock are invalid. Because ANY animal can be a predator to livestock, including dogs. And I suppose you will next introduce legislation to ban dogs from the state. It's irrational. Being a farmer or rancher comes with risks of predators. That's just part of doing business. My father was the biggest potato farmer in WA state in the 1980's. He knew the risks of crops being eaten by animals. And my parents were both very anti-hunting. Hunters were angry that he wouldn't allow hunting on our farmland and even claimed that they would be doing us a favor. But my dad stood strong and true to his morals. Rabbits, deer, etc., were often on our farmland and my dad said that was just the cost of doing business. So quit crying foul.

Correspondence ID: 5898Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Robinson, TX 76706
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 20:00:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please help the wildlife....

Correspondence ID: 5899Project:112008Document:132104

Address: PASCO, WA 99301
United States of America

Outside Organization: Battelle Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 20:23:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am not in favor of having grizzly bears in Our state.

Correspondence ID: 5900Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Anacortes, WA 98221
United States of America

Outside Organization: None Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 20:38:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is a very dangerous and not thought out plan! The number of people who are attacked, some killed, is staggering. This will also pose a great threat on ranchers and the elk herds that roam though the area.

There is a reason why bears live in an area that is mostly remote!

I hope that you do not introduce these animals into our area. It is a tragedy waiting to happen!! I don't say this lightly!!

Correspondence ID: 5902Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kennewick, WA 99337
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 21:06:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzley's do not know boundaries. We are going to have aliens invading. If folks want to visit this mega predator they can go to the zoo, Yellowstone, Glacier, or a trip to Canada or Alaska. Washington State is visited from British Columbia on occasion by these beasts.

Are Grizzlies going to push the resident Black bears further out of their habitat?

Use common sense when making these decisions!

Correspondence ID: 5903Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98274
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 21:37:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support reintroducing the grizzly bear to one of it's native habitats in the North Cascades ecosystem. The hubris of human's in taking a 'we first' approach has led to a lot of destructive impacts and returning the ecosystem to a nature-based model is long overdue.

Correspondence ID: 5905Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Oroville, WA 98844
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 21:47:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please reconsider your desire to introduce more Grizzly's into the North Cascades. We currently have Grizzly's in the eco system, and do not need to artificially add to the population. Ungulate populations are down due to a number of reasons, but wolves and cougars are a contributing factor. Another apex predator will not help the elk and deer. Since we have Grizzly bears here now, why not let them be. If conditions exist to further their population, let it happen naturally. There is no need to bring in additional animals. We already have a wolf and cougar problem, we certainly don't need a grizzly problem. Quit screwing with Mother Nature!

Correspondence ID: 5906Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Pasco, WA 99301
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 21:47:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The grizzlies have free reign in AK, lots of open space in MT, and a whole park in WY! We really don't need them adding to the "wildlife" of the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 5907Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America
Outside Organization: Self employed contractor with BS degree in natural resources Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 21:52:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I have watched the lack of management on our local wildlife which has been diminishing in number for years except the unmanaged wolves. The habitat also has not been managed or maintained which has a lot to do with management for "natural occurrence" such as fires that have ravaged our valley and forests. What makes you think the bears can survive when none of the living animals they eat or vegetation they eat is a stable food source? Local fish and wildlife will not be allowed to make judgements on how to manage and the bears will either move, start eating domestic livestock and people or starve to death. Only a matter of time before all three scenarios play out because of previous mismanagement of the habitat bears need to survive. You are only creating a larger division between the people and government by forcing problems up on us. At some point people will retaliate and hopefully at a bear not the people who put them here. As the former commissioner said the three SSS's will come in to play and your population will not stabilize.
[REDACTED]. Hunter, fisher and local conservationist.

Correspondence ID: 5908Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Ephrata, WA 98823
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 21:58:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We cannot have grizzly bears near our agricultural county. We farm and ranch. Our cattle herd would be a prime target for prey.

Correspondence ID: 5909Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 22:06:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My only issue with this plan is that we aren't planning to introduce more grizzlies per year. They are such slow reproducers. Grizzly reintroduction to the cascades is long overdue, please make it happen and return these magnificent creatures to where they belong.

Correspondence ID: 5910Project:112008Document:132104
Address: laupahoehoe, HI 96764
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 22:07:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: This citizen believes that Alternative C and the proposed Section 10(j) Rule is our best choice that meets both ecological and social needs.

Correspondence ID: 5911Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America
Outside Organization: Woodland Park Zoo Conservation/Preservation
Received: Nov,03 2023 22:21:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Encouraging the grizzly bear (re)population in the northern Cascades is essential for restoring the natural balance of our greater ecosystem. They were hunted into extinction here and need to have us do all we can to bring the balance back nature intended. Their presence not only helps to keep other species in balance with respects to the whole eco structure, they are large carnivores that redeposit seeds for various other wild life and pollinators. (A two for one!). I hope they will have your support. Thank you for your consideration.

Correspondence ID: 5912Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Silvana, WA 98287
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 22:23:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am in favor of reintroducing grizzly bears to the North Cascades, option C 10(j).

Correspondence ID: 5913Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,03 2023 22:27:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of the grizzly bear into the north cascades. As an avid backpacker, I understand the risks that are called out by the opposition, but feel we have a responsibility to steward the land towards its original ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 5915Project:112008Document:132104

Address: E. Wenatchee, WA 98802
United States of America

Outside Organization: ██████████ Business(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,03 2023 22:34:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: How many times must we tell THEM, Grizzly bears are not welcomed in the North Cascades , Its not 1880 , How many back packers are camping and hiking in the Cascades , I do these p[problem Grizzly bears have all ready been placed there, I have attended meetings at Cashmere , Washing, Okanogan , Washing, They have spent a lot of money, man time with posters , saber rattling to convince US, the citizens who live in this area that grizzly bears are ok, THEY DO NOT LIVE HERE WE DO, , HOW, WHEN do you tell Big government to Back Off and go else were, The Elk hunting in Montana has been desamated because of the Grizzly and Wolf They act like the mother who takes her child to the store, and he wants a candy bar, No Johnnie, No Johnnie, No Johnnie and finely Ok , I Do believe 100 % They have already Dumped, Planted , problem Grizzly bears in the North cascades. And some hiker, camper is going to get killed, Because some one from Washington DC, who dosen't know his real name thinks WE need Grizzly bears in the Cascade,s If Grizzly bears are met to be there, GOD will put them there, NOT Man.

Correspondence ID: 5917Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Loomis, WA 98827
United States of America

Outside Organization: Double R Ranch Business(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,03 2023 23:03:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I live and work in Loomis, WA near the eastern edge of the proposed grizzly bear reintroduction area. I manage a large cattle ranch where we raise genetics that are the basis for one of the premier brands of beef in the World. Our cattle graze on private, state, and federal land throughout the year. We make great effort to be good stewards of the land and animals that we use in our operation. As a result, wildlife in the area also benefit and thrive. However, with an increasing predator population brought about by the reintroduction of wolves, the large game population has been steadily dwindling over the past several years. As the ungulate wildlife population dwindles and concentrates in the valleys where predators are more weary of human presence, the predators turn their attention to livestock instead. With the restrictions in place because of the current listing status of the gray wolf in our area, there is very little we can do to reduce the conflict between them and our livestock. It seems the alternative that is being forced upon us is to go elsewhere to raise cattle, which would mean selling our private ground most likely into smaller parcels that would further fragment habitat and increase human population in the area. Now, another predator is being proposed that would further stress the wildlife carrying capacity. It is only obvious that this would lead to more of our livestock being used for prey. Some of the genetics in our herd we have been developing since the late 1980s, and losing some of our key animals can cause setbacks that take decades to recover from. Unfortunately, much of the area of the North Cascade is not habitat that supports grizzly bears year around. Historically, mostly before settlement, the bears could roam into the valleys when wildlife migrated out of the mountains. Now the valleys are all populated, so that natural migration is only going to lead to bear/human conflict. I find it ironic that one of the few confirmed grizzly bear sightings in the recent past resulted in the bear being trapped because it was getting into someone's chicken coop near Colville. If grizzly bears are really that rare in the area, what will happen when we artificially increase the population? Will there be enough chicken coops to feed all of them? Or will some branch out into the finer cuisine of beef tartar? Or even worse, people trying to live and work in the area?

I feel giving the area and the reintroduced animals a "status will not really help much. As evidenced from the wolves, in the end litigation is what drives the decision as to how the animals are managed. We have heard all sorts of promises as to what will happen when there are wolf/human conflicts, yet few of them ever come to fruition because of lawsuits or threats of lawsuits. Even if we believe USFW and NPS are genuine in their management intentions, they will most likely be taken out of their hands by the court system at some point. That is a reality that can not be ignored in this

situation.

Most of the people that are in favor of reintroducing grizzly bears in the North Cascades are individuals that will have the choice whether or not they want to interact with the species. They simply use the area for recreation. I do not have that choice. My livelihood depends on me being outdoors in remote areas on a daily basis and often alone. When my crew or myself are going around fence or fixing a water trough, it is not always easy to be attentive enough to realize you are in the middle of a bear's living room. I realize the probability of an attack is low, but the fact is it still exists and is not something that I want my employees to have to face.

I strongly encourage you to not artificially transplant any grizzly bears into the North Cascades. It is not the right time or place for such and endeavor and will only lead to more problems for both bears and humans.

Correspondence ID: 5918Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sequim, WA 98382
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 23:31:15

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears are the top predator of our North Cascades ecosystem. There needs to be a way that they can be reintroduced into remote areas of the Cascades where humans, livestock etc are at minimal risk.

Correspondence ID: 5919Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98118
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 23:31:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have two concerns:

First, that not all Washingtonians are fans of dangerous wildlife in our forests. I recall what happened to wolves introduced here and how certain packs were poisoned and hunted down to the last wolf cub. No one is concerned with cougars because they are so good at hiding from people, that people forget about them until one turns up in Discovery Park, or chases them during a mountain bike ride. Since it is a case of out of sight, out of mind, all predation is immediately assigned to wolf packs. If grizzlies are introduced, they will become

the new cattle killers. The first problem, then, is the people who have vested interests in not having their cattle killed or their hikes ruined, or just worrying about a picnic being interrupted by a large, dangerous animal.

The second problem is the people who feel that the forest is just an extension of their suburban backyards, that proper administration of natural areas includes exclusion of all dangerous wildlife. These are the people who bring their chihuahuas along on hikes. They don't understand the purpose of natural areas and they think that forests owned by the public will naturally be safe for the public.

Dealing with these two populations and their diverse knowledge and prejudices has to be done sensitively but firmly. Invite them to see the wildlife, but leave their AR-15s at home.

Correspondence ID: 5921Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Pasco, WA 99301
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,03 2023 23:52:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No place in the state of Washington is the grizzly bear welcome. The bear is a threat to all.

Correspondence ID: 5923Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Vancouver, WA 98686
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 02:21:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I oppose the proposed plan to reintroduce grizzly bears to the North Cascades. This area is a heavily trafficked area for hikers, backpackers, and campers. Introducing them will almost certainly cause dangerous situations to arise for unprepared hikers and perhaps prepared hikers too. Grizzly bears are much more dangerous and many people avoid going places where they are, leaving the North Cascades without them would ensure there aren't unnecessary lives lost-both human and animal. I understand that conservation efforts are really important however, this is not the place or the state to do this in.

Correspondence ID: 5929Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 07:02:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I urge you to adopt option A.

I live on lands that directly border the reintroduction area without any civilization or barrier. I have young children. I've experienced the difference between grizzly country and non grizzly country. Let them come down from Canada if they wish but please don't spend precious resources reintroducing what is certain to result in grizzly human interaction and conflict. It's just a matter of time if you proceed.

Thank you for reading.

Correspondence ID: 6388Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Selah, WA 98942
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 08:07:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I look forward rto the reintroduction of grizzly bears in the North Cascade mountain region

Correspondence ID: 6535Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Pasco, WA 99301
United States of America
Outside Organization: Lower Columbia Basin Audubon Conservation/Preservation(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,04 2023 08:17:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Restoring the grizzly bear population to the North Cascades ecosystem is the correct thing to do. It ensures that a totally functioning ecosystem is maintained. A fully functioning ecosystem supports all animals and plants and is the correct action to take which allows people to coexist with nature.

The grizzly bear has the right to live and thrive in areas where it traditionally roamed. As the human population expands into areas where the bear lives encounters will occur, but these do not have to be negative interactions. In fact, they can be positive encounters where bears are observed just being bears. From personal experience, I backpacked for three months in Yellowstone National Park covering many hundreds of miles of trails in the back country. I had encounters with grizzly and black bears on a regular basis but never a bad interaction. Grizzly bears typically do not want any close contact with humans. I had more problems with mosquitoes rather than bears.

Villainizing grizzly bears is a common tactic by many people including our elected officials. This stance is usually a result of being uninformed. Cherry picking data that incorrectly depicts the bear population as a human predator.

Boosting the current grizzly bear population in the North Cascades is the proper thing to do. Keeping the population numbers healthy will help the ecological system thrive to the benefit to all.

Correspondence ID: 6550Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Santa Clara, CA 95050
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 08:21:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I strongly support the National Park Services preferred Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation.

This plan will both effectively restore grizzly bears in North Cascades National Park and give people the tools they need to thrive in and around grizzly bear country. Grizzlies belong in the North Cascades, as they enhance the park's ecological integrity and contribute to its wildness.

Grizzly bears play a vital role in maintaining ecosystem balance, cycling nutrients, dispersing seeds, and changing the behavior of species around them. Restoring them would benefit the park and the people who use it.

A restored population of grizzlies will boost the park's appeal and attract nature enthusiasts, scientists, and tourists from around the world. This would provide economic benefits to local communities and support the park's mission to protect park resources in perpetuity.

Alternative C, with the 10(j) rule, provides managers flexibility to address community concerns while protecting the grizzly population. It ensures coexistence between humans and bears.

Please consider the positive ecological and economic benefits and support Alternative C. Restoring grizzly bears will secure the park's natural heritage and conserve an iconic species for current and future generations. Do not murder these beings. You reintroduce them only to be murdered because their populations are thriving bullshit. Yall slaughtered wolves that were reintroduced as if humans know how to manage wildlife.

Native Americans know how to live beside them. They dont need to kill these beautiful animals.

Thank you for your dedication to our national parks.

Correspondence ID: 6648Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Tacoma, WA 98406
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 08:29:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades. I believe they are beneficial to the natural ecosystem and should take priority over domestic livestock.

Correspondence ID: 6651Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Phoenix, AZ 85032
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 08:29:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No to additional grizzly bears! Keep in mind at one time the Los Angeles basin had grizzly bears, we have already butchered this planet. Allow them to self migrate as the population grows they will move into other areas. Thankyou, mike

Correspondence ID: 6665Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 08:30:08

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Don Striker and Supervisor Brad Thompson,

I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. The proposal would bring up to 25 non-problem grizzly bears into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade and manage them as an experimental population.

Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities. Furthermore, the 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and sometimes respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. As a resident of Twisp and someone who spends loads of time roaming the forests and crags of the North Cascades, I welcome the return of this keystone species to our shared home. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Thank you for taking the time to keep our North Cascades wild!

Sincerely,

Correspondence ID: 6672Project:112008Document:132104

Address: pittsburgh, PA 15216
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 08:30:24

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please stop the needless killing! These bears are necessary to keep balance in nature. As you know they keep the other wildlife healthy by preying on the unhealthy or injured animals. Please give them a chance.

Thank you,


Correspondence ID: 6674Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Flemington, NJ 08822
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 08:30:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly support the National Park Services preferred Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation. if taxpayer pay to restore, then no huntes should be able to destroy them. that needs to be permanent. they are not brought back to be targets for insane hunters.

This plan will both effectively restore grizzly bears in North Cascades National Park and give people the tools they need to thrive in and around grizzly bear country. Grizzlies belong in the North Cascades, as they enhance the park's ecological integrity and contribute to its wildness.

Grizzly bears play a vital role in maintaining ecosystem balance, cycling nutrients, dispersing seeds, and changing the behavior of species around them. Restoring them would benefit the park and the people who use it.

A restored population of grizzlies will boost the park's appeal and attract nature enthusiasts, scientists, and tourists from around the world. This would provide economic benefits to local communities and support the park's mission to protect park resources in perpetuity.

Alternative C, with the 10(j) rule, provides managers flexibility to address community concerns while protecting the grizzly population. It ensures coexistence between humans and bears.

Please consider the positive ecological and economic benefits and support Alternative C. Restoring grizzly bears will secure the park's natural heritage and conserve an iconic species for current and future generations.

Thank you for your dedication to our national parks.

Correspondence ID: 6691Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Arlington, TX 76014
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 08:31:24

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly support the National Park Services preferred Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation.

This plan will both effectively restore grizzly bears in North Cascades National Park and give people the tools they need to thrive in and around grizzly bear country. Grizzlies belong in the North Cascades, as they enhance the park's ecological integrity and contribute to its wildness.

Grizzly bears play a vital role in maintaining ecosystem balance, cycling nutrients, dispersing seeds, and changing the behavior of species around them. Restoring them would benefit the park and the people who use it.

A restored population of grizzlies will boost the park's appeal and attract nature enthusiasts, scientists, and tourists from around the world. This would provide economic benefits to local communities and support the park's mission to protect park resources in perpetuity.

Alternative C, with the 10(j) rule, provides managers flexibility to address community concerns while protecting the grizzly population. It ensures coexistence between humans and bears.

Please consider the positive ecological and economic benefits and support Alternative C. Restoring grizzly bears will secure the park's natural heritage and conserve an iconic species for current and future generations.

We ALL have a responsibility to work together in order to Protect and SAVE our Wilderness, Waterways and Environment from senseless Destruction and Poisoning in the name of Ignorance and Greed.

We have to SAVE our Wildlife, including the incredibly amazing North Cascades where OUR magnificent Grizzly Bears are supposed to live!

We have to STOP the senseless killing of our Wildlife out of Ignorance and Greed!!!

Thank you for your dedication to our national parks.

Correspondence ID: 6884Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Riverside, WA 98849
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 08:42:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To Whom It May Concern:
Here is what is likely to be a familiar set of comments that I wholly endorse:

I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live in and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

Furthermore, the 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Thank you for taking the time to keep our North Cascades wild!

Respectfully,

- [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 7019Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Vancouver, WA 98686-2291
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 08:52:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The Grizzly belongs and is a normal part of a healthy Cascades Ecosystem and I'm all for the reintroduction!

Having said that, experience here in the Northwest with sea lions has demonstrated that any plan to protect or introduce a species which can become a problem needs to include a means of dealing with problem animals. Lacking this, the public will not support the measure.

I'm one of probably less than 1,000 living people who have seen a Cascade Grizzly (Mother & Cub on the south side of Glacier Peak in 2003). The encounter ended well for both my nephew and I and the grizzly family.

Again, I want this iconic animal restored to the Cascades but with controls in place to deal with problem bears.

Correspondence ID: 7138Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bend, OR 97703
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 09:04:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not support reintroducing the grizzly bear in the north Cascades. I frequently hike and backpack in the area with family from Seattle and would no longer do so if there were grizzly bears. With the large city of Seattle nearby, many people would be unprepared to deal with an aggressive bear like the grizzly. Just a simple day hike into the woods from a dense urban environment would be dangerous. There will be much uproar every time an encounter with a grizzly goes bad. I don't think it will fare well with the grizzlies or humans to have the bears reintroduced in such close proximity to a large dense urban area.

Correspondence ID: 7168Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Troy, MI 48085
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 09:06:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly support the National Park Services preferred Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation.

This plan will both effectively restore grizzly bears in North Cascades National Park and give people the tools they need to thrive in and around grizzly bear country. Grizzlies belong in the North Cascades, as they enhance the park's ecological integrity and contribute to its wildness.

Grizzly bears play a vital role in maintaining ecosystem balance, cycling nutrients, dispersing seeds, and changing the behavior of species around them. Restoring them would benefit the park and the people who use it.

A restored population of grizzlies will boost the park's appeal and attract nature enthusiasts, scientists, and tourists from around the world. This would provide economic benefits to local communities and support the park's mission to protect park resources in perpetuity.

Alternative C, with the 10(j) rule, provides managers flexibility to address community concerns while protecting the grizzly population. It ensures coexistence between humans and bears.

Please consider the positive ecological and economic benefits and support Alternative C. Restoring grizzly bears will secure the park's natural heritage and conserve an iconic species for current and future generations.

Thank you for your dedication to our national parks.

every animal has their rightful place on our planet and should be treated with dignity and respect. When we coexist, the world can become a better and safer place.

Correspondence ID: 7197Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 09:18:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support option A. No change. I grew up in Mazama and have enjoyed the North Cascades my entire life. Please don't reintroduce Grizzlies into this environment.

Correspondence ID: 7246Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Willowbrook, IL 60527
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 09:24:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I strongly support the National Park Services preferred Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation.

Grizzly bears in North Cascades National Park must be restored while giving people the tools they need to thrive in and around grizzly bear country. Grizzlies belong in the North Cascades. They enhance the park's ecological integrity and contribute to its wildness.

Grizzly bears help maintain ecosystem balance, cycling nutrients, dispersing seeds, and changing the behavior of species around them. Restoring the Grizzly can only benefit the park and the people who use it. Grizzlies will boost the park's appeal and attract nature enthusiasts, scientists, and tourists from around the world, providing economic benefits to local communities and support the park's mission to protect park resources in perpetuity.

Alternative C, with the 10(j) rule, provides managers flexibility to address community concerns while protecting the grizzly population. It ensures coexistence between humans and bears.

Consider the positive ecological and economic benefits and support Alternative C. Restoration of grizzly bears will secure the park's natural heritage and conserve an iconic species for current and future generations.

Thank you!!

Correspondence ID: 7247Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Okanogan, WA 98840
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 09:24:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of grizzlies into the North Cascades. As a small farmer in Okanogan, WA I feel it is my responsibility to work with nature whenever possible, for the benefit of the plant and animal species that find a safe haven in our orchard, and for my own wellbeing. A human-centric approach to farming, focusing on gaining the most profit, is not in my best interest in the long run. I want my daughter to hear a diversity of songbirds, to see healthy deer populations resting in our orchard, and occasionally see a bear passing through on her path to the river. Similarly, a grizzly bear population would restore ecological balance in the North Cascades and allow these species to survive further into our shared future.

As a hiker who often takes backpacking trips into the Pasayten Wilderness and North Cascades NP, I also feel that the possibility of grizzly bear populations would only enhance my experiences. Being a part of nature is who we are as humans and we have to treat natural spaces with respect, to honor the gifts the land gives to us, and share.

Thank you,
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 7301Project:112008Document:132104

Address: portland, OR 97212
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 09:34:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: i believe reintroduction of the grizzly bear is long overdue. as the major apex predator, the bear is most important to restoring a natural ecosystem in the north cascades.

observing how the hunters have been the most vociferous against wolf reintroduction---hiding behind their role as farmers---
- minimal livestock losses, etc---it's time that we recognize that this federal land is 'our' land, and do what's right. there was strong resistance to the redwood parks in california, too---but they are our country's gems, now.

i strongly support reintroducing the grizzly bear!

Correspondence ID: 7447Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America
Outside Organization: Representing self Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 09:50:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Option A: I live near, and regurally hike and bike in the national forest with the North Cascade National Park just beyond and believe a Grizzly Bear infusion is unwarranted and should be avoided. In the 40 + years I have resided here, a number of attempts have been made to introduce the Grizzly into the North Cascades and in each instance the public said no. Can we now please bring an end to this decision once and for all.

Correspondence ID: 7453Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Hollywood, FL 33026
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 09:51:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: It is because of us humans, that all wildlife is so tragically suffering. We must make EVERY attempt to protect ALL wildlife because we will not exist without them! Restore populations, allow them to thrive, teach coexistence & STOP KILLING ALL WILDLIFE!!!!

I strongly support the National Park Services preferred Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation.

This plan will both effectively restore grizzly bears in North Cascades National Park and give people the tools they need to thrive in and around grizzly bear country. Grizzlies belong in the North Cascades, as they enhance the park's ecological integrity and contribute to its wildness.

Grizzly bears play a vital role in maintaining ecosystem balance, cycling nutrients, dispersing seeds, and changing the behavior of species around them. Restoring them would benefit the park and the people who use it.

A restored population of grizzlies will boost the park's appeal and attract nature enthusiasts, scientists, and tourists from around the world. This would provide economic benefits to local communities and support the park's mission to protect park resources in perpetuity.

Alternative C, with the 10(j) rule, provides managers flexibility to address community concerns while protecting the grizzly population. It ensures coexistence between humans and bears.

Please consider the positive ecological and economic benefits and support Alternative C. Restoring grizzly bears will secure the park's natural heritage and conserve an iconic species for current and future generations.

Thank you for your dedication to our national parks.

Correspondence ID: 7470Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98274
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 09:52:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a frequent user of the North Cascades Ecosystem, I fully support the restoration of grizzly bear to the area. The ecosystem will benefit from the presence of the bears and people will adapt.

Correspondence ID: 7766Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Sedro-Woolley, WA 98284
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 10:18:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support alternative A. The Grizzly Bears have the ability to populate the North Cascades on their own by moving in from either Canada or Idaho/Montana. If the ecosystem will support them, they will eventually move in.

Correspondence ID: 7792Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Rice, WA 99167
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 10:21:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: For grizzly bear recovery efforts, I recommend Alternative C and the proposed Section 10(j) Rule. It meets both ecological and social needs.

Correspondence ID: 7800Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Tonasket, WA 98855
United States of America
Outside Organization: Tonasket Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 10:22:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzlies why Washinton state.
Don't we have enough predator problems without introducing more. Why must we endure your ridiculous own agenda. Leave us alone for a change.

Correspondence ID: 7817Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Tonasket, WA 98855
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 10:25:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am submitting this to voice my opposition to the EIS proposal. We in eastern Washington have already suffered from your reintroduction of wolves which has impacted many ranchers, farmers and others in our area. It has even

led to having to destroy part of the wolf packs. Now you want to reintroduce grizzlies...to what purpose?...so we have to destroy them when human and livestock conflicts arise? Four years ago we strongly rejected the idea of reintroduction of grizzlies into our "backyards" and yet here you are trying to shove it down our throats again. I was born and raised and lived most of my life in the Okanogan and our family has coexisted with wildlife fine until government intervention. For the safety and welfare of the people, please listen to what we are saying: NO MORE GRIZZLIES!!

Correspondence ID: 7840Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Fallon, NV 89406
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 10:28:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly support the effort to reintroduce grizzly bear to the North Cascades ecosystem. Alternative C, managing the reintroduced grizzly bears as an experimental population, offers the greatest degree of flexibility and chance of success for the program.

Correspondence ID: 7856Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Snoqualmie, WA 98065
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 10:30:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I grew up in the Methow and live in Snoqualmie. I recreate all over the state and believe there is much benefit to introducing Grizzly bears to our area. I am opposed.

Correspondence ID: 7859Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 10:30:55

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live in and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

The 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Public opinion polls have shown over and over again broad support for grizzly bear restoration in the North Cascades of Washington, including among those who live in the area. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Introduction of grizzlies is necessary in the North Cascades ecosystem. Grizzly bears lived in the Washington Cascades for thousands of years until extirpated in the last century. We still have a small relict population in the Selkirk Mountains of northeast Washington. However, currently, there are no grizzly populations in the United States or Canada that are large enough or close enough to serve as a source to naturally repopulate the North Cascades.

Thank you for doing all you can to keep our wild North Cascades a "back to the future" home to the magnificent grizzly bear!

Correspondence ID: 7862Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Montesano, WA 98563
United States of America
Outside Organization: Retired Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 10:31:29
Correspondence Type:Web Form
Correspondence: Heck yeah, bring them back!

Correspondence ID: 7894Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tampa, FL 33612
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 10:35:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support ALTERNATIVE C:

This option would move grizzly bears into the North Cascades and redesignate them as an experimental population with a 10(j) rule.

Correspondence ID: 7901Project:112008Document:132104

Address: East Wenatchee, WA 98802-5047
United States of America
Outside Organization: Self Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 10:36:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a significant property owner and resident in the Lake Wenatchee area of North Central Washington I do not want 'imported' Grizzly Bears in NCW because they arrive as angry, thus very dangerous, bears due to being trapped, sedated, and the effects of being caged and transported.

In my lifetime travels I have resided in Brown and Black Bear country and observed both species to be quite peaceable critters so long as a human being does not interfere with their activities. From other people's stories about living in Grizzly Bear country I assume naturally present Grizzly Bears to be no worse than Brown and Black Bears.

And, contrary to popular research, I have now and then observed signs of large bears, Brown or Grizzly, in the White River Valley, above Lake Wenatchee, since the early 1950s.

Legal Residence:

██████████
██████████
East Wenatchee, WA 98802-5047

Also:

██████████ Lake Wenatchee
Leavenworth, WA 98826

Correspondence ID: 7912Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98106
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 10:39:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Humans were responsible for removing grizzlies from the North Cascades and it's our responsibility to bring them back home. Every member of the ecosystem counts, our apex predators need us.

Correspondence ID: 7921Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Tonasket, WA 98855
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 10:41:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: This is in opposition to the EIS draft. I have lived in the Okanogan most of my life and was involved in logging beginning in 1979. Even back then, my partner and I witnessed a grizzly running in front of my truck on Cecille Creek near Loomis. I know of others who have seen them as well so why do we need to "reintroduce" more into areas where people frequent and where attacks will certainly happen. Are they more important than the people you are here to protect? And who will be liable for damages these additional bears will cause? You? We do not want more people endangered and, as we said four years ago "no more grizzlies!

Correspondence ID: 7934Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Prosser, WA 99350
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 10:43:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: In response to the introduction of grizzly bears. Commonsense and history tells us that if G-bears were at home in our area they would have been here a long time ago. I'am totally against the introduction.

Correspondence ID: 7978Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Arlington, WA 98223
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 10:47:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: No thank you to the Grizzly, I am for option A

Correspondence ID: 8076Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Moscow, ID 83843
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 10:56:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzlies belong in the North Cascades. They were there before the colonizers. The Indigenous knew how to live with them. So should whites. And the restoration of the grizzlies should be done in such a way as to not violate the Wilderness Act. Helicopters? Please! And do not move grizzlies that are already protected under the ESA. There are no so-called 'extra' bears that can be moved from Montana. Leave the grizzlies alone. Let them recover themselves. It is the colonizers and the fearful that need help, not the bears.

Correspondence ID: 8089Project:112008Document:132104

Address: spokane, WA 99202
United States of America
Outside Organization: Multicare Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 10:57:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to support the plan Alternative C and the proposed Section 10(j) Rule for the management of grizzly bears. I understand that some may be opposed to introducing these animals into the area. That they are fearful of the bear. However, if we look at the big picture the bear has much more to fear from us than we from them. If we have any hope to maintain any areas balanced in nature, we must have areas where large predators can exist. We have taken so much from nature, it has little left. Do we want to at least maintain some species or continue on the path of extinction? Please support alternative C and give conservation a chance to protect this species, and many more.

Correspondence ID: 8160Project:112008Document:132104

Address: New Bern, NC 28562
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 11:07:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I fully support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades. However, the restoration must be done in ways that do not violate the Wilderness Act. In other words, the restoration project must be as minimally intrusive as possible. Currently, both action alternatives would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives need to be substantially changed as follows:

1. Helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness need to be avoided. There are roads adjacent to the Wilderness areas that can provide release sites for the bears without needed to use helicopters.
2. It is essential that the plans do not involve much hands on human management of the bears such as radio collaring, drugging the bears, etc.
3. I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.
4. A natural recovery alternative should be fully developed. Natural recovery solutions should be favored over active repopulation. This would decrease the need for activities that will degrade wilderness which are in the end bad for bear populations. This will require work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred. I would also endorse an alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.
5. Both action alternatives should include the Bear Smart components that are in the no action alternative. All measures should be taken to ensure that humans populations and bear populations can coexist with minimal interaction and harm to both species.

Correspondence ID: 8306Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98144
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 11:32:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing in support of the no action alternative. I grew up hiking in the north Cascades from the early 1960's. I also have spent much time in the greater Yellowstone eco system where the grizzly population has increased during my lifetime. I understand the importance of a balanced eco system and the historical significance of the Grizzly population in the North Cascades, I have also witnessed significant issues, including friend's who have had serious encounters with Grizzlies - including loss of life. I myself have also had serious encounters so my concern does not come from theory but actual experience. Unfortunately, grizzly and human populations do not go well together so any active reintroduction efforts

should be limited to remote wilderness areas which limit protentional dangerous interactions.

I do support the natural growing of habitat areas but I do not support active reintroduction efforts which would accelerate bear-human interactions.

The main impact that I have observed and personally experienced is increased reluctance to explore, hike, climb, bicycle and generally recreate in our local outdoors. At a time of increased stress, depression, obesity, and isolation, recreation in the outdoors provides everyone - no matter their background - an equal opportunity to experience rejuvenation, peace, and happiness. Reintroduction of grizzlies would result in fewer people getting outside and experiencing our unique precious public lands.

Correspondence ID: 8328Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellevue, WA 98004
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 11:37:31

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I will start by saying I enjoy seeing bears from a distance. I have been to Brooks Falls and have seen the Grizzly bears up close and personal in their home environment. I am also a hiker who hikes in the North Cascades and I understand the risk to both humans and bears of introducing grizzlies to the region. The North Cascades is a beautiful region of Washington. I hike alone, and I believe it is risky to introduce brown bears to a region where hikers often travel solo. Traveling solo in bear country is risky business, and there are many places in Montana and Idaho and Wyoming I won't go solo due to the grizzly risk. I am opposed to reintroducing grizzly bears to the North Cascades, as I believe that t willow lead to unwanted conflict between humans and bears.

Correspondence ID: 8394Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Port Angeles, WA 98362
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 11:50:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The U.S. National Park and Fish and Wildlife Services are proposing to reintroduce grizzly bears to the North Cascades National Park and ecosystem (NCE) situated in north central Washington State. The NCE is a historical habitat of the grizzly bear.

As I understand the proposal, just a handful of bears (3-7) would be relocated to the NCE each year, with a decades-long (60-100 years) goal of 200 grizzly bears in the NCE.

The area of the NCE is approximately 9,800 square miles, or 6.1 million acres, comparable in size to the state of Vermont. If the goal is achieved, that would provide about 50 square miles, or 30,000 acres, of habitat for each animal.

It has been estimated that, in 2018, British Columbia (BC), Canada had a population of 14,925 grizzly bears. Report, BC Ministry of Forests, Lands, Natural Resource Operations and Rural Development (April 2020). In an almost 40 year period (1960-97), only 41 grizzly attacks on humans have occurred in BC. Ursus, Vol. 11, A Selection of Papers from the Eleventh International Conference on Bear Research and Management, Graz, Austria, September 1997, and Gatlinburg, Tennessee, April 1998 (1999), pp. 209-218. If one estimates the area of BC to be 364,763 square miles (Google search), each BC bear has access to 50% less habitat than a NCE bear.

Grizzly-human conflict is neither foreordained nor inevitable. The small population proposed, and the expansiveness of the NCE, should make grizzly-human contact infrequent, and risk of human injury or death miniscule.

We, as a species, are destroying Planet Earth. We should make every effort to attempt to rebalance the scales for the species with which we share the planet.

I support the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the NCE.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Correspondence ID: 8415Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98104
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 11:54:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzlies belong in the North Cascades. Humans that choose to live in one of the few undeveloped regions must accept the risks, however minor, of their choice. Plan B is preferred. Plan C is an acceptable compromise. Plan A is no good.

Correspondence ID: 8429Project:112008Document:132104
Address: kettle falls, WA 99141
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 11:56:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support Alternative A.
I do not want grizzlies translocated because I feel this would only be setting them up for failure, mainly due to potential human/sheep/cattle conflicts where the grizzly would lose in the end. If there was a rule that would not allow a grizzly to be hunted and killed due to a conflict with a human or sheep/cattle that would be a different matter and I would support it, but in this day and age of politics and with the wolf conflicts ongoing where the wolf typically loses in the end I don't want this to happen to the grizzlies. Protect them where they currently exist!

Correspondence ID: 8513Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Olympia, WA 98502
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 12:11:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I have a cabin at the foot of the North Cascades in Mazama, WA where I spend about three months a year. I would love to know that healthy grizzlies also call this mountain range home.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live in and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

Furthermore, the 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Thank you for considering these comments and doing what's right for grizzlies, our ecosystem, and future generations.

Correspondence ID: 8515Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tonasket, WA 98855
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 12:12:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am opposed to introduction of Grizzly Bear into the proposed area. There are already Grizzly bears in the area and others roaming in from the North (Canada) as history and current findings have shown. We do not need to bring others into this gene pool. We further do not need to increase the predator population in this area that is being managed for increasing and sustained wildfires. This management decreases the habitat and populations of pray species that do not need another predator. Leave this area alone and let it naturally evolve!

Correspondence ID: 8522Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Arlington, WA 98223
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 12:14:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have enough black bears living in my back yard now. Do not want or need the grizzlies!! My livestock and my grandkids do not need the grizzlies either. Do not mess with Mother Nature!!

Correspondence ID: 8528Project:112008Document:132104

Address: San Antonio, TX 78216
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 12:15:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: "A Society grows great when old men plant trees whose shade they know they shall never sit in";

I strongly support the National Park Services preferred Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation.

This plan will both effectively restore grizzly bears in North Cascades National Park and give people the tools they need to thrive in and around grizzly bear country. Grizzlies belong in the North Cascades, as they enhance the park's ecological integrity and contribute to its wildness.

Grizzly bears play a vital role in maintaining ecosystem balance, cycling nutrients, dispersing seeds, and changing the behavior of species around them. Restoring them would benefit the park and the people who use it.

A restored population of grizzlies will boost the park's appeal and attract nature enthusiasts, scientists, and tourists from around the world. This would provide economic benefits to local communities and support the park's mission to protect park resources in perpetuity.

Alternative C, with the 10(j) rule, provides managers flexibility to address community concerns while protecting the grizzly population. It ensures coexistence between humans and bears.

Please consider the positive ecological and economic benefits and support Alternative C. Restoring grizzly bears will secure the park's natural heritage and conserve an iconic species for current and future generations.

Thank you for your dedication to our national parks.

"There is none which compares in importance with the great central task of leaving this land even a better land for our descendants than it is for us"

-Theodore Roosevelt

Correspondence ID: 8551Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sedro Woolley, WA 98284
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 12:20:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I've been hearing discussions about the possible return of grizzlies to the north Cascades for a few years and hope that the plan can finally move forward.

I attended part of the November 2 listening session in Darrington, WA, and heard a lot of fear, a lot of emotion. Hunters afraid that they won't be able to find game if there are grizzlies in the Cascades. Tribal members afraid the salmon runs will be destroyed. Neighbors afraid that grizzlies will come all the way down to the river valley and attack livestock and pets. People afraid that they won't be able to hike safely.

I understand those fears, but think they're overblown and come from misunderstanding and ignorance. When I'm out hiking, backpacking, or even in an established campground, I'm potentially sharing space with predators and behave accordingly. I've seen and heard signs of bear, bobcat, and wolf while out hiking. I love knowing that there's still space for native wildlife, predators included. I've seen firsthand what happens in an ecosystem that has no predators--overpopulation by prey animals, overeaten grazing areas, disease, and collapse. An ecosystem is a complex system that needs all its pieces to be healthy--including native predators. Like grizzly bears.

I've read the summary of the three plans and favor Alternative C. The long timeframe (much longer than I think most opponents are willing to recognize) and provision for addressing problem bears give people time to adapt to the presence of grizzlies in the backcountry, agencies the opportunity to address problems, and bears time to establish territories away from humans.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Correspondence ID: 8553Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tonasket, WA 98855
United States of America

Outside Organization: personal Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 12:21:01

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The EIS has failed to evaluate the impacts the bears will have as they move out of the North Cascades into areas populated by people, farms and ranches.

The EIS has failed to adequately evaluate the impacts the bears will have on anadromous fish populations in Washington State.

The US Department of Interior should commit to being liable for damages caused by the bears to private land, farms and ranches and to the people who live in Washington State. IF/ When a bear kills someone then people within the Department of Interior who approve this plan should be held criminally and personally liable.

The EIS assumes that bears will adapt to the North Cascades ecosystem and adapt to the food sources there. Bears typically are taught by their mother what to eat: elk, fish, moths in Wyoming etc. whatever is best for them in their home range.

Moving bears to the north cascades erroneously assumes bears will change their eating habits to adapt to a new location. This assumption is wrong. In 1996 the US fish and wildlife service joined in an effort with the Canadian wildlife organization to move a Canadian Griz. south to the US border above the Pasayten Wilderness area in the North Cascades. That was a

problem bear that was eating fish at a Canadian fish hatchery. That bear went into the Pasayten Wilderness area for about 2 days then headed North to the Canadian fish hatchery. The bear did not adapt to a new ecosystem. It returned to its native food source. You cannot train Griz. to live in a new habitat. This information is a matter of public record in the notes from a Wenatchee National Forest Leadership team meeting where the information was presented by the forest Griz. expert Bill Gaines. Griz. planted in the North Cascades will move in search of better food sources that they are accustomed to. This point is not covered in the EIS.

The EIS has failed to adequately evaluate the financial impacts of Griz. on outfitter guides in the North Cascades. The EIS did not adequately evaluate the financial impacts that will happen as tourism changes. Any increase in tourism will cause an increase in air pollution due to auto emissions. Increased tourism will also over tax existing recreation facilities. Where will the money come from to expand and modify recreation facilities? This is not covered in the EIS. People go to Yellowstone Park to see the bears. They will go to the North Cascades to view bears as well.

The EIS is faulty in many respects and will lead to negative impacts on the North Cascades ecosystem, the people, recreation facilities and economy of the area and it will have negative effects on the bears the US Fish and Wildlife service intend to relocate to a new ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 8654Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Custer, WA 98240
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 12:37:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I see NO benefit to adding grizzly bears to Washington.

Wolves have already scattered elk herds in the Ione area. Adding more predators sure won't help.

Correspondence ID: 8659Project:112008Document:132104
Address: kirkland, WA 98033
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 12:37:19
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: i am for grizzly bear re introduction. i think option C is the best option. it makes sense to restore the bear given its spiritual significance to first nations people who share its ancestral home land. i also think we owe it to future generations to proactively move to restore and support all the native fauna that call the north cascades home. with accelerating climate change this becomes more important now than ever, as these ecosystems and their inhabitants are increasingly experiencing greater stress. i have hike often in grizzly country in Montana and Wyoming, and even though i have rarely seen them in the wild, just knowing they are there, adds a kind additional sense of the sacredness to the wilderness experience.

i think for people who live in closest proximity to the bears home range deserve additional flexibility to address nuisance bears, and conflict. this ia why i strongly advocate for restoring them, while also allowing the flexibility that option C provides. thank you. [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 8689Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Redding, CA 96003
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 12:40:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I believe that grizzly bears should be restored to their land that they survived originally. The reason grizzlies are missing from the Northern Cascade mountains are due to people hunting and killing them. Grizzly bears deserve

to live in Washington, Oregon and California. With more land for them to roam they will find more food to survive. People in Alaska have lived with Grizzlies for centuries. If a bear becomes a nuisance it can just be relocated without harm.

Correspondence ID: 8714Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 12:46:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hi,

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the EIS proposing reintroduction options for Grizzly Bears into the North Cascades. I'd like to provide some background information about myself before providing my comment. I was born, raised, and continue to live in the mountains of Chelan County, near Wenatchee, close to the designated North Cascades Grizzly Bear Recovery Area. Next summer, we are moving to a rural area of Okanogan County, near Twisp, that is within the recovery area. I am an avid outdoorsman, who spends many hours, days, and nights, in the wilds of the North Cascades ecosystems, covering hundreds of miles on foot every year. I enjoy trail running, hiking, backpacking, birding, hunting, and observing the ecosystem as a whole.

Having said this, I am extremely supportive of reintroducing Grizzly Bears to the North Cascades. Grizzlies are a vital component to the ecosystems they reside in, digging and aerating soils, along with spreading seeds far and wide throughout mountain ecosystems. Having an intact ecosystem to live and recreate in, is beyond special, and restoring Grizzly Bears will put another puzzle piece back into its ecological place, after it was wrongfully removed. There is something so profound and exciting about having Grizzlies on the landscape, even if you never see one. Whenever I am hiking in Montana or Wyoming, you can feel it. I hope to feel this same sense of awe and wonder here in my own backyard, and maybe one day see a wild Grizzly in the North Cascades. This likely will only be possible during my lifetime with a reintroduction program. Nearby populations across the border are already very low, and with many barriers such as highways and development separating the North Cascades from thriving Grizzly populations, it is unlikely they will disperse on their own to establish a new population.

Specifically, my preference is in support of Alternative B, where this population will be granted full ESA protection. This is important to protect such an important ecological resource as Grizzly Bears, from being lethally removed due to pressure from small interest groups and local governments. Grizzly Bear recovery should take precedence over any anthropogenic concerns such as livestock depredation etc., as it is not the public's responsibility to subsidize and cater to ranchers, who already graze livestock on public lands at minimal cost. Many people who don't support Grizzly Bear recovery are already anti-predator in general, and the 10(j) rule could provide loopholes for lethal removal of bears without adequate cause over the following decades. Alternative B will provide for a more standardized and regulated approach to the recovery and protection of Grizzly Bears in the North Cascades.

I do understand the reasoning of compromise with Alternative C, and would support Alternative C secondarily. But I must state that my preference, and in my opinion best chance at long term for recovery of Grizzly Bears in the North Cascades, is Alternative B.

Thank you again for this opportunity to comment.

Correspondence ID: 8737Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Kirkland, WA 98034
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 12:50:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The arguments for grizzly restoration are indicative of living in the past. Supporters say that people can coexist peacefully beside them. The basis of this arrogant argument means only a few people in Alaska and Montana will die or be injured. And these are places have far smaller populations than Washington. Do you find this acceptable collateral

damage? Is that what you call wildlife "management"?

Those who simply want to see them can travel to nearby states and British Columbia to do so. I have seen grizzly in the Pasayten Wilderness less than thirty years ago, so they already exist here. If it would benefit the bears, they would move here on their own. But with a growing human population and the popularity of outdoor activity among our residents, often with a dog, it makes no sense to reintroduce a species that presents a risk to us directly, and a cost to the farmers and land owners that live here. There is no valid logic in wanting to bring them back just because they "used to roam freely" here. Four thousand years ago, large lions roamed freely in southern Europe. Does it seem like a good idea to reintroduce lions there now? I doubt the residents there would benefit in any way. And there is no benefit to reintroducing this aggressive predatory species into our own backyard. Our ecosystems have done very well without. Thank you for listening.

Correspondence ID: 8791Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Yakima, WA 98908
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 13:02:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My wife and I hike, fish, and hunt in areas that would be impacted by the proposed grizzly bear introduction. We see this as an unnecessary endangerment and a waste of resources. Please consider the needs of people who actually utilize these lands!

Correspondence ID: 8937Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Tacoma, WA 98406
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 13:33:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support Alternative A (no action)

Correspondence ID: 8970Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Forks, WA 98331
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 13:43:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The proposed intervention alternatives (B and C) of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) pose unnecessary risks to other endangered species within the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE) at this time. Table A-1 lists 8 federally threatened or endangered species with critical habitat in the NCE which are also likely to be affected by grizzly bear reintroduction.

If the purpose of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) is to "protect and recover imperiled species and the ecosystems upon which they depend" as the EIS states, then the reintroduction of one species at the cost of several others is logically counterproductive. For example, while the EIS states that fish are not expected to be a primary food source of reintroduced grizzly bears in the NCE, there is not adequate analysis in the EIS of the potential effects on State and Federal threatened/endangered/sensitive fish species that could be grizzly bear food sources. Grizzly bears have an immense capacity to feed on fish, and it is conceivable that threatened/endangered/sensitive fish species will be adversely impacted, but this EIS does not adequately demonstrate that these risks are low.

Table C-2 indicates the action alternatives (B and C) would cost approximately 7.1 million dollars in capture & release, monitoring, and staff time alone over ten years. As a resident of Washington and a taxpayer, I would rather these species recovery efforts and taxpayer dollars first be spent on stabilizing the populations of imperiled prey species, as opposed to predator species. For example, I would prefer more emphasis be placed on recovering the extirpated South Selkirk woodland

caribou herd, or imperiled fish species in Washington.

Furthermore, the most recent effort from the federal government to reintroduce grizzly bears to the NCE was stopped just three years ago, in 2020, after opposition from local stakeholders. Stakeholder concerns with action alternatives in this EIS will likely be the same or similar as concerns regarding the previous reintroduction plans: restarting the process so soon shows disregard for those local stakeholders. While I would support grizzly bear reintroduction efforts in the NCE at the right time, for the reasons listed above, I do not believe that the time is now, and cannot support either alternative B or C in this EIS.

Correspondence ID: 8973Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 13:43:58

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Restoring the top predator in the ecosystem, the grizzly bear, will bring balance to the ecosystem of the North Cascades. It is the right and correct thing to do. Those who feel at risk from the presence of grizzlies should take steps to minimize that risk without harming the bears. Public funds should be made available to initiate the process, but after a reasonable period of time, those funds should gradually phase out

Correspondence ID: 8980Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Yakima, WA 98903
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 13:45:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We do not need to introduce anymore grizzlies. Just stop.

Correspondence ID: 8988Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Algona, WA 98001
United States of America

Outside Organization: n/a Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 13:47:03

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: NOT IN FAVOR - my six reasons below:

1. Safety Concerns: Grizzly bears are large and powerful predators that can pose a significant threat to human safety. While proponents argue that bear attacks are rare, introducing these apex predators into an area that may see increased human activity, such as hiking, camping, and recreational pursuits, could raise the risk of bear-human conflicts. This could lead to injuries or fatalities, and necessitate additional resources for bear management and public safety.
2. Local Opposition: It's crucial to consider the sentiments and concerns of local communities. Many residents may be apprehensive about living in close proximity to grizzly bears and the potential disruptions they bring to their way of life. Disregarding these concerns can strain community relations and lead to resistance against the conservation efforts.
3. Economic Implications: The North Cascades region relies heavily on tourism and outdoor recreation for its economic well-being. Visitors come to enjoy the beautiful landscapes and engage in various outdoor activities. The potential for bear-human conflicts, as well as the perception of increased danger, could deter tourists and outdoor enthusiasts. This might lead to a decline in tourism revenue, impacting local businesses and employment.
4. Resource Competition: Introducing grizzly bears could disrupt the local ecosystem and lead to competition with other native wildlife, such as black bears and cougars, for food resources and territory. This competition could adversely affect the

populations of other species and disrupt the ecological balance of the area.

5. Relocation Challenges: Translocating grizzly bears into the North Cascades from other regions can be a difficult process. It can be stressful for the bears and may lead to increased mortality rates among the introduced individuals. This raises ethical concerns about the welfare of the animals.

6. Impact on Livestock and Agriculture: Grizzly bears have a well-documented history of preying on livestock, particularly in regions where they coexist with agricultural activities. The North Cascades are home to ranches and farms, and the introduction of grizzlies may result in financial losses for farmers due to livestock depredation. This could create tension between conservation efforts and the livelihoods of local communities.

I realize, the introduction of grizzly bears into the North Cascades is a complex issue with legitimate concerns related to safety, economic impacts, and the well-being of local communities. Wildlife management decisions should carefully weigh both the benefits and drawbacks of such actions. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 8989Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Tampa, FL 33613
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 13:47:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I strongly support the National Park Service's preferred Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation.

This plan will effectively restore grizzly bears in the North Cascades National Park and give people the tools they need to thrive in and around grizzly bear country. Grizzlies belong in the North Cascades, as they enhance the park's ecological integrity and contribute to its wildness.

Grizzly bears play a vital role in maintaining ecosystem balance, cycling nutrients, dispersing seeds, and changing the behavior of species around them. Restoring them would benefit the park and the people who use it.

A restored population of grizzlies will boost the park's appeal and attract nature enthusiasts, scientists, and tourists worldwide. This would provide economic benefits to local communities and support the park's mission to protect park resources in perpetuity.

Alternative C, with the 10(j) rule, allows managers to address community concerns while protecting the grizzly population. It ensures coexistence between humans and bears.

Please consider the positive ecological and economic benefits and support Alternative C. Restoring grizzly bears will secure the park's natural heritage and conserve an iconic species for current and future generations.

I appreciate your dedication to our national parks.

Respectfully I remain
[REDACTED], ("MORTAL," and A Member Of The Human Family --- As Are We All), ---
"EQUALLY"

Correspondence ID: 9039Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Vista, CA 92081
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 14:01:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I am increasingly disheartened by the NPS, FS, BLM, and FWS violations of the Wilderness Act by using helicopters, chainsaws, and other mechanized equipment in Wilderness areas. It shows an increasing disregard and disrespect of fundamental Wilderness values and the law.

Correspondence ID: 9096Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Clinton, WA 98236
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 14:10:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: For the "locals" who are concerned about safety and don't want the bears introduced, I vote we make them relocate instead. Grizzlies should be reintroduced to their native regions. As a lifelong Washingtonian, I whole heartedly believe they should return.

Correspondence ID: 9152Project:112008Document:132104

Address: REDMOND, WA 98052
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 14:23:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support grizzly reintroduction!

Correspondence ID: 9173Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Atlantic Beach, FL 32233-4511
United States of America

Outside Organization: - Select - Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 14:27:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Draft Environmental Impact Statement 'Alternative C' is the most comprehensive plan that ensures both active restoration and pragmatic management in recovering the North Cascades grizzly bear.

Correspondence ID: 9180Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Atlantic Beach, FL 32233
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 14:28:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Draft Environmental Impact Statement 'Alternative C' is the most comprehensive plan that ensures both active restoration and pragmatic management in recovering the North Cascades grizzly bear.

Correspondence ID: 9226Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98126
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 14:35:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm an avid hiker and I value the wildness of the North Cascades. I want grizzly bears to be a part of that wildness again. There is plenty of space for both of us. As a conservationist, I know grizzly bears provide important ecological services, like distributing seeds and aerating alpine meadows. I've read that bears are considered ecosystem engineers, they have the ability to modify their environment. I have also learned that through their foraging habits, bears spread plant and berry seeds in their droppings and spread marine-derived nitrogen into the forest surrounding salmon streams. Bears are important links in food webs and help maintain populations of deer and other prey species through predation.

Humans were responsible for removing grizzlies from the North Cascades and it's our responsibility to bring them back home. If we don't take action now, we risk losing grizzly bears from the North Cascades forever along with negative consequences to the ecosystems and our environment without these keystone species.

Correspondence ID: 9252Project:112008Document:132104

Address: eugene, OR 97405
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 14:41:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Reintroducing an apex predator to Northern Washington State will ensure that innocent men, women and children are going to end up dead.

Having lived in Fairbanks Alaska, I have tremendous respect for bears and their ability to kill when hungry, protecting their cubs, or simply feeling territorial.

Most Americans from the lower 48 seem to think bears are just cute and cuddly "Teddy Bears." They're not. If you're not prepared to defend yourself (and that means a 338 Winchester or heavier rifle, or a 12 gauge with slugs), you WILL suffer a horrible death if a bear attacks you or your family.

Re-introducing bears in the Northern Cascades means that those mountains will be effectively "off limits" to most who once enjoyed that wilderness.

This is such a bad idea. Really, just DON'T do it. People are more important than grizzly bears!

Correspondence ID: 9278Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Twisp, WA 98956
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 14:47:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do NOT introduce grizzly bears to the north cascades region. If they naturally return over a very long time horizon, that's ok, but there is no need to hurry that process along. There is no evidence of a dire need for grizzly bears in the region that would justify the risk.

Correspondence ID: 9328Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Davis, CA 95618
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 15:03:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: PLEASE RESTORE grizzlies to the North Cascades in conformity with the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives would violate the Wilderness Act. Helicopter landings and flights, the use of telemetry installations, and heavy-handed management of bears ALL VIOLATE THE ACT. Use the roads in the recovery area or that dead-end at Wildernesses to provide release sites without the use of helicopters. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 9331Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tillamook, OR 97141
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 15:03:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear NPS:

I respectfully request you maintain the "no action" choice regarding Grizzly Bears in the No Cascades NP system. I feel the few bears that roam that area is plenty for that wilderness area to handle, given the proximity to rural interface areas.

As an avid backpacker, I look forward to backpacking in this area without the high volume of apex predator grizzlies. We have enough other regions of the continental US that have maintained the grizzly population in its habitat. I also live in a rural area and understand how easily these wild creatures could expand to unintended regions, causing reduced access by locals, cost of protective measures by private individuals and stress for local home/landowners.

Please do not change your current policy regarding the grizzly bears in the North Cascades NP.

Sincerely,


Tillamook, OR

Correspondence ID: 9338Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 15:07:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Do not reintroduce grizzlies to the north Cascades. There are dozens of grizzly attacks in the sparsely populated Rocky mountains. I can only imagine how many we will have in the densely populated Cascades range. Black bears are doing fine.as the top predator in the range and we don't need grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 9343Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Gold Bar, WA 98251
United States of America

Outside Organization: Citizen-Tax Payer- Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 15:10:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in favor of restoring balance to the Noth Cascades with the re introduction of Grizzly bears. I have hiked in all of the national parks and wilderness areas of the North Cascades. I have hiked in wilderness areas of Alaska where grizzly bears are present. Please proceed with the plan to allow grizzly bears to reestablish them selves in the North Cascades.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

Correspondence ID: 9388Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Great Falls, MT 59401
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 15:30:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I strongly support the National Park Services preferred Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation. Restoring grizzly bears will secure the park's natural heritage and conserve an iconic species for current and future generations.

This plan will both effectively restore grizzly bears in North Cascades National Park and give people the tools they need to thrive in and around grizzly bear country.

Grizzlies belong in the North Cascades, as they enhance the park's ecological integrity and play a vital role in maintaining ecosystem balance, cycling nutrients, and dispersing seeds.

Restoring them would benefit the park and the people who use it.

A restored population of grizzlies will provide economic benefits to local communities and support the park's mission to protect park resources in perpetuity.

Alternative C, with the 10(j) rule, provides managers flexibility to address community concerns while protecting the grizzly population. It ensures coexistence between humans and bears.

I respectfully urge you to consider the positive ecological and economic benefits and support Alternative C. Thank you for your dedication to our national parks.

Correspondence ID: 9390Project:112008Document:132104
Address: [REDACTED], UN 63-400
Poland
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 15:31:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Alternative C and the proposed Section 10(j) Rule is our best choice that meets both ecological and social needs.

Correspondence ID: 9412Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Vancouver, WA 98664
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 15:38:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the restoration of a healthy population of Grizzly Bears to Washington's North Cascades through Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. This plan is wisely modeled on the process that has worked successfully in Montana.

Grizzly Bears are ecologically and culturally significant; they are a missing component of the North Cascades ecosystems and their biodiversity. Human actions over the past 150 years extirpated the Grizzly Bear from the North Cascades; we now have the unique opportunity to restore them to their historic range where suitable habitats still exist.

Restoring Grizzly Bears as an "experimental, non-essential" population under a well-crafted Section 10(j) Rule of the Endangered Species Act provides managers with the flexibility to reduce, prevent and address human-bear conflicts and give greater comfort to local communities that are concerned about the impacts of wildlife recovery on economic and recreation activities.

I also urge that Grizzly Bears be restored in a way that minimizes conflicts with the Wilderness Act and does not harm the North Cascades' wilderness character. Alternative C should be modified to avoid helicopter landings in wilderness and to avoid heavy-handed bear management. Many roads bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to wilderness

boundaries that could provide release sites rather than helicopter landings within designated wilderness.

The source of Grizzly Bears to repopulate the North Cascades also is a concern. Montana's grizzlies are not yet recovered under the Endangered Species Act. Any dispersing Grizzly Bears from Glacier, Yellowstone or Grand Teton national parks are needed to naturally recover in adjacent wilderness areas.

I urge a compromise in Alternative C that integrates natural recovery measures with population augmentation in the final management plan. Working with partner agencies in British Columbia, corridors should be designated and managed to encourage Grizzly Bears to move across the international border and naturally expand into vacant suitable habitat in the North Cascades. This seems like a quicker way to jump start recovery than solely depending on bears taken from still recovering populations in the Northern Rockies.

Correspondence ID: 9423Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tonasket, WA 98855
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 15:40:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello,

I am against the brown bear restoration to the North Cascade where I live.

It will change how we go hiking and just being able to walk around on our property without carrying protection.

A restoration similar to this happened in Alaska and the locals tell me that after the restorations the outdoors are off limits to human and pets. It has sadly has lowered their standard of living and enjoyment of being even just outside of their houses.

Please investigate the negative effect it has on the Alaskan project and I am strongly against this restoration in the North cascade. Do not restore them here and ruin the reason we live here.

Correspondence ID: 9425Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spokane V, WA 99206
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 15:40:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please reintroduce grizzly bears under the 10j rule, keeping them nonessential and experimental.

Please fully staff the Park Service, the USFWS, the Tribes, and ensure that WDFW also has adequate staff to manage and monitor bears and respond to conflicts. These agencies should also work collaboratively to continue outreach efforts to fully prepare communities outside federal land for bear coexistence. State and federal agencies must provide seed money to assist communities to become Bear Smart communities (IGBC framework) to reduce and prevent conflicts with grizzlies.

Grizzly bears targeted for reintroduction should also come from the NCDE and specifically Glacier National Park since the habitat and plant communities are far more similar to the NCE. This will greatly improve the survival of reintroduced bears and may have an effect initially on reducing conflict behavior by reintroduced bears (Set them up for success).

Thank you!

Correspondence ID: 9435Project:112008Document:132104

Address: SEATTLE, WA 98115-4824
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 15:42:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think if Grizzlies liked the North Cascades they would of found this prime habitat years ago. No large fish runs to draw them, a short supply of ungulates and coastal weather that will push them into partial hibernation and conflicts with humans at lower elevations.

Recommend leaving the WDFW Grizzly Mgmt. Plan in place.

██████████
██████████
Seattle, WA 98115

Correspondence ID: 9438Project:112008Document:132104
Address: darrinton, WA 98241
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 15:42:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am in favor of alternative A : NO ACTION

My reason is that with the decline of the fish, deer, and Elk populations there would not be enough food in the north cascade mountains to sustain the Grizzly bear. This would force them to move down into the low lands amongst the human population. This would cause a lot of conflict between the Grizzly Bear and humans. To me that would not be fair to the Grizzly Bear or humans. If the Grizzly Bear wants to make the north cascades in Washington their home we should allow them to migrate down out of Canada on their own and not try relocating them ourselves.

Thank you for listening to the concerns of the people that live, work and that enjoy the back country of the north cascades.

Correspondence ID: 9459Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Fairbanks, AK 99709
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 15:47:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think it is a fantastic plan to reintroduce grizzlies to the Northern Cascades. However, I believe the extensive use of helicopters, to bring them in and monitor them is horribly invasive. These are wilderness areas and that must be respected and maintained. The thwack-thwack-thwack from helicopters is actually terrorizing to animals and should be avoided. There are roads which may be utilized to bring the bears in. I think it is in the best interests to establish an agreement with the Canadians to make protected corridors to enable ease of movement and to keep gene pools vital. This will benefit more than just grizzlies and recognizes that wildlife knows no borders or boundaries. I also believe it is important that the bears receive full protection and not be considered a nonessential experimental population. Labeling them as such basically insures half measures are just fine and dandy, rather than truly giving our best for these bears. It also belittles their position as a top predator who helps hold and maintains ecosystem health and viability.

In short, I urge you to please consider the big picture and include in your planning a more natural re-establishment of these bears. Holding up the tenets of wilderness must be maintained. It is also important in your planning to include education for the public so that all may have the best experience possible. Grizzly bears are an iconic species and a top predator that has been revered as well as feared for their strength and power. Reintroducing them is a wonderful plan. Please do it in a responsible, noninvasive way, which will give them the best opportunity to make a new home.

Correspondence ID: 9476Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 15:52:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello, Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this issue.
This is a horrible idea or plan to reintroduce a species that has been gone for decades.
You are putting human lives in jeopardy. Citizens who enjoy hiking or hunting or spending time outdoors will be at risk to a known predator. Not just any predator, but a apex predator. One that has no predator. In recent weeks we have seen reports of grizzly attacks in Canada and the state of Idaho. People lost their lives in these.
This plan reminds me of a public vote at the end of the 1990's that outlawed the use of dogs while cougar hunting. All this did was allow a species to overpopulate and become a serious problem. There have been reports of cougar attacks since this happened. Now, no one hunts cougars anymore. It got to the point where the state just added a cougar tag to your big game license and charged you for it. A foolish move by the department of wildlife. I hunt in Washington and have come across black bears and cougars and been forced to change my hunting plan.
Hikers though are a different story. Many carry bear spray, which is to be deployed when the bear is thirty feet from you. Grizzlies can run up to thirty five miles per hour. At thirty feet you have less than two seconds to accurately shoot the spray in the right direction if you haven't already soiled yourself and we're to slow. Thus ending in being mauled to death.
The state introduced grey wolves to eastern Washington and that has been very controversial. Ranchers losing cattle. Over population because once again a animal with no predator. I hunt up in twist and have seen wolves as close as seventy five feet away.
Very uncomfortable situation. Both wolves and bear eat deer and elk which is what we hunt. This will threaten the population of these animals, which will lead to no one hunting and a huge revenue loss to the state.
So, let's use some common sense and NOT reintroduce grizzlies to Washington state, for the safety of it's citizens.
Thank you for this opportunity to voice my opinion on this subject.

Correspondence ID: 9487Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Riverside, WA 98849
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 15:56:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I would like to see grizzly reintroduced to Washington.

Correspondence ID: 9547Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Olympia, WA 98502-3112
United States of America
Outside Organization: [REDACTED] Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 16:15:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a hiker who has enjoyed hiking where grizzlies roam, esp Montana, British Columbia, and Alberta., I am in favor of alternative C.
It appears to offer the most tools for success and increased health of the ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 9548Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 16:16:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am against the grizzlies being reintroduced to the north cascades. I like to hike these areas so the whole idea of populating a dangerous predator into a place where we already established laws preventing such in the past shouldn't even be considered let alone allowed.

Correspondence ID: 9549Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Chapel hill, NC 27517
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 16:16:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Alternative C and the proposed Section 10(j) Rule is our best choice that meets both ecological and social needs.

Correspondence ID: 9568Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Tonasket, WA 98855
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 16:25:47
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Why on earth would this be proposed? You have been told over and over that this is not wanted. Grizzly bears once roamed in Seattle wa too. Why not release them into discovery park instead?

Correspondence ID: 9586Project:112008Document:132104
Address: seattle, WA 98113-0185
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 16:31:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: It's time to stop the on-again/off-again process that has been going on. It's time to return the grizzly bear to the North Cascades---and not by the 10(j) process. Grizzly bears were in Washington state long before people; this is their country also. They still live in various parts of the United States, co-existing well with human beings. They are also key in strengthening the biodiversity of our ecosystem. Please return the grizzly bear to the North Cascades as quickly as possible.

Correspondence ID: 9603Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Yakima, WA 98901
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 16:41:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I hope you will consider the reintroduction of grizzlies to the North Cascades region. I know there is a lot of information & details I could include in my letter, but you've heard it all before, & I'm not going over the same ground with you again. Bottom line: those bears need to be brought back. I favor Conservation Northwest's option, alternative C.
Our local senator, Dan Newhouse (R) is against it, & he is just a dumb farmer, looking out for the damn cows & ranchers. That's what happened to America. We want to civilize everything, pave it over, chop down the trees, & wipe out "bothersome" nature & its unruly animals. NO It's time to call a halt to overzealous nay-sayers & restore nature & its animals & plants to a time before we thought we knew better & wiped too much of it out. Just review what happened in Yellowstone NP when wolves were restored. There is a lovely video on how the restoration one one single species affected the entire ecosystem. The wolves reduced the ruminants' overgrazing, which allowed riparian areas to be restored, and stream health to be improved. All of life in the park benefitted from the simple reintroduction of a species man thought was dangerous & should be killed. Enough already. It's time for grizzlies to return to the North Cascades. Species conflict should be minimal, as there are not that many humans living where the bears will be roaming. It's time Man made way for nature again. We've lost so much already to urbanization. Say Yes to bears!

Correspondence ID: 9637Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Rougemont, NC 27572
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 16:57:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live in and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

Furthermore, the 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Thank you for taking the time to keep our North Cascades wild!

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 9711Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Menands, NY 12204
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 17:18:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To Whom It May Concern:

I live in New York State, but I have visited Yellowstone and the Grand Tetons National Parks where grizzlies reside. I believe that apex predators like grizzlies are an essential element in ecosystems.

I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with

partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 9754Project:112008Document:132104

Address: La Conner, WA 98257
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 17:40:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I understand that people who live west of the Cascades hold a great deal of fear about the reintroduction of grizzlies. There is a lot of misinformation about grizzlies preying on livestock and attacking people. The science tells us that grizzly attacks are rare and that humans and livestock can co-exist with these apex predators in the same area. More importantly, the science has proven over and over again the importance of apex predators to our entire ecosystem. It is my hope that finally science will win out over fear and myth and that grizzlies will be successfully reintroduced to the North Cascades. It's beyond time to restore this ecosystem and to reintroduce grizzlies. They will never be there in the abundance they once were, but having them in their home territory once again goes a small step toward repairing the damage humans have done.

Correspondence ID: 9757Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Portland, OR 97221
United States of America

Outside Organization: None Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 17:41:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We believe that Grizzly bears should be reintroduced to the North Cascades, and the draft plan adequately addresses concerns, such as risks to humans and livestock. Humans and grizzly bears have coexisted for many many centuries in the North Cascades, and we can do so again. We are avid tent campers, and we have camped near other grizzly populations in Montana and Wyoming without incident. Please reintroduce grizzlies to the North Cascades as soon as feasible.

Thank you,


Portland Oregon

Correspondence ID: 9758Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Graham, WA 98338
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 17:41:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To whom it may concern,

I am a natural resources technician who routinely works in the north cascades and north east WA. I generally work alone and in very remote locations on state and private land. Right now I carry bear spray but even when I have encountered black bears I am never afraid of them because they really don't kill humans.

Grizzlies do. I don't want to run into one by myself, cruising timber, miles in the back country. If they come down naturally that's great. If you reintroduce them, you will be choosing to put people at risk of death. Please don't.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 9772Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 17:46:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades via Alternate C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. Grizzly bears once roamed much of western North America, including the area now called the North Cascades. Apex predators such as the grizzly are essential to the efficient functioning of the ecosystems they have adapted to. While reintroduction to their entire former range is impractical, there is ample space in the North Cascades to accommodate both grizzlies and current human activities, recreational and otherwise. Section 10(j) allows wildlife managers flexibility in addressing conflicts that may arise.

Correspondence ID: 9780Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Chalfont, PA 18914
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 17:49:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly support the National Park Services preferred Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation.

This plan will both effectively restore grizzly bears in North Cascades National Park and give people the tools they need to thrive in and around grizzly bear country. Grizzlies belong in the North Cascades, as they enhance the park's ecological integrity and contribute to its wildness.

Grizzly bears play a vital role in maintaining ecosystem balance, cycling nutrients, dispersing seeds, and changing the behavior of species around them. Restoring them would benefit the park and the people who use it.

A restored population of grizzlies will boost the park's appeal and attract nature enthusiasts, scientists, and tourists from around the world. This would provide economic benefits to local communities and support the park's mission to protect park resources in perpetuity.

Alternative C, with the 10(j) rule, provides managers flexibility to address community concerns while protecting the grizzly population. It ensures coexistence between humans and bears.

Please consider the positive ecological and economic benefits and support Alternative C. Restoring grizzly bears will secure the park's natural heritage and conserve an iconic species for current and future generations.

It's just possible that restoring grizzly bears to this park will bring about the same dramatic ecological changes that happened in Yellowstone National Park with their reintroduction of a wolf pack, which changed the entire ecology of the area as documented in a video you should seek out and watch if you haven't already.

Thank you for your dedication to our national parks.

Correspondence ID: 9788Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Burlington, WA 98233
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 17:52:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Having lived in Marblemount Wa for 16 years, I emphatically disagree with the plan to release Grizzly Bear in the wild. There are homes with children residing all along the forest area. This is a great endangerment to human lives and is not acceptable.

Thank you

Correspondence ID: 9803Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Valley Center, CA 92082-7635
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 17:57:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Alternative C and the proposed Section 10(j) Rule is our best choice that meets both ecological and social needs.

MAKE IT HAPPEN!

Correspondence ID: 9813Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mercer Island, WA 98040
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 18:01:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of grizzly bears to North Cascades National Park. Complete ecosystems include large omnivores such as the grizzly and their absence creates challenges for biodiversity. We humans can and should adapt to their presence. We have no natural right to impoverish the local ecosystem in service of our needs. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 9839Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Kennewick, WA 99337
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 18:10:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I grew up in the foothills of the Cascades on the eastern boundary of Issaquah, and the greater ecosystem of the region holds an everlasting bond within my heart and soul. Hearing that we have an opportunity and extremely well thought out plan to re-introduce a species that were once an integral part of the North Cascades ecosystem brings me joy and hope that we can continue healing the natural world around us and co-exist with nature in a productive and resilient way.

I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live in and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

Furthermore, the 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Thank you for taking the time to keep our North Cascades wild!

Correspondence ID: 9854Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Alstead, NH 03602
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 18:15:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: U have read the information accompanying this petition and a strongly agree on the Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation. Thank you for your care.

I strongly support the National Park Services preferred Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation.

This plan will both effectively restore grizzly bears in North Cascades National Park and give people the tools they need to thrive in and around grizzly bear country. Grizzlies belong in the North Cascades, as they enhance the park's ecological integrity and contribute to its wildness.

Grizzly bears play a vital role in maintaining ecosystem balance, cycling nutrients, dispersing seeds, and changing the behavior of species around them. Restoring them would benefit the park and the people who use it.

A restored population of grizzlies will boost the park's appeal and attract nature enthusiasts, scientists, and tourists from around the world. This would provide economic benefits to local communities and support the park's mission to protect park resources in perpetuity.

Alternative C, with the 10(j) rule, provides managers flexibility to address community concerns while protecting the grizzly population. It ensures coexistence between humans and bears.

Please consider the positive ecological and economic benefits and support Alternative C. Restoring grizzly bears will secure the park's natural heritage and conserve an iconic species for current and future generations.

Thank you for your dedication to our national parks.

Correspondence ID: 9861Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Alstead, NH 03602
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 18:16:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: O have read the information accompanying this petition and I agree with the National Park Services preferred Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation. Thank you

I strongly support the National Park Services preferred Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation.

This plan will both effectively restore grizzly bears in North Cascades National Park and give people the tools they need to thrive in and around grizzly bear country. Grizzlies belong in the North Cascades, as they enhance the park's ecological integrity and contribute to its wildness.

Grizzly bears play a vital role in maintaining ecosystem balance, cycling nutrients, dispersing seeds, and changing the behavior of species around them. Restoring them would benefit the park and the people who use it.

A restored population of grizzlies will boost the park's appeal and attract nature enthusiasts, scientists, and tourists from around the world. This would provide economic benefits to local communities and support the park's mission to protect park resources in perpetuity.

Alternative C, with the 10(j) rule, provides managers flexibility to address community concerns while protecting the grizzly population. It ensures coexistence between humans and bears.

Please consider the positive ecological and economic benefits and support Alternative C. Restoring grizzly bears will secure the park's natural heritage and conserve an iconic species for current and future generations.

Thank you for your dedication to our national parks.

Correspondence ID: 9873Project:112008Document:132104
Address: omak, WA 98841
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 18:19:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Game Dep needs to be responsible for any future damage to livestock or even human lives if they bring this kind of animals back here!! 🙄🙄🙄

Correspondence ID: 9895Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Beaverton, OR 97003
United States of America
Outside Organization: Dominic Aiello Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 18:29:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am opposed to grizzly bear reintroduction. Grizzly bear populations must be kept tightly controlled. They pose a significant risk to rural residents, livestock, hunters and anglers.

Correspondence ID: 9900Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Othello, WA 99344
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 18:30:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I strongly disagree with releasing grizzly bears into the North Cascades! Where is our common sense? Ridiculous!

Correspondence ID: 9902Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Greenville, RI 02828
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 18:31:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Save all the bears!!

Correspondence ID: 9929Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Renton, WA 98058
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 18:40:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To Whom it May Concern:

I am writing in support of the North Cascades Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan, Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act 10(j) Designation. As an avid hiker, climber, and backpacker, I am well aware of the risks involved with the reintroduction of grizzlies into the park, but believe the benefits far outweigh those risks.

Grizzly bears once roamed the entire west coast, including the Pacific Northwest, until they were hunted & their habitat fragmented to near extinction in the region. We should do what we can to bring the bears, and their positive contributions to the ecosystem, back to the Pacific Northwest.

North Cascades is the perfect location to try this plan. Please implement Alternative C.

Thank you,

██████████
██████████
Renton, WA 98058

Correspondence ID: 9930Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Puyallup, WA 98375
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 18:41:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzlies don't adhere to arbitrary borders. We have grizzlies in Washington. They come down from Canada and over from Idaho. Washington is already reducing predator management opportunities in this state while at the same time introducing more predators. It makes no sense. The ungulate populations will be decimated. Let us also note the increase of negative grizzly-human interactions in other states that are significantly less populated. I do not see this as a benefit to our state or our ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 9940Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ruston, WA 98407
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 18:43:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support this plan. Grizzlies belong in the North Cascades and are an important part of our ecosystem. I like that this plan is a good compromise between landowners and conservationists. I hike and enjoy many parts of the state and believe this is an appropriate move forward.

Correspondence ID: 9957Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seahurst, WA 98062
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 18:51:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We are writing to support the restoration the grizzly bears to the North Cascades ecosystem.
Michael and Carlyn Roedell

Correspondence ID: 9961Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Monte Sereno, CA 95030
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 18:51:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support grizzly bear reintroduction and anything we can do to save bears, wolves, mountain lions and other top predators from people and hunting and habitat loss.

Correspondence ID: 9970Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Poulsbo, WA 98370
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 18:53:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Are you OUT OF YOUR MINDS??? Have you ever been terrorized by a brown bear? I have. You city-activists have no idea what you are promoting. I hope you end up being confronted by one of these wild animals that DO NOT BELONG in civilized states like Washington. Wise-up..

Correspondence ID: 9974Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Stehekin, WA 98852
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 18:55:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Stehekin, Wa resident here using a pseudonym for reasons anyone who knows Stehekin would understand many in my community would seek to make my life here more difficult if they became aware of my support of this. As a tax paying, property owning, contributing citizen of the north cascades, I FULLY SUPPORT all efforts to reintroduce the grizzly bear to its historic range here in the north cascades. I am 100% onboard with this effort. I think it is a great idea and about time. As it stands right now, the north cascades ecosystem is in many ways degraded from nearly 200 years of resource exploitation, and a frontier/livestock herding mentality that persists to this day in many areas including here in Stehekin among some of the residents. NPS and the department of fish and wildlife must not be once again bowed by this minority of voices who only seek to enrich themselves and their own out of date ideas at the expense of a fully functioning ecosystem for the greater public at large. While I think some of the concerns of those who oppose this effort can be addressed I truly feel it is important that this effort to undertake the reintroduction of the grizzly be continued forward. Just know that in the small community of Stehekin there are many including myself who support this effort. Thank you for your time, yours truly, Anonymous

Correspondence ID: 9977Project:112008Document:132104
Address: White Salmon, WA 98672
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 18:57:19
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I have reviewed the management options for the re-introduction of the grizzly bear into the North Cascades Ecosystem. I support the Alternative C management option because of its inclusion of additional tools for management.

Thank you,
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 9990Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spanaway, WA 98387
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 19:04:15

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please introduce grizzlies back to Washington. People need to learn to live with wildlife. They were here way before we were and deserve their land back. Humans have destroyed their habitat and we need to amend that. We need to live with them and they deserve to live

Correspondence ID: 10001Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 19:13:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The majestic Grizzly Bears are an integral part of the ecosystem in the Northwest, and it's vital that we provide them with a chance to return home and thrive. As a nature enthusiast, I understand the importance of expanding our conservation efforts. By doing so, we can have a significant impact on our biodiversity and fulfill our responsibility to coexist harmoniously with wildlife. I join many others in advocating for the safe and responsible return of Grizzly Bears to their natural habitat. Please return them to the North Cascades and expand their range of land access.

Correspondence ID: 10029Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Renton, WA 98058
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 19:31:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: With climate change, will we have any expectations of more occurrences of what happened to that experienced and well prepared couple from Banff? They did everything right, sat phone, bear spray, all food up tree far away etc, and were still attacked due to the late spring frost affecting the available food supply, combined with desperation to fatten up for hibernation. I could not imagine what their family and friends must be going through with the circumstances of their death.

I would like more information on what animal behaviorists found of that situation, which i know is rare but could it become less rare? Will hiking with young children still be okay?

Correspondence ID: 10036Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Port Townsend, WA 98368
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 19:35:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello,

I am writing to support a plan to have grizzly bears in the North Cascades under an "experimental population" designation. This would allow federal agencies, conservation organizations, tribal people, and the general public to observe and monitor the movement and propagation patterns of the grizzlies and to ensure that conservation goals are being met in a scientifically sustainable manner.

Thank you for listening.

Correspondence ID: 10037Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98502
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 19:35:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Where Grizzly bears are in their native habitat presently, the human population is small compared to western WA. Think about the number of hikers that roam the Cascades. 11.4 attacks per year will increase, I believe by at least three per year when the population reaches the 200 bear's mentioned. Spreading of seed etc is accomplished well by birds and black bears. Mr Long has given no reason for reintroduction. This is nothing but an attempt to make certain people feel good about themselves. As for indigenous people living with Grizzlies for 10,000 years, it's possibly longer than that, but there are no records to show how many bear attacks there were, is there? So no way of knowing how many humans were attacked.

This a bad idea.

Correspondence ID: 10044Project:112008Document:132104

Address: San Anselmo, CA 94960
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 19:39:58

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live in and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

Furthermore, the 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Thank you for taking the time to keep our North Cascades wild!

The North Cascades Grizzly Bear Recovery Zone (NCGBRZ) is the second largest of six such designated areas at nearly 10,000 square miles. Combined with contiguous protected areas in British Columbia, including Manning Park, there are 14,000 square miles of productive, wild habitats, wilderness, and roadless areas.

People and grizzly bears can coexist and thrive. They do so in British Columbia, Montana, and Wyoming where grizzly populations and back and front country recreation continue to grow hand in hand, providing a vital economic boost to those areas' gateway communities.

Grizzly bears lived in Washington for thousands of years. We still have a small population in the NE WA Selkirk Mountains. However, currently, there are no grizzly populations in the United States or Canada that are large enough or close enough to serve as a source to naturally repopulate the North Cascades.

Having wiped out the grizzly bear over the past 150 years we now have the unique opportunity and the ethical obligation to restore them to their native home, where suitable habitats still exist.

Grizzly bears are ecologically and culturally significant and are vital to the overall health of the North Cascades ecosystem

and its biodiversity. They are considered an indicator of ecosystem health.

Restoring grizzly bears as an "Experimental, non-essential" population under a well-crafted Section 10(j) rule of the Endangered Species Act makes sense. Such a designation will provide flexibility for wildlife managers to prevent and address human-bear conflict and a greater level of comfort for people who are concerned about the impacts of wildlife recovery on economic and recreation activities. Agencies have used the Section 10(j) Rule in the past to restore black-footed ferrets, California condors, wood bison, and many others.

Correspondence ID: 10045Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Colville, WA 99114
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 19:40:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live in and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

Furthermore, the 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Thank you for taking the time to keep our North Cascades wild!

Correspondence ID: 10046Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Federal Way, WA 98003
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 19:40:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support restoring the Grizzly Bear to the North Cascades Ecosystem in Washington. Looks like more than 30 years have passed since a plan has been attempted. I hope this year doesn't end in failure. The alternative C which allows for more flexible management seems to be a workable option for easily moving bears from one area to the next should problems arise. However, I am hoping that being an endangered species in Washington will prevent them from being hunted which was the cause of their extinction in the area. I have hiked in British Columbia and seen grizzlies and cubs also moving about. We were within eyesight, but the bears did not change their directions to pursue and I expect in most cases that would be true. I think both bears and humans can enjoy life in the North Cascades. I am hoping that the new EIS will be completed without delay and action will be taken to bring Grizzly Bears back! Thank you for your consideration!

Correspondence ID: 10062Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Covington,wa, WA 98042-4986
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 19:44:56

Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Alternative C is best solution-Bears need all the protection they can get!

Correspondence ID: 10068Project:112008Document:132104
Address: CARNATION, WA 98014
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 19:46:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: NOT in favor. Poorly planned, with lots of opportunities for conflict.

Correspondence ID: 10089Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Enumclaw, WA 98022
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 19:55:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the option that grants reintroduced grizzly bears with full Endangered Species Act protections (Alternative B). Jim Holyan

Correspondence ID: 10094Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Trout Creek, MT 59874
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 19:56:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I strongly support the National Park Services preferred Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation.

This plan will both effectively restore grizzly bears in North Cascades National Park and give people the tools they need to thrive in and around grizzly bear country. Grizzlies belong in the North Cascades, as they enhance the park's ecological integrity and contribute to its wildness.

Grizzly bears play a vital role in maintaining ecosystem balance, cycling nutrients, dispersing seeds, and changing the behavior of species around them. Restoring them would benefit the park and the people who use it.

Alternative C, with the 10(j) rule, provides managers flexibility to address community concerns while protecting the grizzly population. It ensures coexistence between humans and bears.

Please consider the positive ecological and economic benefits and support Alternative C. Restoring grizzly bears will secure the park's natural heritage and conserve an iconic species for current and future generations.

Thank you for your dedication to our national parks.

Correspondence ID: 10110Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Pasco, WA 99301
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 20:03:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Absolutely no Grizzlies in the State of Washington!

Correspondence ID: 10128Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bonney Lake, WA 98391
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 20:11:10

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am not in favor of having grizzlies reintroduced into Washington State. We are having quite enough trouble with the wolves as it is. My husband is a hunter and the wolves have decimated the population of game. Could grizzlies not be introduced in another state that isn't already dealing with a prior reintroduction? I certainly would not feel comfortable hiking any longer if they were a reintroduced into our state. I beg you reconsider. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 10133Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Benton City, WA 99320
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 20:12:24

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Bringing grizzly bears to Washington state is abhorrent to me. This dangerous predator is bad for the safety of people and cattle as well as other animals. It is a very great concern to me that our government is insistent on putting our lives in danger in this way.

Correspondence ID: 10135Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tallahassee, FL 32310
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 20:12:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Job 12:7-10 GNT

[7] Even birds and animals have much they could teach you; [8] ask the creatures of earth and sea for their wisdom. [9] All of them know that the Lord's hand made them. [10] It is God who directs the lives of his creatures; everyone's life is in his power.

I strongly support the National Park Services preferred Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation.

This plan will both effectively restore grizzly bears in North Cascades National Park and give people the tools they need to thrive in and around grizzly bear country. Grizzlies belong in the North Cascades, as they enhance the park's ecological integrity and contribute to its wildness.

Grizzly bears play a vital role in maintaining ecosystem balance, cycling nutrients, dispersing seeds, and changing the behavior of species around them. Restoring them would benefit the park and the people who use it.

A restored population of grizzlies will boost the park's appeal and attract nature enthusiasts, scientists, and tourists from around the world. This would provide economic benefits to local communities and support the park's mission to protect park resources in perpetuity.

Alternative C, with the 10(j) rule, provides managers flexibility to address community concerns while protecting the grizzly population. It ensures coexistence between humans and bears.

Please consider the positive ecological and economic benefits and support Alternative C. Restoring grizzly bears will secure the park's natural heritage and conserve an iconic species for current and future generations.

Thank you for your dedication to our national parks.

Correspondence ID: 10159Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Omaha, NE 68102-5073
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 20:26:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I write to comment on the draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) that evaluates options for returning grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem in Washington. I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and wilderness. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection. Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive. For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed. The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration of my views.

Correspondence ID: 10171Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lexington, KY 40502
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 20:33:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The no action alternative is best,ensuring minimal handling of grizzlies. Wildlife corridors are of paramount importance as well

Correspondence ID: 10183Project:112008Document:132104

Address: North Platte, NE 69101
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 20:41:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: 1. The American Bear Foundation of Washington has always championed the well-being of bears. However, we firmly oppose the reintroduction of grizzly bears into the North Cascades. It's evident that grizzlies are already finding their way into the region, with recent incidents like the young grizzly in Stevens County. We believe in natural migration and proper management. The existing challenges with the black bear, cougar, and wolf populations in Washington highlight the need to avoid adding more pressure on our wildlife.

2. As someone who frequently hikes, the thought of an increased grizzly bear population in the North Cascades is concerning. Observing the events in places like Montana and Idaho, it's clear that more bears can lead to more dangers. Grizzlies have every opportunity to migrate from BC or Idaho without human intervention. I urge you to let nature dictate its path.

3. The North Cascades have always been a haven for outdoor enthusiasts like me. It's come to my attention that grizzly bears already exist in this range, as noted by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. Introducing more would not only threaten the fragile mule deer population but also increase the risk for those of us who love the outdoors. I'm against any plans to reintroduce grizzlies in Washington.

4. The recent incident in Stevens County, where a grizzly bear was captured, is a testament to the growing predator challenges in Washington. Our state is already grappling with managing wolves, cougars, black bears, and more. Considering the strain on our ungulate populations, I cannot support the idea of reintroducing grizzlies into the state.

5. I felt compelled to voice my concerns about the potential reintroduction of grizzly bears in Washington. It's undeniable that grizzlies are already making their way into the state from neighboring regions. The absence of physical barriers means they can migrate naturally. Given the state's challenges in managing its existing wildlife, introducing another apex predator seems counterproductive.

6. The American Bear Foundation of Washington has always been at the forefront of advocating for bear welfare. Yet, we cannot support the reintroduction of the grizzly bear. The state already hosts this formidable predator. With the challenges the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife faces in managing the rising numbers of black bear, cougar, and wolves, introducing a larger and more aggressive predator seems like a step in the wrong direction.

7. As a regular visitor to the North Cascades, the potential increase in grizzly bear population is alarming. The incidents in states like Wyoming serve as a cautionary tale. With no barriers preventing grizzlies from migrating from places like BC, it's best to let nature take its course.

8. The beauty of the North Cascades has always drawn me in. However, the knowledge that grizzly bears are already present, as confirmed by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, makes me apprehensive. Introducing more would jeopardize not only the mule deer but also the safety of countless individuals. I'm firmly against the reintroduction proposal.

9. The recent capture of a grizzly bear in Stevens County underscores the challenges Washington faces with its predator populations. With the existing issues surrounding wolves, black bears, and cougars, it seems imprudent to consider adding grizzlies to the mix. I strongly advise against this reintroduction.

10. The presence of grizzly bears migrating into Washington from places like BC and Idaho is undeniable. Without any physical barriers, they can naturally inhabit the state. Given the difficulties in managing the current wildlife populations, I believe it's in the best interest to refrain from reintroducing more apex predators.

11. The American Bear Foundation of Washington is unequivocal in its position: reintroducing the grizzly bear is not in the best interest of the state. The challenges posed by the increasing numbers of black bear, cougar, and wolves are evident.

Introducing a predator of the grizzly's stature would exacerbate these challenges, putting both humans and wildlife at risk.

12. The American Bear Foundation of Washington wishes to express its reservations about reintroducing grizzly bears to the North Cascades. Recent events, such as the grizzly incident in Stevens County, highlight the existing challenges. We advocate for natural migration and believe that the current pressures on our wildlife, especially ungulates, make this reintroduction inadvisable.

13. As a frequent visitor to the North Cascades, the idea of more grizzly bears is concerning. The experiences of states like Montana and Idaho serve as a warning. Grizzlies can naturally migrate from neighboring regions, so I believe we should let nature take its course.

14. The North Cascades offer a unique experience for outdoor lovers. However, the presence of grizzly bears, as confirmed by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, poses a threat. Introducing more bears could harm the mule deer population and increase risks for visitors. I'm against this reintroduction.

15. The recent grizzly bear incident in Stevens County is a clear indication of the challenges we face with predators in Washington. Our state is already stretched thin managing various predators. Given the pressures on our ungulate populations, reintroducing grizzlies seems unwise.

16. I'm writing to express my concerns about reintroducing grizzly bears in Washington. Their natural migration from regions like BC and Idaho is evident. With the state's current wildlife management challenges, adding another apex predator seems ill-advised.

17. The American Bear Foundation of Washington believes that reintroducing the grizzly bear is not in the state's best interest. The challenges posed by the rising numbers of other predators are evident. Introducing grizzlies would only add to these challenges, endangering both humans and wildlife.

18. The North Cascades are a haven for many, but the potential reintroduction of grizzly bears raises safety concerns. The incidents in states like Wyoming are a testament to the risks. Grizzlies can naturally migrate from nearby regions, so human intervention seems unnecessary.

19. The North Cascades are a sanctuary for many outdoor activities. However, the existing grizzly bear population, as noted by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, is already a concern. Adding more bears could jeopardize the mule deer and increase risks for visitors. I oppose this move.

20. The grizzly bear situation in Stevens County highlights the predator challenges in Washington. With the existing predator population and the pressures on our ungulate herds, reintroducing grizzlies seems counterproductive.

21. I wish to voice my concerns about the potential reintroduction of grizzly bears in Washington. Their presence, migrating from regions like BC and Idaho, is already noticeable. Given the state's wildlife management challenges, reintroducing more apex predators is concerning.

22. The American Bear Foundation of Washington is clear in its position: reintroducing the grizzly bear poses significant challenges. The state's current predator management issues are evident. Introducing grizzlies would exacerbate these issues, putting both humans and wildlife at risk.

23. The potential reintroduction of grizzly bears in the North Cascades is alarming for many of us who frequent the area. The experiences of states like Montana serve as a cautionary tale. Grizzlies have every opportunity to migrate naturally, so human intervention seems unwarranted.

24. The North Cascades are a favorite for many outdoor enthusiasts. However, the presence of grizzly bears, as confirmed by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, is concerning. Introducing more bears could harm the mule deer population and increase risks for visitors. I'm against this proposal.

25. The recent grizzly bear capture in Stevens County underscores the challenges we face with predators in Washington. Our state is already dealing with various predators. Given the pressures on our ungulate populations, reintroducing grizzlies seems ill-advised.

26. I'm writing to express my reservations about reintroducing grizzly bears in Washington. Their natural migration from regions like BC and Idaho is evident. With the state's current wildlife management challenges, adding another apex predator seems ill-advised.

27. The American Bear Foundation of Washington believes that reintroducing the grizzly bear is not in the state's best interest. The challenges posed by the rising numbers of other predators are evident. Introducing grizzlies would only add to these challenges, endangering both humans and wildlife.

28. The North Cascades are a haven for many, but the potential reintroduction of grizzly bears raises safety concerns. The incidents in states like Wyoming are a testament to the risks. Grizzlies can naturally migrate from nearby regions, so human intervention seems unnecessary.

29. The North Cascades are a sanctuary for many outdoor activities. However, the existing grizzly bear population, as noted by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, is already a concern. Adding more bears could jeopardize the mule deer and increase risks for visitors. I oppose this move.

30. The grizzly bear situation in Stevens County highlights the predator challenges in Washington. With the existing predator population and the pressures on our ungulate herds, reintroducing grizzlies seems counterproductive.

31. I wish to voice my concerns about the potential reintroduction of grizzly bears in Washington. Their presence, migrating from regions like BC and Idaho, is already noticeable. Given the state's wildlife management challenges, reintroducing more apex predators is concerning.

32. The American Bear Foundation of Washington is clear in its position: reintroducing the grizzly bear poses significant challenges. The state's current predator management issues are evident. Introducing grizzlies would exacerbate these issues, putting both humans and wildlife at risk.

33. The potential reintroduction of grizzly bears in the North Cascades is alarming for many of us who frequent the area. The experiences of states like Montana serve as a cautionary tale. Grizzlies have every opportunity to migrate naturally, so human intervention seems unwarranted.

34. The North Cascades are a favorite for many outdoor enthusiasts. However, the presence of grizzly bears, as confirmed by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, is concerning. Introducing more bears could harm the mule deer population and increase risks for visitors. I'm against this proposal.

35. The recent grizzly bear capture in Stevens County underscores the challenges we face with predators in Washington. Our state is already dealing with various predators. Given the pressures on our ungulate populations, reintroducing grizzlies seems ill-advised.

Correspondence ID: 10187Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sacramento, CA 95864
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 20:44:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Striker and Supervisor Thompson,

I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears in the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years. I am a frequent visitor to this area and have hiked the trails of the North Cascades for the last 40 years.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. As you are aware, the plan is modeled on what has worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

The 10(j) rule will provide important management tools to reduce, prevent, and sometimes respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to this part of their historic range.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to Washington State through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of a key western ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Thank you for leadership on this important issue and for your consideration of my views.

Correspondence ID: 10198Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Port Townsend, WA 98368
United States of America

Outside Organization: [REDACTED] Unaffiliated Individual(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,04 2023 20:52:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My family and I (four tax-paying and voting residents of Washington State have previously lived for many years in the "grizzly country" of northwest Montana. We support restoration of a healthy grizzly bear population in the North Cascades. We note that grizzlies lived there for thousands of years before they were exterminated by colonizing settlers. And we know that grizzly bear country also has clean water, abundant native fish, and many other healthy wildlife populations. Bears are keystone species!

We have first-hand knowledge that people and grizzly bears can coexist and thrive. We know they do so in British Columbia, Montana, and Wyoming, where grizzly populations and back country recreation continue to grow, providing vital economic benefit to adjacent, local communities.

We are heartened to learn that public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, which includes many who live in the North Cascades.

We support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. We agree that Alternative C is the best choice for bears and people who live in and visit their North Cascades Ecosystem. This plan wisely echoes what's worked in Montana, where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak Mountains. Restoration there has proceeded with few problems, and active educational programs have increased acceptance and supportive involvement of local people and communities.

We think it wise that the 10(j) rule will give more management tools to reduce, prevent, and respond to human-bear conflict. If properly implemented, the 10(j) rule should increase peoples' acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Please bring back this important native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore a vital piece of this ecosystem, our regional cultures, and natural heritage.

Thank you for working to restore ecosystem balance and keeping the North Cascades wild!

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 10212Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Okanogan, WA 98840
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 20:58:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We have already ruined the bears chance to survive. Our communities and lives have moved on. We had the chance to preserve the bears and blew it. Why reintroduce an old concept to the modernized cascades? Even Harts pass has become a tourist mob... do you really expect adding bears to the overwhelming mobs a good thing? I am against this! The time and effort would be better spent managing the already overwhelming crowds and destruction to what little ruggedness remains.

Correspondence ID: 10214Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Renton, WA 98058
United States of America
Outside Organization: NRA Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 21:00:47
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I like to deer hunt in the north cascades Do not want to die in my tent killed by a grizzly thanks but no thanks.My grandson feels the same way. There are a lot of people who aren't afraid of grizzle bears and some of those folks are not with us anymore. Alaska is a better place for grizzly bears. Thanks for hearing me out Dewey 80 years old.

Correspondence ID: 10215Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Basalt, CO 81621
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 21:01:19
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies in the North Cascades, but please do in a manner that is consistent to the wilderness act. No motors are allowed in the Wilderness, including helicopters. Please let grizzlies migrate into the Cascades. Do not remove grizzlies that are not recovered from other locations such as Montana.

Correspondence ID: 10223Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Everett, WA 98203
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 21:07:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: While I support preserving our species, grizzly bears will cause tremendous damage to life and property. I am strongly opposed to having them reintroduced to the North Cascades. There are countless hikers who will be injured/die, along with issues with families who live in areas where they might show up. This is a terrible idea. Please no.

Correspondence ID: 10225Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Snohomish, WA 98290
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 21:09:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: While I understand and appreciate the desire to restore the grizzlies to their natural habitat for ecological reasons, I find the second listed objective ("Provide Pacific Northwest residents and visitors with the opportunity to again experience grizzly bears in their native habitat.") to be quite puzzling. As an avid hiker, experiencing a grizzly in their native habitat is, frankly, terrifying. I recognize that this was originally their native habitat and we have pushed them

out, but I'm truly concerned about the impact it will have on outdoor recreation in the area. Even when hiking in established bear country (such as in Banff) it's surprising how many people are ill-prepared for a potential grizzly encounter, and I fear for the potential repercussions of unknowing hikers encountering them in Washington state. There's already enough groan-inducing headlines of tourists in other national parks.. So, I'm voicing my opinion and desire that grizzlies are not reintroduced into the area.

Correspondence ID: 10236Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sacramento, CA 95827
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 21:14:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness. I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection. Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest. A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

Correspondence ID: 10254Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sedro Woolley, WA 98284
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 21:25:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: DO NOT re-introduce grizzly bears to the N. Cascades. This ecosystem cannot support more grizzlies. Grizzlies can already access this area from Montana, Idaho and Canada. If "the ecosystem" could provide everything the bears need, there would already be a viable population. And there isn't. If you bring more bears into the ecosystem, they're going to go elsewhere for their needs. Farms, back yards, ranches. There's a lot of private property in the N. Cascades ecosystem. All the people making this proposal live elsewhere. You need to consider the rights and needs of the people who live there. They're already supporting the Washington Fish and Wildlife's elk. They shouldn't have to support grizzlies too. Any grizzly-human encounter is not going to go so well for the human. I SAY NO TO RE-INTRODUCING GRIZZLIES TO THE N. CASCADES ECOSYSTEM.

Correspondence ID: 10258Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Snohomish, WA 98290
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 21:27:03

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As an avid hiker and a person who usually hikes with a dog I am against the reintroduction. I understand the ecological size of things, such as how the reintroduction of wolves some places helped with population controls and

revitalized the rivers, but I haven't seen much in terms of concrete examples of how grizzlies are a keystone species in ways that back bears, mountain lions, coyotes, and wolves don't already fill. Grizzlies primary spring food source being meat is concerning. I know they live plenty of places without much negative interaction with humans. As an area with so much front and back country recreation I just don't think it is advisable.

Correspondence ID: 10261Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Marietta, GA 30008
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 21:28:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: • I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

- I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.
- A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.
- For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.
- The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 10265Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olga, WA 98279
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 21:30:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Bring back the bears! They should never have been extirpated in the first place. And honestly, one is more likely to be killed in a mass shooting than mauled by a grizzly. At least hikers can take precautions against bears, so the concern about endangering humans is misplaced and overblown.

Correspondence ID: 10274Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellevue, WA 98007
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 21:38:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly are native to the area and it is wilderness. They should be brought back. It seems that the plan of action is very slow.

Correspondence ID: 10289Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spanaway, WA 98387
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 21:53:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My vote is NO to Grizzlies in Washington State. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 10292Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Sammamish, WA 98074
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 21:53:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We should restore bears and continue monitoring human, bear conflict rather than not doing. In the current technology it should be easy to track and monitor the movements of the bears. Grizzlies belong here in this area.

Correspondence ID: 10296Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Edmonds, WA 98020
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 21:58:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Thank you for the opportunity to comment. For the record, I am OPPOSED to the introduction of grizzly bears into the North Cascades under any conditions.

There are already too many hikers and backpackers in the back country. Adding grizzly bears to the mix is just inviting conflict, injury, and death to people - and bears.

To naively believe that "berry eating bears" won't eventually discover salmon to eat is folly. Bears are omnivores and opportunistic - they will eat whatever is easily available and nutritious for them. With such a keen sense of smell it should not take them long to discover salmon!

I like fishing the high lakes. I do this for the invigorating hike and the satisfaction of catching trout on my own hand-tied flies. I don't want to have to be constantly on guard, looking over my shoulder, for a grizzly bear.

While it is easy to romanticize the arrival of grizzly bears roaming free and wild in the North Cascades by viewing NPS pictures of mama bear and cub from the comfort of one's living room, equal time should also be given to those unsuspecting folks who have been maimed or killed by a provoked grizzly. We never see those photos, yet those photos would depict the unfortunate reality of human-bear encounters.

When I hike thru wilderness areas, there is enough "wild" for me as provided by wolves, goats, black bears, cougars, elk, deer, marmots, pikas, and all the rest. I don't need grizzly bears to feel the "wild".

While I suspect that the decision to introduce grizzlies into the North Cascades has already been made, and that allowing a comment period, though a required step of the process, is likely a futile attempt to push back on that decision, again I firmly say NO to grizzly bear introduction to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 10308Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Sammamish, WA 98074
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 22:15:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife

populations.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live in and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

Furthermore, the 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Thank you for taking the time to keep our North Cascades wild!

Correspondence ID: 10321Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Red Bank, NJ 07701
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 22:26:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please move forward with this plan to re-introduce grizzlies into the North Cascades, and provide them the protection they need to thrive.

Correspondence ID: 10324Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Graham, WA 98338
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 22:28:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My husband is a Forestry Technician for a private company that works alone in the woods regularly. "Reintroducing" grizzly bears present a horrendous level of danger to anyone previously safe in our portion of the beautiful PNW.

This is absolutely unwise and unsafe. You will be putting many hikers, campers, workers including my husband, in very real and unnecessary danger.

Please do not do this. Please to not make me even more worried for his safety than I already am.

Correspondence ID: 10332Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Garwood, NJ 07027
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 22:32:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I strongly support the National Park Services preferred Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation. It's only because our American ancestors hunted grizzly bears almost to extinction that we even have to debate this reintroduction. Let Grizzly Bears return, and this time let's try to remember that grizzlies are an integral part of the forest ecosystem, and let's let them LIVE!!!

This plan will both effectively restore grizzly bears in North Cascades National Park and give people the tools they need to thrive in and around grizzly bear country. Grizzlies belong in the North Cascades, as they enhance the park's ecological integrity and contribute to its wildness.

Grizzly bears play a vital role in maintaining ecosystem balance, cycling nutrients, dispersing seeds, and changing the behavior of species around them. Restoring them would benefit the park and the people who use it.

A restored population of grizzlies will boost the park's appeal and attract nature enthusiasts, scientists, and tourists from around the world. This would provide economic benefits to local communities and support the park's mission to protect park resources in perpetuity.

Alternative C, with the 10(j) rule, provides managers flexibility to address community concerns while protecting the grizzly population. It ensures coexistence between humans and bears.

Please consider the positive ecological and economic benefits and support Alternative C. Restoring grizzly bears will secure the park's natural heritage and conserve an iconic species for current and future generations.

Thank you for your dedication to our national parks.

Correspondence ID: 10346Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellevue, WA 98004
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 22:45:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To Whom it May Concern,

I am writing to express my deep concern regarding the plans to reintroduce grizzly bears into the North Cascades ecosystem in Washington State. As a resident and an avid outdoor enthusiast, I understand and value the importance of biodiversity and the restoration of natural habitats. However, I am troubled by the potential risks this reintroduction poses to the safety of the public.

I acknowledge that grizzly bears are a part of our nation's wildlife heritage and that their presence can be a symbol of a healthy and balanced ecosystem. Nevertheless, they are aggressive and dangerous predators. This year alone, four Montana state residents were killed by grizzly bears and I feel that reintroducing these bears to Washington state -- a more densely populated state -- will result in human fatalities. It is imperative that we learn from these annual fatalities to ensure the utmost safety of those who visit and enjoy our wildlife areas.

The reintroduction of a top predator like the grizzly bear is a decision with significant implications. There will eventually be families who will lose their loved ones because of this action. These inevitable future victims will not remain nameless. Knowing this, how can anyone with good conscience willfully choose to reintroduce such a predator? Who will be held accountable for those unnecessary deaths? Most importantly, how should the local residents feel about the willful introduction of a mortal hazard on behalf of the Federal Government?

We are stewards of our nations wildlife on behalf of future generations but we are also obligated to establish and maintain a safe environment for those future Americans as well. Bears often eat people.

Sincerely,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 10350Project:112008Document:132104
Address: La Conner, WA 98257
United States of America

Outside Organization: - None - Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,04 2023 22:48:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I could not be more opposed to the reintroduction of grizzlies to the North Cascades. It is a horrible idea to have grizzly bears roaming the North Cascades again. These are not the mountains of 100 years ago when grizzlies were here. Unlike WY, MT, and ID, the people and communities inhabiting the North Cascade range are unaccustomed to grizzlies. The human residents of this habitat came here knowing that there were no grizzlies. And we neither want nor need grizzlies back in this area. Encounters between bears and humans will be inevitable. The negatives of having grizzlies back in the Cascades far outweigh the few, if any, benefits to the ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 10353Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Darrington, WA 98241
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 22:51:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My wife and I are retired with a 2nd home in Darrington. We are for gradual restoration of grizzlies in the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 10360Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Anacortes, WA 98221
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 22:57:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in favor of allowing the grizzly bears to return to the Cascades. I believe that Alternative C with Section 10(j) designation is the proper choice. These bears belong here and I truly believe we can co-exist with the correct management. I understand that the plan is wisely modeled on what is already a working plan in Montana where there have been few problems. Please bring the bears back to their native land. Thank you for allowing me to comment.

Correspondence ID: 10374Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Everett, WA 98201
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023 23:12:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I vote no on reintroducing grizzly bears into Washington and the North Cascades. If they happen into our state again naturally, fine. But I'm against shipping them into the state. I prefer to have our wilderness scenic rather than inhabited by alpha predators. And I'd rather not have to hike armed.

Correspondence ID: 10417Project:112008Document:132104

Address: San Antonio,, TX 78209
United States of America

Outside Organization: Terra Advocati Unaffiliated Individual(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,05 2023

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live in and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

Furthermore, the 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Thank you for taking the time to keep our North Cascades wild!

Correspondence ID: 10447Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Goldendale, WA 98620
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a long-time resident of Klickitat County, I want to register my vote
.....AGAINST having Grizzly Bears being released into our County,
or anywhere within 1,000 miles of Klickitat County.

IMHO, who ever thought up this plan, is either seriously uneducated, naive, or flatly... insane.

Grizzlies are notorious for considering everything and everyone they see, as being their dinner. They're also notorious for being aggressive and they hold no fear of anything in their path. They know, that they are at the top of the predator chain.

At present, there are plenty of predators... already residing within the confines of Klickitat County. These aggressive predators are, coyotes, cougars, and Bald Eagles. Each species is quite capable of taking down... children, pets, and livestock of all sizes.

Grizzlies not only can take down... children, pets and livestock of all sizes, but they're well known for being able to tear apart buildings, out of both simple curiosity, as well as looking for food.

No one is safe, in the path of even one Grizzly, and in a group (mother & cubs), that danger escalates...exponentially!!

Correspondence ID: 10483Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Olympia, WA 98502
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 01:25:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please pass Alternative C.
We need grizzlies back in the ecosystem. Alternative C provides for ecosystem balance and safety.

Thank you!

Correspondence ID: 10516Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Redmond, WA 98052
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 02:18:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am strongly in favor restoring grizzlies to the north Cascades. This restoration must be done by means that are compatible with the terms of the Wilderness Act and are in keeping with its wild character. Unfortunately, both of the action alternatives as presented would violate the Wilderness Act. Specifically, an alternative must be developed that avoids helicopter landings in and flights over Wilderness. Instead, bears can be released from any of the many roads that crisscross the recovery area or terminate at the edge of the Wilderness. I also oppose the placement and use of telemetry installations, and any management strategy for the bears that calls for trapping, sedating, or otherwise molesting the bears once released. Additionally, I strongly oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration plan, as this would entail taking grizzlies currently fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana and dropping them into the north Cascades, where they would lose their previous protection. Moreover, it is not as though Montana has grizzlies to spare to relocation. Grizzlies in Montana have not yet recovered under the Endangered Species Act, and any grizzlies dispersing from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

It is thus imperative that a natural recovery alternative be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. Information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding likely natural migration of bears from Canada suggests that much of the current apparent urgency for repopulation may be more about protecting agency discretion than about protecting Wilderness or creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

Furthermore, natural recovery measures must be included in whatever plan is implemented so as to reduce the reliance upon activities that would degrade the environment for grizzlies and other species. This needs to include a partnership with British Columbia to create corridors for bears to travel across the border in search of food and mates, to prevent genetic stagnation and inbreeding.

Finally, the no-action alternative has many good provisions covering how people and communities can coexist with grizzlies, and these measures must be included in whatever action is implemented. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park. It is incumbent upon agencies to anticipate possible points and means of interaction, and to protect both humans and bears, and to ensure that no situation ever reach the point that lethal means be used to resolve a conflict with a bear.

Correspondence ID: 10520Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Horsham, PA 19044
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 02:30:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To Whom It May Concern:

Please restore grizzlies to the North Cascades, and do so in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act or harm the area's wild nature.

The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and heavy-handed management of bears.

Please ban relocating grizzlies out-of-state, as this may void their ESA protections.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed. This may require work with British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears.

Thank you for your consideration on this matter.

Correspondence ID: 10525Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Maple Valley, WA 98048
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 02:44:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Alternative A - no action!! Do not bring more grizzlies here. It's an obvious safety concern. I don't know why this even up for debate again.

Correspondence ID: 10532Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bangor, ME 04401
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 03:10:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live in and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

Furthermore, the 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

The North Cascades Grizzly Bear Recovery Zone (NCGBRZ) is the second largest of six such designated areas at nearly 10,000 square miles. Combined with contiguous protected areas in British Columbia, including Manning Park, there are 14,000 square miles of productive, wild habitats, wilderness, and roadless areas.

People and grizzly bears can coexist and thrive. They do so in British Columbia, Montana, and Wyoming where grizzly populations and back and front country recreation continue to grow hand in hand, providing a vital economic boost to those areas' gateway communities.

Grizzly bears lived in Washington for thousands of years. We still have a small population in the NE WA Selkirk Mountains. However, currently, there are no grizzly populations in the United States or Canada that are large enough or close enough to serve as a source to naturally repopulate the North Cascades.

Having wiped out the grizzly bear over the past 150 years we now have the unique opportunity and the ethical obligation to restore them to their native home, where suitable habitats still exist.

Grizzly bears are ecologically and culturally significant and are vital to the overall health of the North Cascades ecosystem and its biodiversity. They are considered an indicator of ecosystem health.

Restoring grizzly bears as an "Experimental, non-essential" population under a well-crafted Section 10(j) rule of the Endangered Species Act makes sense. Such a designation will provide flexibility for wildlife managers to prevent and address human-bear conflict and a greater level of comfort for people who are concerned about the impacts of wildlife

recovery on economic and recreation activities. Agencies have used the Section 10(j) Rule in the past to restore black-footed ferrets, California condors, wood bison, and many others.

Correspondence ID: 10556Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wyndmoor, PA 19038
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 04:17:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Supporting the National Park Services preferred Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation is imperative. It will effectively restore grizzly bears in our North Cascades National Park and give people the tools necessary to thrive in and around grizzly country. These bears belong in the North Cascades, as they enhance the park's ecological integrity and contribute to its wildness.

Grizzly bears play a vital role in maintaining ecosystem balance, cycling nutrients, dispersing seeds, and changing the behavior of species around them. Restoring them would benefit the park and the people who use it.

A restored population of grizzlies highlights the park's appeal attracting nature enthusiasts, scientists, and tourists around the globe. Economic benefits to our local communities that support the park's mission in protecting park resources in perpetuity is a wonderful outcome as well..

Alternative C, with the 10(j) rule, provides managers flexibility to address community concerns while protecting the grizzly population. It ensures coexistence between humans and bears.

Your consideration of the positive ecological and economic benefits supporting Alternative C. Restoring grizzly bears will secure our park's natural heritage and conserve an essential species for the greater good~ and generations beyond us too.

With appreciation you for your dedication to our national parks.

Correspondence ID: 10564Project:112008Document:132104

Address: dayton, OH 45417
United States of America

Outside Organization: self Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 04:39:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Correspondence ID: 10580Project:112008Document:132104

Address: SEATTLE, WA 98101-5105
United States of America

Outside Organization: - None - Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 05:24:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Strongly support restoring a sustainable population of grizzly bears in the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 10596Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bothell, WA 98011
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 06:16:03

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello! I would love to see the introduction of the grizzly bear into the North Cascades as it is a place where they used to roam. I believe it is also important for government agencies to be able to have more flexibility to be able to help these animals and their dealings with human population.

Correspondence ID: 10599Project:112008Document:132104

Address: moxee, WA 98936
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 06:21:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do NOT want grizzly bears reintroduced to Washington. They cannot be fenced in like cattle to stay in their assigned area. They will roam to find food. There is no natural habitat in Washington. They are a too big apex predator to live in an area where humans and domestic livestock live and move. They need to be in a wilderness area removed from human contact. Keep them out of Washington.

Correspondence ID: 10602Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sequim, WA 98382
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 06:32:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Options for restoring grizzly bears to Washington's North Cascades Ecosystem, where the animals were once abundant and on a proposed rule under section 10(j) of the Endangered Species Act that would provide agencies more flexibility to manage the grizzly bear population in different situations, including bears that may come into conflict with people.

Long experience with this issue has made it clear that such a rule is paramount for the success of active grizzly bear recovery efforts. Alternative C and the proposed 10(j) Rule is our best choice that meets both ecological and social needs.

Correspondence ID: 10605Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Feasterville, PA 19053
United States of America

Outside Organization: Bucks Environmental Action Non-Governmental(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,05 2023 06:40:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: It is with joy that we at BEA can finally submit a comment regarding the long-overdue reintroduction of the grizzly Bear back into the North Cascades ecosystem. This is a premier place to have this happen because 1- it is a huge and mostly undeveloped area teeming with natural resources and 2- because it is a historical area where grizzlies thrived until hunted out.

Although we would dearly like this species to be fully protected under the ESA law, we understand the need for the Alternative denoting the population as " Experimental" is more palatable for more stakeholders. Having flexibility in a situation where a predator such as the grizzly bear is being introduced is frightening to many, and it is possible selecting this alternative would be more facultative of these long term efforts, but especially in the short run.

Research that focused in the overall impacts of restoring a keystone predator species has been clear in its conclusions:

restoration of a predator helps not only stabilize populations of prey animals, but it also has had beneficial consequences on trees, plants and grasses. Hence, our support for another introduction of an animal that might help restore and/or maintain the entire North Cascades system, crucial in light of climate change occurrences.

We thank you for your support of this project .

Correspondence ID: 10623Project:112008Document:132104
Address: LEAVENWORTH, WA 98826
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 07:16:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: NO GRIZZLY BEARS!

So many opportunities to enhance or restore the greater North Cascades Complex yet you choose to commit limited resources toward one small aspect that residents do not want. Shame on you for ignoring the people that live and interact with this environment everyday.

My family and I do not support grizzly reintroduction, we choose option A.

Correspondence ID: 10629Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America
Outside Organization: Twisp Auto Parts inc. Business
Received: Nov,05 2023 07:25:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The problem is the bears will come down into the lower valley to find their food due to the fact most of thier food chain has been wiped out up high and the rest are hiding on the valley floor In our back yards to escape all the wolves and cougars. The game department has a low deer count as it is. Even the squirrel, grouse ect count is in danger due to the increased predator count.

Correspondence ID: 10631Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98102
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 07:26:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: After reading the proposal for Grizzley reintroduction, I am writing to support the proposal. While there may be some on going management issues these certainly seem manageable with current techniques and resources. More importantly the opportunity it provides to preserve an iconic American species while helping better balance the ecosystem of our diminishing open space is one that I believe we need to seize while we have an opportunity.

Correspondence ID: 10662Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mountlake Terrace, WA 98043
United States of America
Outside Organization: N/A Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 07:59:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support restoring a grizzly bear population to the area. Not only do animals have a right to live and flourish as much as humans do, but they are also a vital part of our ecosystem. Large predators such as grizzly bears create a balance to the natural ecosystem. They remove sickly animals that could spread disease, control animal populations, and help

build a more natural balance of plant life in an area. We have seen in Yellowstone with the reintroduction of wolves how powerful keystone species can be to transforming an ecosystem to be healthy for everyone. Humans and grizzly bears can live in peaceful co-existence. Yes there will be encounters but they will be rare and if you treat the animals with respect they will be no harm to us. Part of going into nature is seeing animals. We do not mind seeing deer despite the fact that they sometimes attack. All animals are defensive sometimes but we do not mind other types. Just the big predators are eliminated and that is a problem. We need our natural predators to establish the correct biodiversity in Washington state. I fully support the re-introduction of grizzly bears and any other apex predators such as wolves, coyotes, black bears, etc back into our wild areas as a vital part of correcting the damage humans have done to our natural environment. We can, will, and must learn to live in peaceful co-existence for a better future for the planet.

Correspondence ID: 10671Project:112008Document:132104

Address: BOTHELL, WA 98021
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 08:18:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly Bears belong in our natural environment. Humans lived with them for thousands of years before they were nearly annihilated. The plan worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

The 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Alternative C and the proposed Section 10(j) Rule is our best choice that meets both ecological and social needs.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 10681Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bear, DE, USA, DE 19701
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 08:30:55

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello,

I would like to comment on this plan. I am a US Citizen who loves the outdoors and its wildlife. However, while grizzlies are charming on a picture, they are well known to be dangerous for backpackers even if backpackers take all advertised precautions. The Washington Cascade range is very beautiful and currently one of the only mountain range in the US without grizzlies. When I think about going into the mountains, I think twice about going to a place with grizzlies, so Europe is my natural place to go but is quite further away from the US.

I feel that adding grizzlies to the Cascades would detract from going there as the cascades have sufficient amount of issues to deal with while backpacking: - with the wilderness from the Cascades, one has to reckon with water, backpack weight, navigation, etc. Adding the stress of not knowing if a Grizzly is around would add to those stressors in a significant way. I believe this would detract backpackers from going to the Cascades (think PCT backpackers who would be affected) and I wouldn't think US fish and wildlife personnel would want lower amount of backpackers in Washington. My opinion.

Sincerely and thanks for reading,

Correspondence ID: 10688Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Staunton, VA 24401-2872
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 08:51:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I respectfully submit that the people who are proposing to reintroduce grizzly bears to the Cascades are insane.

The animals are killing machines, and one of them killed my great-grandfather Benjamin Hamby in Montana in the late 19th century, destroying the family's westward expansion. I feel certain that if a legitimate poll were taken of the people who will actually have to live amongst the reintroduced bears, it would be overwhelmingly defeated. Of course, if the polled area were gerrymandered to include Seattle, the poll would favor grizzlies in everyplace except Seattle.

The flawed premise of these foolish restoration projects is an outgrowth of Rousseau's philosophizing, that mankind has fallen from nature's perfect paradise and that all efforts should be used to recover that lost innocence. But to quote Lady Bracknell from *The Importance of Being Earnest*, "that reminds one of the worse excesses of the French Revolution. And I presume you know what that unfortunate movement led to." Humankind has manipulated the "wilderness" since the beginning of time.

The news article where I read of this project mentioned that some indigenous tribes support it because it comports with their traditions and religion. So what? Why should these tribes' benighted superstitions have any more value than some of those of other religions that we have thankfully gotten past, say witch burning or executing homosexuals.

In sum, this project is based not on some scientific principal or discovery, but on a particular absurd philosophical hobbyhorse. And to refer to another French thinker, Voltaire wrote: "Certainement qui est en doit de vous rendre absurde est en doit de vous rendre injust," which is often translated as: "Anyone who can make you believe absurdities can make you commit atrocities."

Correspondence ID: 10689Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Monroe Township, NJ 08831
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 09:04:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am writing to support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades. Furthermore, I believe that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character.

Unfortunately, both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. These action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears.

Furthermore, I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Finally, I believe that natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation.

Thank you for considering my comments on this important issue.

Correspondence ID: 10698Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Arlington, WA 98223
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 09:14:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Leave the grizzly bears where they are. Leave them alone. If they wanted to re-enter the cascades they would do so. Do you think they cannot determine where they want to go on their own? Very arrogant of you. Are you God?

Correspondence ID: 10701Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Port Orchard, WA 98366
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 09:18:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support bringing in more grizzlies to the North Cascades. Balancing the ecosystem we have unbalanced with our unchecked development and open grazing laws has been destructive to the natural environment. If ranchers are concerned, they should not open graze, put electric fences around their herds, problem solved. We have messed with our environment for so long, developed land that should have been left to wildlife, it's time to do the right action. Bring the grizzlies back.

Correspondence ID: 10705Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Naples, FL 34113
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 09:24:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: In this vastly overpopulated world, it gives me great comfort to know that a few places remain on earth where things are still wild. Please, by all means speed the introduction of grizzlies into the North Cascades not only for me but also my children and grandchildren. The positive affects on the ecosystem will be substantial and the existence value of a pristine ecosystem in the lower 48 is priceless. Count me as completely in favor of the plan.

Sincerely,

██████████, Ph. D. Natural Resource Management

Correspondence ID: 10712Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Fallbrook, CA 92028
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 09:34:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As an avid hiker in our national parks I have had the opportunity several times to hike and enjoy North Cascades National Park. According to the NPS website grizzlies currently live in the park so the question is why artificially increase their numbers? What exactly is the purpose and how is this beneficial? The risk to humans using the park would increase as considerably more apex predators would exist.

Correspondence ID: 10713Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Lopez Island, WA 98261
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 09:35:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I would like to express my support for the recovery and augmentation for the grizzly bear recovery in the North Cascades Ecosystem. Grizzly bears, since the retreat of the Cordilleran Ice Sheet, have been part and parcel to the

Pacific Northwest coastal and mountain regions. They played a vital role in sculpting the various habitats by aerating soil, dispersing seeds, helping pollinate plants, and dispensing nitrogen through the forest. Grizzlies, with their wide-ranging diet, in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem relying on some 266 different food sources, indicate the overall health of an ecosystem, making them a very valuable umbrella species that would allow research to be carried out on a plethora of different species of flora and fauna through their direct and indirect connection to the grizzly bear. They are also culturally significant to many first nations and indigenous tribes of the Pacific Northwest, which by virtue means they should be restored and respected.

With all the reasons that the grizzly should be returned, there is also great need for caution and a robust recovery plan with set goals for recovery which, when achieved, should be strictly adhered to. This requires the challenging work of seeking the valued observations, concerns, and culturally significant points of many different stakeholders involved in the matter, including tribes and first nations people, ranchers and other agricultural producers, hunters, naturalist, scientists, and members of the rural communities who will live in bear country. In addition, the ESA cannot be used or perceived by the public as government overreach or as a tool to keep bears protected forever. This has been an ongoing problem with the rocky mountain population for nearly 15 years where both the NCDE and the GYE populations have met recovery objectives but remain on the ESA.

As important as bears may be, they are potentially dangerous, and without proper education for locals and tourist alike, can potentially cause human fatalities. A robust and rigorous approach to education to mitigate as much possible fear and poor practices will be required by federal and state agencies along with NGO partners to provide this education.

It should also be noted that the public has a right to know why the bear is being considered for recovery. In much of the literature I have read on sites such as NPS, USFWS, and Conservation Northwest, it simply states that we wish to restore it to its historic grounds and/or the bear is an apex predator (which is not entirely true). This project, which is going to costs millions in taxpayer dollars as well as increased fundraising campaigns and grant proposals by both government and non-profit agencies and organizations, should offer complete transparency about the costs, risks, and ecological role of the grizzly bear in its relation to the North Cascades Ecosystem. To vaguely state that "it was there in the past," does not due diligence to the bear or the stakeholders who will be impacted by the bear. Information on the ecological benefits, and how that roles differs from the already robust population of black bears is vital information for the public to know.

As a career environmental educator/naturalist who has taught seminars and lead multi-day bear tours and educational programs specifically about grizzlies in Denali and Yellowstone, I can say through my observations of both bears, tourists, and locals, that the key to recovery is education, and transparency of information. In a contentious political climate with wildlife being a very polarizing topic, it is important to respect everyone's concerns, and provide accurate information and develop an effective and detailed outreach/education plan for all stakeholders to receive the most accurate, up-to-date, and easily comprehensible information related to all aspects of the recovery effort. Urban environmentalists should be aware and be able to empathize with the challenges and potential dangers for rural agricultural producers living in bear country. Comparatively, ranchers and rural communities should be privy to information on the ecological benefits of the grizzly, justification for increased tax monies going to grizzly recovery, and feel supported and heard by the federal, state, and non-profit agencies involved to maintain their safety and way of life. This project will present many challenges, but with rigorous science and a detailed education/outreach plan, I feel that the recovery efforts can be successful and therefore should move forward with action alternative C of the recovery efforts. Augmenting a small number (3 -7) grizzlies per year will give both the bears and the public time to adapt and grow together toward a viable population and enhance the overall ecological health of the North Cascades Ecosystem.

Thank You

Correspondence ID:	10716Project:112008Document:132104
Address:	Woodbridge Township, NJ 07095 United States of America
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual
Received:	Nov,05 2023 09:40:53
Correspondence Type:	Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live in and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

Furthermore, the 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Thank you for taking the time to keep our North Cascades wild!

Correspondence ID: 10719Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ellensburg, WA 98926
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 09:42:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Quite literally the stupidest idea ever. Any government official contemplating this plan should be required to camp in Grizzly country alone for a week.

Correspondence ID: 10726Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Casper, WY 82604
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 09:53:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Alternative C is an 'action alternative' and would designate grizzlies in the area as an experimental population under section 10(j) of the Endangered Species Act. Both Alternative B and C options would add 3 to 7 bears each year to the ecosystem over the next 5 to 10 years until a total of 25 bears is reached.

*This designation would give communities and land managers additional options for managing bears, including deterrence, relocation, or removal of animals involved in a conflict. These additional tools could offer more safety and certainty for the region, while still providing for the recovery and conservation of the species.

Correspondence ID: 10728Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98273
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 09:54:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I absolutely support re entry of grizzlies to the area. The only way to combat climate change is to rectify the destruction of native habitats for all creatures. Wonderful news!

Correspondence ID: 10730Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Hood River, OR 97031
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 09:55:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Reintroduction is a priority.

The reasons are obvious and the detractors have no valid arguments other than unfounded fear and greed.

The ecosystem needs the balance and there is plenty of space.

Make it happen.

Correspondence ID: 10737Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Maple Falls, WA 98266
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 10:07:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: First I'd like to say why didn't the Forest service make this community a priority for meetings? And why not several or at least 2 or 3 dates so people can plan & workaroud different schedules?

As a Foothills resident and having lived in Washington about 50 years, Whatcom county since 1990, I have concerns.

#1 I am in support of grizzly's being reintroduced to the North Cascades, I'm more likely to be negatively affected but I realize the value of being a caretaker for the earth & boosting ways for ecosystems to get back to taking care of itself or as close to that as we can.

#2 Any idiot who hikes or recreates in these mountains and says they "don't want to see wildlife", or specifically bears, isn't equipped to handle a walk in the woods. They need to be educated on the value of not stinking up nature by sanitizing it for humans. There's a reason for each animal and humans have screwed up the balance that God gave us in nature so catastrophically that we have to act to bring it back in balance. Sadly, that still won't be enough.

#3. Arguments against grizzlies because of salmon need to look at the science. Brown bears in Canada and Alaska generally feed on flora, fauna & mammals not fish. The coast grizzlies feed on fish. Look it up. Kind of like transient Orcas feed on mammals but local pods feed on salmon.

#4. Grizzlies keep the ecosystem in balance. What do we have without them? Ever been to an area with too many mountain lions, over run with deer and coyotes? That is a system out of balance. Grizzlies repopulate the forest with necessary diversity of seeds in their scat.

#5. Grizzlies don't want to deal with humans and generally won't if u stay out of their territory. Frankly, they might be the only thing that saves the North Cascades from becoming loved to death by humans.

#6. In the last 10 years our trails have gone from soft earth to hard pack due to human steps. The roads are clogged with idiots who can't tell when a trailhead is TOO CROWDED ,and a one lane road with no pullouts coz some idiot parked there, can't handle people coming and going. You think a grizzly will be by that trail any time soon, dream on.

#7. Ranchers with cattle & sheep have been grazing their herds in the wilds of the North Cascades FOR FREE for decades. It's time for us to quit subsidizing their earnings and let them live with nature & that means living with grizzlies. I'm not against culling bears that humans have trained to love trash nor am I against some measure of protective killing for grazers.. with close oversight.

#8. Finally, Rangers need the resources to get out in the community both to talk about all of the above and to continuously educate folks on what those beautiful mountains mean. Including fire management & who uses the forest and their responsibilities when they are in it.

Wilderness IS NOT a beautiful place to see nature . True wilderness means humans don't get to ruin the earth in that location and we don't have that anymore. We never will even if we introduce grizzlies to this area again.

Correspondence ID: 10740Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Cropseyville, NY 12052
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 10:09:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

Correspondence ID: 10742Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Yacolt, WA 98675
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 10:10:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Vote: No. We have more than enough bears already.

Correspondence ID: 10743Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Colville, WA 99114
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 10:12:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Alternative C

Correspondence ID: 10746Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mazama, WA 98833
United States of America
Outside Organization: board member Mazama Community club, + some signs. Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 10:18:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Attendance at Winthrop's Grizzly event overflowed the parking lot, and was mostly standing room only inside. A show of hands requested by one of the 1st hour's speakers indicated about a 50/50 split among attendees. However the anti-Grizzly bear folks with their big Hollywood style "cowboy" hats were too shy to sit in the front row with my pro-Grizzly bear friends, and none of these anti-folks claimed to represent the huge memberships such as the Sierra Club and Conservation NW. There were 4 empty seats next to Doug Anderson (another xc-skier) and I, in the front row, during the first hour. Many attendees who drew numbers to speak were too shy to do so. My Swiss wife went hiking instead. I had more trouble with Moose and tourists, than Grizzlies when I rangered in Denali, but found most hikers oblivious to their surroundings including Grizzlies. The Griz however could easily smell the tourists, and avoided them. Oh, I favor alternative C, in case you're still counting.
██████████, Mazama WA

Correspondence ID: 10753Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America

Outside Organization: Retired-Government Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 10:33:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I attended a public meeting in Cashmere, WA (Chelan County) several years ago on the subject of restoring Grizzly bears to the North Cascades. The public sentiment, like the one recently held in Darrington, was overwhelmingly against the idea on reintroducing the species from outside North Cascades. Conversely, the majority comments were to let the bear population take a natural hold on their own. I have been roaming the Cascades in the past 45 years and have spotted Grizzlies from time to time but only took notes and never reported it. Same thing is true with a lot of other sportsmen/hunters or outdoor recreation enthusiasts. The proposed area of the release north of I-90 corridor is heavily populated and we will encounter conflict if the number of bears reach the target population in 40 to 50 years. By that time, the projected human settlements and activity will grow exponentially. It is a bad idea and I strongly oppose the plan. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Respectfully submitted,
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 10754Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Gig Harbor, WA 98335
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 10:34:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support re-establishing the grizzly bear population in the cascades and through out the west. Bringing in a healthy population of predators will improve the health of the ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 10755Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Pasco, WA 99301
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 10:35:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Thank you for letting the public comment on the program. I am strongly apposed to this program. I only see human and animal hardship ahead. What is the benefits of this program? I love the grizzlies. I vist them at the WSU resurch center. That can become mean at a moments notice and cuddly at another time. Some of these bears have been around humans all their lifes but I would not turn my back on them. Why are we moving them any way. I believe if they did not like where they are living the would move on their own. Please leave them where they are. You may also take your wolf back. Outside of killing beef they love chickens I have lost 27 to them over the winter.

Correspondence ID: 10758Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98199
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 10:38:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I join with Conservation Northwest to strongly support Option C. We humans need to do everything humanly possible to restore grizzly bears to their historic habitat, both for their sake and and to do what we can to restore the natural environment.
Bruce Cross..

Correspondence ID: 10761Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 10:43:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm very much in favor of restoring grizzly bears to the N. Cascades. When apex predators are removed from an ecosystem, that ecosystem becomes fundamentally changed. I appreciate that the concerns around salmon populations has been thoughtful addressed by selecting specific, non-salmon eating bears. This opportunity to reintroduce and re-establish a self sustaining population should not be passed up because people are afraid of bears. Environments like the N. Cascades are wild in large part because of the animals that call this place home. The threat that bears pose to humans is wildly overstated and I would consider myself fortunate to see a grizzly in the wild. I'd probably find myself in need of a change of pants, as well.

Correspondence ID: 10781Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Yakima, WA 98901
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 11:05:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The North Cascades is a 6.1 million acre largely undeveloped and sparsely populated area which holds cultural significance to Native American Tribes. As one of the last places where the reintroduction of Grizzly Bears is possible in the Lower 48, this plan will allow for a Keystone Species to regain its rightful top spot in the ecosystem. I heartedly endorse this plan and would like to be kept in the loop for upcoming Public Comment Meetings, eh?

Correspondence ID: 10792Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Vancouver, WA 98665
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 11:13:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Restoration of a complete ecosystem would benefit the ecosystem as been demonstrated in Idaho, Montana. Half interested humans may protest the action to restore ecosystem health but their objections should be identified as what they are which is selfish and deliberate ignorance and disrespect of the north Cascades ecosystem. Please continue at full speed to restore the north Cascades ecosystem by bringing back bear and wolf population to pre European settlement levels. If the European descendents object, then remove their objections by removing their access to the area. If takings are necessary by law then let's pay for their access and property and remove them to a safer less natural place.

My request is based upon well known science and traditions. In addition, I note that indigenous people have a long history of ecosystem knowledge and integration and should be included in the management of north Cascades area including all of north washington. It is after all their cultural and traditional rights also. Please include Shoshone, colville, Yakima, cour d alene, coastal, tribes in consultation and management of this important ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 10798Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 11:19:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to support restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades ecosystem.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation.

I believe this is the best compromise to support grizzly restoration along with the needs of people who live, work and visit the

North Cascades.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 10805Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Quincy, WA 98848
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 11:24:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am against introduction of grizzlies to Central Washington.

Correspondence ID: 10810Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Everett, WA 98203
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unemployed Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 11:27:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am in favor of the Grizzly Bear reintroduction. Please do it.

Correspondence ID: 10815Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Simpsonville, SC 29680
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 11:32:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I have family and friends that reside in Central Washington State. Letting grizzly bears loose on farmland is dangerous to my family and friends!! Bears maul people in their pathways when hungry, angry or irritated. How does the government plan on guarenteeing that my family and friends will not be killed or mauled? I do not see this a beneficial to farmland. Out of state activists that believe in the debunked theories of climate change and plastic in the oceans so I have to use a paper straw. This same lunacy is found in the proponents of this new ridiculousness that NOW ENDANGERS PEOPLE!!!! Why these people care more about the climate and plastic than HUMAN LIFE is beyond comprehension! Releasing grizzly bears ENDANGERS PEOPLE, ie MY FRIENDS AND FAMILY in addition to COUNTLESS OTHER LIVES OF THE COMMUNITY MEMBERS AND FARMLAND OWNERS! Enough already! This is absolutely a proposterous, ignorant, DANGEROUS plan. If my family and friends are killed or mauled, I will be suing the National Park Service and EVERY ACTIVIST that wrote this ridiculous plan.

Correspondence ID: 10821Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Saint Louis, MO 63139
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 11:42:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears.

I also oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North

Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Furthermore, Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 10827Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: Community Member Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 11:49:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a longtime resident of the Methow Valley, I have spent many hours over the last 38 years in both the North Cascades National Park, and the Wenatchee/Okanogan National Forest hiking, cycling, and studying the flora and fauna. The crowds have increased significantly and I think reintroducing the Grizzly Bears to the Park would be a disservice to both the bears and the people. I vote NO to this plan by the NPS. It will cause more problems than it will solve. Untrained people carrying weapons, and unnecessary encounters between grizzlies and people b abuse of stupid humans, to name a couple of reasons. Again I say NO to this his proposition.

Correspondence ID: 10829Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98104
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 11:51:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear National Park Service,

Thank you for the hard work in drafting a "Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Environmental Impact Statement, North Cascades Ecosystem" plan.

I fully support the "Proposed Action--Restoration as an Experimental Population Under the ESA" plan.

All of the listed needs for action such as restoring grizzly bears to their ecosystem from which they've been extirpated, restoration of biodiversity, and an understanding that grizzlies can and will eventually cross international borders are all reasons to take action and propose/use our own standards of re-introduction now.

The ultimate goal of any species work - as cited by the NPS - is to support the recovery of the grizzly bear (or a species) to

the point where it can be removed from the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife. The proposed action's preferred alternative does this.

Additionally, the agency asserts that in "the preferred alternative, the agencies considered factors such as the likelihood of successful grizzly bear restoration, public safety, long-term management, impacts on natural and socioeconomic resources, and how well the alternatives meet the purpose and need and objectives of the plan." With the understanding that NPS and its specialists are well-positioned to come to this recommendation, I equally support the preferred alternative (Alternative C).

Please move forward with the proposed action's preferred alternative (Alternative C).

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 10830Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kennewick, WA 99338-2521
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 11:51:15

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: There is no beneficial reason for introducing grizzly bears into Washington state lands. The introduction of these bears presents additional risk to people, to property, to livestock, and will present yet another predator competing for game animals which are not of themselves problematic. There is no natural predator that hunts this bear, and any law prohibiting the lawful killing of these bears will result in ever increasing problems. What are the provisions for self-defense? Property protection? Livestock protection? Population control? Geographic zone containment?

Correspondence ID: 10835Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lynnwood, WA 98087
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 11:53:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a long time hiker and who has enjoyed hiking in the Cascades, reintroducing grizzlies seems incredibly dangerous. I'm all for wildlife, but grizzlies are so unpredictable and powerful it seems unsafe to have them where people would regularly be around. I have visited both Glacier and Yellowstone when multiple trails were closed due to unsafe bear behavior (they were bears that followed hikers because they were interested in the food in their packs) and it would be terrifying to experience that here. I also live near Mill Creek town center and there has already been black bears in the surrounding neighborhoods where kids play and people go for their daily runs, and the idea that these could be grizzlies in the future that unsuspecting people could encounter seems really dangerous as well. Thanks for your consideration.

Correspondence ID: 10839Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bremerton, WA 98337
United States of America

Outside Organization: Self Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 11:56:52

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not support the re-introduction of grizzly bears in North Cascades National Park. The park is located too close to urban areas to safely do this.

Correspondence ID: 10842Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Snohomish, WA 98290
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 12:00:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live in and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

Furthermore, the 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Thank you for taking the time to keep our North Cascades wild!

Stay wild,

Correspondence ID: 10846Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Edmonds, WA 98026
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 12:12:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of Grizzly Bears into this area.

Those at the meeting who mentioned things like they want to hike in peace or do not wish to encounter the bears (wildlife in general) are not realistic and do not understand that the bears were already here, until

Man made areas and people invaded their space.

I love the wilderness and all it has to offer. I have always been cautious and try to plan ahead should I encounter wildlife. Of course I don't want them harmed and I don't wish to be harmed. But it is us, the humans, who must take the lead by reintroducing them to the area, and setting it up, as much as is possible, our co-existence with the bears, with all wildlife.

As for our salmon population, my understanding is that these bears live on berries, and vegetation. Could they possibly evolve to include salmon into their diet, possibly, but it would most likely take a very long time for that to occur.

People need to realize that the wilderness areas of our state are the homes of our wildlife - including bears.

I'm not able to get out and hike or explore the wilderness any more, but I want my children and the generations after me, to be able to live peacefully, smartly as they experience our wilderness with all wildlife, including grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 10854Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tacoma, WA 98446
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 12:24:37

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am not opposed to the natural regeneration of the NATIVE Grizzly Bear population within the State of Washington under ESA and support RCW 77.12.035 Protection of grizzly bears--Limitation on transplantation or introduction--Negotiations with federal and state agencies. "Grizzly bears shall not be transplanted or introduced into

the state... Only grizzly bears that are native to Washington state may be utilized by the department for management programs".

However I am opposed to transplanting Non-Native Grizzly Bears into Washington State.

According to the NPS most of the Grizzly bears in WA had been killed by 1860. The population of the state was certainly more outdoor aware-savvy than today and had determined that apex predators and humans (and their livestock) don't coexist very well, even at WA 1860s human population levels.

More recently Yellowstone's grizzlies have tripled their range and are now moving north out of the national park and grizzlies in the Northern Continental Divide recovery zone are heading south.

Given that the combined population of Washington is 2.54 times that of Montana and Idaho combined, the North Cascades Grizzly Recovery Zone appears to be disproportionately sized in the Federal Habitat Plan when compared to the tri-state population distribution.

According to Montana FW&P throughout the 2010s, for every reported human - bear encounter, there was an average of 23% of the humans injured or killed, and 23% of the bears KILLED. One year it was no humans injured, but 50% of the bears killed. Thankfully the actuals are small, but transplanting Non-Native Grizzly Bears into the more populated Washington State North Cascades Recovery Zone would likely have greater negative consequences.

Correspondence ID: 10861Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Port Orchard, WA 98528
United States of America
Outside Organization: NA Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 12:31:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: You know all the arguments you've heard them all before mine are no different. keep them where they are.

Correspondence ID: 10866Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Kalamazoo, MI 49004
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 12:45:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Restoring and reintroducing any local species to any ecosystem improves that ecosystem, and our environment as a whole. The North Cascades are a vital habitat in need of restoration. Reintroducing Grizzly Bears (Ursus Arctos) or Brown Bears, won't only benefit them, but their habitat, ecosystem, natural resources, tourism, and help reduce our environmental impact, increasing our resiliency to climate change. Any action towards these ends should be supported, as increasing the footprint of preserved and ecologically complete natural spaces is of vital importance. It's simply the right thing to do. Any risk associated with reintroducing bears can be, and has proven to be greatly mitigated with educational programs. Restore habitat. Save one of our great North American mammals. Save our planet. Help Grizzly Bears in the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 10868Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Everett, WA 98203
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 12:47:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: How many times are people going to have to reject this free for all plan called "Grizzly Bears";Restoration plan.

We don't what this is the State of Washington. Washington State has to many people and we will not be doing justice to these bears. They deserve to be in a less populated area somewhere far north or left along where they thrive now.

Please STOP these notions of reintroducing this animal into a situation like this....

Thank You,
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 10870Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America
Outside Organization: Community Member Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 12:54:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I already sent my comments, but forgot to note for the record that I support Option A . No Change. Please append that comment to my earlier electronic testimony. Thank you. [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 10871Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bedford, UN MK42 7DP
United Kingdom
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 12:56:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I fully support grizzlies being encouraged to repopulate the North Cascades, but this must be carried out in a way that does not negatively impact the wilderness ecosystem, its character, and ultimately, the bear's habitat.

Both action alternatives involve helicopters, and would therefore violate the Wilderness Act. Helicopters are incredibly intrusive. They spook wildlife with their intense and constant noise, and displace or even kill animals and insects caught in their vortex. There are several roads, and a dead end in the recovery area that borders the official Wilderness. These could easily be utilized to release grizzlies into the Wilderness, as they will naturally move away into this preferable habitat once released.

The 10(j) rule should not be implemented in this case. The grizzlies should remain under the full protection of the Endangered Species Act (ESA), rather than be put at risk of 'incidental harm' under this weaker rule. Being taken from their homes in neighboring states and dropped by helicopter into the North Cascades is incredibly risky in comparison to road transportation, whilst weakening their protection status going forward.

Montana needs all the grizzlies they currently have, because they are still classed as recovering under the ESA. There are no spare grizzly bears! Their natural dispersal from Glacier or Yellowstone is required to repopulate and restore (via trophic cascade) areas such as the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest. Just 25 transplanted grizzlies and 3 naturally occurring grizzlies are believed to exist in these vast areas.

Endangered species should be encouraged to recover by dispersing naturally. This needs to be a valid action option, supported by detailed analysis and development. This would need to involve the removal of man made obstacles - both physical and mental. How we view grizzlies has a huge impact on their recovery. We should consider this slower, but likely more successful repopulation method; allowing the bears to live and thrive, without the shock and risks that the other actions entail; all with full ESA protections in place. The impact of this action on Wilderness would also be negligible, and likely positive.

It is not about how quickly we can move them, but how successful they are over time. They should be able to go at their own

pace. The other actions are a quick fix, with no guarantee of success. They must be urgently reviewed to include natural recovery measures.

The border with British Columbia must be made as permeable as possible, utilizing wildlife corridors, so that the bears can go back and forth at will, whilst we respect and restore former Wilderness; naturally protecting the tiny grizzly population in North Cascades from inbreeding and unnecessary mortality.

The 'no action' alternative has solid Bear Smart actions within it, encouraging coexistence. This should form the backbone of all the action alternatives. If we can't be tolerant of the species, how can we possibly ensure their recovery? With residents and visitors increasing the likelihood of human-bear interactions in the parks, education is key to minimizing the risks to bears and humans.

Correspondence ID: 10874Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lakewood, WA 98498
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 13:13:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: After hiking the PCT and spending many weeks hunting fishing prospecting in the cascades i can tell you there is no true wild left in Washington State. Due to logging and development the furthest you can get from any road is 11 miles in the entire state. Whats more concerning is where all our big populations of deer and elk are and are not. Our deer are not in the cascades our elk are not in the cascades. The big food mammals are all in populated areas look how many deer were killed in the units around the areas these bears would call home. They dont have the food or habitat to avoid human conflict. This idea will get bears killed due to their unavoidable human interactions.

Correspondence ID: 10879Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Richland, WA 99354
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 13:19:24

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am totally opposed to the dangerous plan to introduce grizzly bears into Washington's public lands.

Correspondence ID: 10890Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Atlanta, GA 30316
United States of America

Outside Organization: n/a Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 13:36:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Draft Environmental Impact Statement 'Alternative C' is the most comprehensive plan that ensures both active restoration and pragmatic management in recovering the North Cascades grizzly bear. Please enact this plan for the benefit of all. Thank you!

Correspondence ID: 10895Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Everett, WA 98203
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 13:52:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am opposed to the plan to relocate any grizzlies from their current habitat to the North Cascades. this places an undue hardship on the bears that will be removed from their current place of living and moved to a different location. These bears will have to adapt to a new area and suffer the stress of being tranquilized and transported. IF this is

done on an "experimental" basis, the bears will be at additional risk of being further relocated, or possibly euthanized if they then come into conflict with humans or livestock in the new areas.

While I appreciate the intention of the organizations to "restore the balance of nature", this seems to be to be once again a case of humans deciding what is "best" for wildlife and interfering with the existing ecosystem. The relocated bears will have to learn to survive in unfamiliar territory. There is considerable risk for conflict with humans, as humans in the North Cascades are not used to recreating with Grizzly bears thus presenting a distinct possibility of unpleasant or dangerous encounters both to the bears and humans.

With increasingly high density of human use on hiking trails in the North Cascades and overuse of many trails, if it becomes necessary to close trails due to bear activity, this will place additional strain on the already fragile ecosystem of overused trails.

I urge you to reject any of the proposals to relocate Grizzly bears to the North Cascades. Please leave these beautiful animals alone to live in their current habitat.

Correspondence ID: 10897Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 13:54:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live in and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

Furthermore, the 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Thank you for taking the time to keep our North Cascades wild!

Correspondence ID: 10902Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lake Stevens, WA 98258
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 14:00:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears are a cornerstone species in the ecosystem of the Pacific Northwest and Alaska. Grizzly bears are also unfortunately an endangered species. The North Cascades are one of the most wild and untouched remaining wildlife areas where these critical animals can thrive. Reintroducing them would allow a restoration of the ecosystem as it should be. This effort in its entirety must be pursued in order for the ecosystems of this region to continue to thrive for many years. The North Cascades have a wilderness area which is virtually unmatched in the lower 48. There is only one main road to travel through the park, and access to trailheads can routinely require 1-2 drives off the main road just to reach the

trailhead. When compared to, for example, Mount Rainier National Park, it's easy to see why the North Cascades offers proper wilderness areas that are immensely less trafficked than other national parks. There is always the possibility of human-animal conflict, and for that to constitute bad press for the project. This should absolutely not stop the project from moving forward. Residents of mountain towns misunderstand the project and it's goals, and they seem to think that these bears are going to be outside their homes and wandering around town like you could find in a remote Alaskan village. These bears will still likely rarely be seen by people, and the people who do see them should be well-equipped and well-educated hikers and mountaineers who are deep in the North Cascades. It is important to note that it is extremely unlikely that a Grizzly bear would be seen at a popular area and pose a threat to humans.

The value of the Grizzly bear species and the fact that it is endangered means that the North Cascades should absolutely be home to a new population of this important predator. There is no other wilderness area in the lower 48 which provides a better home for these animals to grow in population and help the recovery of the species.

Correspondence ID: 10903Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lynnwood, WA 98087
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 14:02:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I would just like to comment to give my full support and excitement over the prospect of reintroducing grizzlies to their natural habitat. As an avid hiker whom spends almost every weekend near possible reintroduction areas I can confidently say I think the positives vastly outweigh any risk. The slow rate that the population would take to set leaves plenty of time for local communities to become bear aware. I just hope that certain peoples misplaced fears don't derail a vital effort to repair human caused damage to this wonderful ecosystem. This is my first time leaving a public comment so I hope this was in some way helpful

Correspondence ID: 10904Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Jackson, WY 83001
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 14:03:52

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am from northwest Washington, and have been following various attempts to bring grizzly bears back to the North Cascades for decades.

I am glad to see this effort resurrected this year, and I hope that some accommodation can be made to bring this keystone predator back to where it belongs. I don't need to reiterate all the reasons for this, as the Park Service and F&WS both know them well. If we provide for the bear, we provide for so many other kinds of wildlife in these wildlands.

Thank you
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 10907Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98502
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 14:07:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in full support of restoring these important predators to our landscape and trust it can be done in a balanced and slow pace to allow the population to establish. Thank you for your efforts!

Correspondence ID: 10908Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Carnation, WA 98014
United States of America
Outside Organization: Year Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 14:11:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: 11/05/2023

Dear Sirs,

My husband and I volunteer for both the Mt. Rainier National Park and the Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest as Backcountry Rangers. We have been avid hikers in the state of Washington for many years.

We have noticed the huge increase in the number of people enjoying the forests of Washington post-Covid. Human presence is higher than it has ever been with families backpacking for the first time in wilderness. I want people to enjoy the forests and wilderness like we do. We have a few cougar here, and a few shy Black Bears. Those animals tend to keep to themselves. I have no fear of camping in the backcountry, knowing they are there. If we happen to run across the carcass of a deer in the woods, we move along but don't worry too much about being killed ourselves. The hiking trails here connect with the North Cascades, most notably the Pacific Crest Trail. Many hikers are solo. They and new families have never had to worry about the animals in Washington (except mice).

Brown Bears change all of that. In Yellowstone humans have been killed by Brown Bears protecting an animal carcass. We have so many new hikers here and especially along the Pacific Crest Trail- that human-bear encounters cannot be avoided. The National Forest is requiring bear-proof food containers since last April because of the increase. Trails originating at I-90 can have 1000+ people per day on a week-end, and each year we notice more excursions farther into the woods- up the PCT to Stevens Pass and for many more than pre-Covid, past Stevens Pass to the North Cascades and Canada. Allowing Brown Bear introduction there will be a catastrophe. Humans recreate there.

A Brown Bear male can have a range of 1615 square miles- into Mt Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest. They are aggressive and don't scamper up a tree if surprised by a quiet hiker- they stand their ground and might charge. An emaciated Brown Bear will see a human child as food. I could not imagine the horror of a parent getting between a Brown Bear. They are an Apex Predator and I believe they should be allowed to exist but not where children and solo hikers are enjoying the wilderness.

Dare I ask the question- if Brown Bears are introduced in the North Cascades- how many human deaths would it take before it was deemed a mistake? And how many Brown Bears will get euthanized because they charged a human? I vote for zero, on both counts.

Sincerely,

Correspondence ID: 10910Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 14:12:19
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I think this is a terrible plan for several reasons:

The most important reason, to me, is one I have heard absolutely no one talk about: the animal cruelty aspect. I don't understand how you can think it is not cruel to pluck innocent bears, who are minding their own business and living their lives, out of their homes and transport them somewhere else for your own selfish reasons. Because you think that a wrong was done once upon a time and that these bears would be good for the ecosystem? Well, two wrongs don't make a right. I suppose you think that the bears will adjust and be happy happy. How the hell do you know that? Do you even care? I suppose maybe that is what the African slave traders thought about the Africans, too. Yes, I am indeed equating you with African slave traders.

#2: The remote portions of the North Cascades are no longer as free from human visitation as when the grizzlies last lived there. There would be massively more opportunities for human/grizzly encounters. You simply cannot recreate the past, however romantic it may seem to you. I do not understand why you would willingly create such a situation. It would not end well and you are in Fantasy Land if you think all will be fine. People and bears will needlessly die.

#3: This is the least important reason because it is purely selfish. If grizzlies are re-introduced I will no longer recreate in the North Cascades. I know no one but me cares about that but there it is. I am sure I cannot be the only person for whom this is true. Maybe this is an unspoken goal? You certainly wouldn't verbalize it if so.

Again, I am appalled at the casual, implied acceptance of animal cruelty in your plan. What monster would do such a thing? Only a human.

Thank you for reading my comments.

Correspondence ID: 10916Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98199
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 14:20:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a citizen of Washington state and someone who spends a substantial amount of time in the wilderness of the North Cascades I am dismayed to hear that you are still considering the reintroduction of grizzlies into that environment. The fact that these animals dispersed seeds does not outweigh the safety factor for the average person out there enjoying our wilderness.

I don't appreciate "in Washington making decisions like this when they are not spending any time in the woods and don't have to think about their own safety. All you have to do is read the news about a recent attack up in Alberta where a couple and their dog were killed by a grizzly bear.

I vote no on the subject and will continue to vote no. Please do the right thing and leave grizzlies where they are we do not need them reintroduced into our society.

Correspondence ID: 10918Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sequim, WA 98382
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 14:24:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Pursuant to the Revised Code of Washington (see below), I am opposed to the artificial enhancement of a Grizzly bear population in the state of Washington. They are already in the state, albeit in limited numbers. If the population expands naturally, that's fine with me. We don't need to bring bears (that might be problem bears) in from out of state.

RCW 77.12.035

Protection of grizzly bears--Limitation on transplantation or introduction--Negotiations with federal and state agencies.

The commission shall protect grizzly bears and develop management programs on publicly owned lands that will encourage the natural regeneration of grizzly bears in areas with suitable habitat. Grizzly bears shall not be transplanted or introduced into the state. Only grizzly bears that are native to Washington state may be utilized by the department for management programs. The department is directed to fully participate in all discussions and negotiations with federal and state agencies relating to grizzly bear management and shall fully communicate, support, and implement the policies of this section.

[2000 c 107 § 211; 1995 c 370 § 1

Correspondence ID: 10929Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, MN 98119
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 14:37:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I would love to see grizzly bears reintroduced to NOCA. I strongly support their reintroduction and would love to see a balanced approach to their management.

Correspondence ID: 10935Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Sequim, WA 98382
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 14:45:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live in or, like me, enjoy visiting the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

Correspondence ID: 10942Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Weare, NH 03281
United States of America
Outside Organization: None Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 15:00:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I don't live there and I understand people's concerns. BUT, wildlife was here way before us. We need to share the land. We need to be aware of our surroundings. Live in the city and allow wildlife to survive. I have several animals that come through my yard, including black bears. I just remember to look before going out. Do what you think is right.

Correspondence ID: 10946Project:112008Document:132104
Address: yacolt, WA 98675
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 15:16:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzly bear reintroduction does not make sense at this time for the state of washington due to the fact of our dwindling and mismanged game populations. Current predator populations already have taken a toll on current prey ungulate populations under the current mangement system in place with no relief insight. The prey population aside the danger to human reacracionists will greatly increase causing people to rethink areas of insterest to visit costing local town lost revenue with the dis[lace recreation group. At this time i do not think that the state of washington is ready for the reintroduction of grizzly bears into the north cascade ecosystem especially when we are already seeing Grizzle bear movement into the region naturally.

Correspondence ID: 10963Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Vashon, WA 98070
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 15:46:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do what you can to increase our grizzly population by implementing alternative C and Section 10(j). Their well being and presence is essential to Washington State's ecosystems. Thank you, Annie

Correspondence ID: 10968Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bothell, WA 98011
United States of America

Outside Organization: Woodland Park Zoo Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 15:51:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello, I am an instructor at Woodland Park Zoo and I am in support of reintroducing grizzly bears to the Cascades. As soon as public commenting for this issue opened up my team put together a whole program for the reintroduction of grizzly bears in the north Cascades. I have watched numerous grizzly bear story times and puppet shows and I see how much this issue means not only to the kids but also for the washingtonian community at large. Our grizzly bears at Woodland Park Zoo are named Juniper and Fern. They are some of the most popular and beloved animals at our zoo and have been great ambassadors for developing animal empathy between people and the ecosystems they are apart of. Reintroducing these animals means that the kids we teach could actually grow up and witness a life with ecosystems intact. They could see bears like Juniper and Fern outside of glass and bars. They could have the promise of a government that prioritizes the health of the land they are caretakers of. They could have hope, that humanity will figure out how to coexist. As a former park ranger I understand the safety and economic concerns of grizzly reintroduction, but at my heart and hopefully yours, I know it's the right thing to do. It doesn't hurt to try and adapt. Thank you for reading this and I hope you thoughtfully consider what an opportunity you have and what it could mean for our community.

Correspondence ID: 10970Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98106
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 15:54:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly Bears are a key stone species. If they go extinct, the entire Pacific Northwest will fall into ruin. If there is a worry of wild fish or farm farming populations, a majority of a bears diet is fruit, and will often also eat things like squirrels, not interfering greatly with fish. They are also a very important animal to indigenous peoples. If the bears are gone, a big part of their culture is as well. These beautiful creatures have been here far longer than us. They deserve to live. Protect the Grizzlies, protect the Pacific Northwest.

Correspondence ID: 10972Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Denver, CO 80211
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 15:57:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To Whom It May Concern,

I strongly support the restoration of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, one of North America's premier intact ecosystems. North Cascades National Park and the surrounding ecosystem have more than enough open space to successfully recover grizzly bears. This would be a major step in restoring the species across its historic range. Restoration in the North Cascades will contribute to the greater recovery of the species across North America. Grizzlies provide ecological benefits and will improve the ecosystem's health. Where grizzlies thrive, ecosystems thrive. These bears regulate populations of the animals they prey on and keep forests healthy by dispersing seeds and berries. Additionally, the population of bears on the Canadian side of the North Cascades ecosystem is considered critically endangered, and wildlife biologists do not believe a natural recovery is possible. Reintroducing bears on the U.S. side will complement significant efforts led by First Nations in Canada to bring back this sacred cultural species.

Grizzly bears roamed across the North Cascades for thousands of years as an essential part of the ecosystem. In the 20th century, however, people hunted, trapped and poisoned them to near extinction. According to the Park Service, the last confirmed sighting of a grizzly bear in the U.S. portion of the North Cascades Ecosystem was in 1996.

When a similar review process began in 2015, it received overwhelming public approval, with more than 159,000 public comments supporting restoration of grizzlies in the North Cascades. People from all 50 states spoke up in favor of returning grizzlies to their historic habitat. Grizzlies are one of the slowest reproducing land mammals in North America, so the sooner we begin supporting their repopulation, the better chance they have for long-term survival.

This is a first step toward bringing balance back to the ecosystem and restoring a piece of the Pacific Northwest's natural and cultural heritage. It is an opportunity to make progress for wild places -- to restore the last missing piece of the park and the broader ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 10982Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seabeck, WA 98380
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 16:15:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 10987Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellevue, WA 98005
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 16:18:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: No bear pls. I don't want to take risk and not be relax out there.

Correspondence ID: 10992Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Columbus, OH 43214
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 16:24:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I strongly support the National Park Services preferred Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation. Former and deceased president Regan tried to eradicate wolves and bears by barbaric methods and then years later on taxpayer money wolves and bears had to be rightly reintroduced because their numbers were dangerously small. So BEAR this in mind because we need grizzly bears as well as humans. COEXIST!

This plan will both effectively restore grizzly bears in North Cascades National Park and give people the tools they need to thrive in and around grizzly bear country. Grizzlies belong in the North Cascades, as they enhance the park's ecological integrity and contribute to its wildness.

Grizzly bears play a vital role in maintaining ecosystem balance, cycling nutrients, dispersing seeds, and changing the behavior of species around them. Restoring them would benefit the park and the people who use it.

A restored population of grizzlies will boost the park's appeal and attract nature enthusiasts, scientists, and tourists from around the world. This would provide economic benefits to local communities and support the park's mission to protect park resources in perpetuity.

Alternative C, with the 10(j) rule, provides managers flexibility to address community concerns while protecting the grizzly population. It ensures coexistence between humans and bears.

Please consider the positive ecological and economic benefits and support Alternative C. Restoring grizzly bears will secure the park's natural heritage and conserve an iconic species for current and future generations.

Thank you for your dedication to our national parks.

Correspondence ID: 10997Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Cle Elum, WA 98922
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 16:30:05

Correspondence Type:Web Form

Correspondence: I urge you to su

Correspondence ID: 11001Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 16:33:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am supportive of the draft Grizzly Restoration Plan. I think it provides a sensible compromise to both recreation, conservation and land use goals.

Correspondence ID: 11023Project:112008Document:132104

Address: SPOKANE, WA 99223
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 17:09:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades. Grizzly bears inhabited the North Cascades for thousands of years until they were extirpated by hunting and the fur trade. As an apex predator, grizzlies are key to the ecological health of an area. They affect water quality, forest health, and fish and wildlife populations.

As such, I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. Alternative C as the best choice for bears and the people who live in and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is a compromise for various interests, and has been shown to be effective in Montana, where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

Furthermore, the 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Correspondence ID: 11036Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Canadian, OK 74425
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 17:24:16

Correspondence Type:Web Form

Correspondence: Please protect and save the grizzly bears!

Correspondence ID: 11038Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Concord, CA 94521
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 17:24:24

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly support the National Park Services preferred Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation.

I volunteer in wildlife education with children (and adults). In learning more about wildlife, I've discovered the importance of biodiversity. It's essential for keeping nature in balance and benefitting the animals of the world - including the human animal!

This plan will both effectively restore grizzly bears in North Cascades National Park and give people the tools they need to thrive in and around grizzly bear country. Grizzlies belong in the North Cascades, as they enhance the park's ecological integrity and contribute to its wildness.

Grizzly bears play a vital role in maintaining ecosystem balance, cycling nutrients, dispersing seeds, and changing the behavior of species around them. Restoring them would benefit the park and the people who use it.

A restored population of grizzlies will boost the park's appeal and attract nature enthusiasts, scientists, and tourists from around the world. This would provide economic benefits to local communities and support the park's mission to protect park resources in perpetuity.

Alternative C, with the 10(j) rule, provides managers flexibility to address community concerns while protecting the grizzly population. It ensures coexistence between humans and bears.

Please consider the positive ecological and economic benefits and support Alternative C. Restoring grizzly bears will secure the park's natural heritage and conserve an iconic species for current and future generations.

Thank you for your dedication to our national parks.

Correspondence ID: 11043Project:112008Document:132104

Address: San Anselmo, CA 94960
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 17:27:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I felt compelled to voice my concerns about the potential reintroduction of grizzly bears in Washington. It's undeniable that grizzlies are already making their way into the state from neighboring regions. The absence of physical barriers means they can migrate naturally. Given the state's challenges in managing its existing wildlife, introducing another apex predator seems counterproductive.

Correspondence ID: 11046Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Green Valley, AZ 85614
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 17:28:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I fully support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades. The restoration must be implemented by methods and strategies that do not violate the Wilderness Act so as to avoid any harm to the area's wilderness character. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and to steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration project as this would jeopardize grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana as when the grizzlies are taken from their homes and dropped into the North Cascades, they would lose their previous protection.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears. These coexistence measures must be included in both of the action alternatives.

Correspondence ID: 11049Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Chehalis, WA 98532
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 17:31:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To whom it may concern:

I'm not going to even try to be politically correct here, after reading the comment that stated bringing Grizzlies here to the North Cascade ecosystem would be a benefit as the Grizzlies would help to keep the elk and deer populations in check? SERIOUSLY, that statement is totally out of line and quite frankly stupid and it pissed me off! Just ask the residents of the Northeast and the Blue Mountains as their Mule Deer, Elk, Whitetail Deer and now MOOSE populations are now in serious decline or heading into critical risk status a due to the out-of-control 'PREDATOR' train wreck we have right now in Washington state! Wolves in the North Cascades, Blue Mountains and Selkirks are out-of-control. Our Blue Mountains rocky Mountain Elk and Mule Deer populations are at 'critical risk' status right now due to the high Cougar, Black Bear populations and yes Wolves. The state currently listed (WDFW claims) we now have 4 Wolf packs in the Blue Mountains management game units, I challenge that number and strongly believe 5 packs are now established - 'OUT OF CONTROL in the Blues'; I challenge you, the National Parks Service, Federal Wildlife staff and Our own Washington Game Commissioners to go there and see for yourselves, ask the ranchers, the locals, a local Outfitter (Western Life Outfitters, Dave Waldron from Pomeroy 509-843-1535) to get a reality check of what happens when predator populations collide, *(that would be a novel idea wouldn't it, out in the field experience!).

Now you want to add another Apex predator to the state, GRIZZLIES, I say 'NO WAY'! It's funny you want to truck in a predator in over a 10 year period with no plan what so ever for a management objective goal and a plan to keep them in check (ie: hunting) of an alarming '200+ Grizzlies', which means if this does come to fruition you will not allow us the opportunity to hunt them and keep them in a check and balance status, but 200+ seriously? Case in point a wolf management plan example: in the Blue Mountains game units at least 2 wolf packs need to be removed or relocated ASAP, yet just the idea of that will have the 'Anti-Hunting groups' cries shoved down our throats. The citizens that live out there know the realities in the Blue Mountains. The citizens in the Winthrop, Omak, Okanagan, Twisp area to name a few already know the growing wolf packs, cougars and black bears are killing the deer, elk and moose at alarming rates. The black bears love protein, especially in the Spring, they get tired of green grass, they love to eat vulnerable deer fawns and elk calves, just ask our WDF&W big game Biologist! *(the Elk calf study of 125 Elk calves collared in the Blue Mountains in 2021 was a disaster of epic proportions) . They, the locals, know how bad it is. 'Who, or someone needs to support Our Mule Deer and Elk for Christ's sake!'; A stacked deck of WDF&W Commissioners with Anti-Hunter values are not honoring or implementing the WDFW Mission Statement anymore, far from it. If you want Grizzlies trucked into this state, then set a management objective quota of '60' Grizzly Bears and when you exceed that objective by 10 plus issue hunting permits. Funny though, we have no plan to control the robust Wolf population or a strategic plan to reduce or relocate a Wolf population that has exceeded its carrying capacity such as the Blue Mountains where the destruction of that regions 'unulates' in my lifetime will never recover! Yet we hear rumors of

WDFW wanting or intending to end Cougar hunting in our state or reducing a Cougar season?? ~NO WAY ~ Wow, how out of touch that rumor or management concept would be? Our neighbor, Oregon, has estimated they have over 6000+ Cougars and growing, their Cougar season is January 1st. thru Dec. 31st., why you may ask??? You can figure it out for yourselves! Next on the menu in the Blues is cattle, sheep and the Palouse Whitetails. You wonder why "mature Bighorn Ram" are spotted now off of HWY 12 in the Pomeroy area, you NEVER saw them in town, NEVER ! Their here now, reason being , it's "SAFER in Town" !!! Fair warning ranchers of the Blue Mountains!

So I have no faith that the National Park Service and WDFW would even conceive of a hunting management tool to control a Grizzly bear population as that isn't politically correct for your urban anti-hunter vision of our outdoors.

In 1975 the population in Washington state was 3.6+ million in 2022 it was 7.6+ million, heading towards 8 million in the very near future. It's amazing we have Cougars all over the westside, Black Bears all over the westside now, a beyond healthy Coyote population doing their part to keep the neighbors pet populations in check, funny I wonder how Grizzlies in Bellevue will be accepted in the future?

I'm very aware we currently have a few Grizzlies in our state however they came in from B.C. when they become a factor then we need to react. I'm also aware that the Wolves came into our state via B.C., Idaho and Oregon however they need to be managed now, case in point the Blue Mountains conflict. However, I have no faith any action will take place by WDFW, National Park Service or the Federal Government . I'm good with the few Grizzlies we have I'm Not good with adding an entire new experiment of Grizzlies trucked into our state. Many people rave how cool the Wolf addition has as been in Yellowstone , keep in mind the population of Wyoming in 2022 was 578, 000 people.

Again, bottom line, I have no faith that the National Park Service, Federal Government and Washington DFW would create a responsible management plan for a Grizzly Bear re-introduction. Don't even get me going on the "out of control" Sea-Lion, Seal, Cormorants and Terns issue destroying our NW Salmon and Steelhead species. Hell, there's more Seals and Sea Lions now than when Lewis and Clark came through.

As an example: The Sea Lions problem, ~ Total inaction continues, no plan to manage the problem ever, not even one solution ~ shame on you! Yet you all want our "Orcas" populations to thrive, what do our Orca populations mainly feed on? Yep, Salmon!

What makes me believe a re-introduction of another Apex predator, 'Grizzlies' would be any different! We, the people of Washington, Hunters, Fishermen, Backpackers, Trappers and all Conservationist are and must be the stewards of the land and its wildlife, utilize our game department Biologist, the Science, their Research and not unfounded emotions, *(as mentioned above; how Grizzlies in the North Cascades would be beneficial to managing the ungulates population' ~(those ungulate populations are being eaten currently at alarming rates) and manage the wonderful resources we have in Washington and it's NOW time to apply that theory!

I am opposed trucking Grizzlies into the North Cascades.

Regards:

Concerned Washington State Citizen

██████████
Chehalis WA. 98532
████████████████████

Correspondence ID: 11051Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98273
United States of America
Outside Organization: Skagit County Farmer / VP Skagit County Farm Bureau Business(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,05 2023 17:34:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I find this plan to bring Grizzly Bears to Washington state to be against the law.
RCW 77.12.035

The action should be halted immediately.

In addition if makes no sense from a practical side of things to introduce an Apex predator to the area where people and livestock are plentiful. It is asking for problems that do not now exist.

In addition the plan to restore salmon runs is habitat driven by the restoration of positive habitat. This is going in the wrong direction. More bears, less salmon, it cannot mean anything else.

Management record- the talk has been that there will be good managers of this trial to protect people and property but that is about as far from the truth as it can be based on past history with Elk in the region that continue to damage property, take lives, cause accidents, and threaten the livestock industry with a contagious disease call hoof. The damage caused alone is more that \$1,000,000. and yet nothing has been done.

NOTHING! Is this the good management that is talked about?

Food safety has been compromised by elk dedicating on crops causing major food production to be removed from the area where elk are present to the loss of local owners and farmers all because of poor management.

Protect the Public!

Protect the incomes!

Protect the Salmon!

Protect the domestic animals and farm crops!

Stop increasing the size and scope of government adding at least \$100K to \$400 K annually to the cost of citizens.

The people in these areas where the bear will be are not for this action it is the people that do not live and work in the area that want to prosper from he action and won't have to deal with the results.

SAY NO, VOTE NO, AND WORK TO MAKE SURE IT IS NO!!!

NOT NOW, NOT TOMORROW AND NOT EVER!!!


Skagit County Farm Bureau

Correspondence ID: 11052Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 17:35:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: MY wife Kathy and I are firmly against introducing Grizzle bears into the area. We already have lost sheep to cougar's, and don't want to loose anymore livestock or possibly ourselves to the predator grizzle..

Correspondence ID: 11058Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Moses Lake, WA 98837
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 17:42:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: There are grizzly bears in the north cascades of Washington state. When black bear hunting in the northern gmus . I have to take a test, from the Washington department of wildlife, to distinguish between a black bear and a grizzly bear. My brother has seen grizzly bears near heritage lake.

Correspondence ID: 11061Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 17:43:47
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please reintroduce grizzlies under plan C. You have the data. You have a plan. The sooner you start the better. I went to the public meeting in Winthrop. None of the comments against bears made any sense or were based on facts. The bears belong in the North Cascades along with the other animals that are rare or missing. Wolves, wolverines, fisher, bighorn sheep, mtn. goats, cougars, gray squirrels
Thanks for all you do to protect our land.

Correspondence ID: 11063Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 17:44:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a Bellingham, WA resident and very frequent visitor to the North Cascades ecosystem in all seasons, I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations. Where grizzlies live, our wild places are wilder and our ecosystems are in full bloom. After killing all of our grizzlies and robbing the mountains of their presence, we now have the unique opportunity and the ethical obligation to restore them to their native home, where suitable habitats still exist.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live in and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

Furthermore, the 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an essential piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Correspondence ID: 11069Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Carnation, WA 98014
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 17:47:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am whole-heartedly opposed to reintroducing grizzly bears.

1. Grizzly bears will attack without provocation, to injure and kill unprotected and unaware humans.
2. There is no such thing as "certainty, safety, and control" per the 10 (j) designation, when referring to this dangerous animal.
3. Anyone responsible for enacting such a short-sighted proposal would be responsible for the death or injury to ANY person by a grizzly bear.
4. Grizzly bears don't have a vital enough role in nature to reintroduce them into an environment where their presence outweighs the safety of those who wish to appreciate, study, and protect nature.

Raised by a father who was a professor of Wildlife Management and Forestry at the University of Idaho, I am pro-nature, animals and wildlife. This includes the pesky racoons, garbage-raiding black bears, the coyotes, bobcats, and scary cougars that live in my rural neighborhood. Grizzly bears are another matter entirely.

Please don't follow through on this proposal to add dangerous predatory animals to the environment for some cultural and vaguely romantic motive that could come back to bite....AND kill.

Correspondence ID: 11070Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Carnation, WA 98014
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 17:50:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please keep my info private: Comment ID: 2501753-132104/11069

Correspondence ID: 11091Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Commerce Township, MI 48382
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 18:16:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Yes! Restore the grizzly to its' historical range. Too much ecosystem damage in this Country has occurred over decades, and even centuries. It is time to fix the destruction and damage of the habitat these majestic animals have a right to exist in. Now may be the only remaining time to fix this. The way things are headed with the current political climate of this nation - and our extraordinary, but quickly disappearing natural areas and continuing human encroachment, there may not be another opportunity to restore our ecosystems for decades to come, Or, perhaps, even into the next century, if ever. Now is the time! The dream of a complete and fully restored ecosystem has been a dream to many of us - we are all stewards of the beautiful publicly owned lands that belong to all of us. Perhaps a system to help ranchers who have endured livestock predation should be on the table as well.

Sincerely,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 11092Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Marysville, WA 98270
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 18:17:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Stop it. No added dangerous animals
I enjoy camping and hiking with my grandchildren and enough hazards already exist
Other states are avoided in areas where these big bears roam. They are teddy bears in pictures but experience a night in a tent in grizzly country before you vote to force these creatures on my recreation grounds
Please no more bears

Correspondence ID: 11096Project:112008Document:132104
Address: yakima, WA 98908
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 18:24:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Regarding introducing grizzly bears into Central Washington Forests..... This is a not a good idea.... in fact is really a pathetically stupid idea. We have enough bears in our area.... we do not need a predator species. Please do not do this....

Correspondence ID: 11098Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 18:30:01

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I fully support reintroducing grizzly bears into the North Cascades. I have lived and worked in the mountains of British Columbia and Alaska in bear country. Yea you need to be aware of bears, but that is what a wilderness is about. We should not be propitiating a theme park the focus should be wilderness with all the animals
The bears will add to the Environment and belong there.

Correspondence ID: 11100Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 18:31:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly support reintroducing grizzly bears to the North Cascades. We need our top predators back to restore balance and to ensure a thriving ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 11104Project:112008Document:132104

Address: West Linn, OR 97069
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 18:43:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No Grizzly Bear Introduction Into North Cascades, Washington !!

I consider myself environmentally minded and support wildlife, habitat restoration, and protection of endangered species.

I support the existing grizzly bear protections currently in place in locations of the northern Rocky Mountains and Alaska.

However, our family does not support the reintroduction of grizzlies into the North Cascades, Washington.

The reasons are many. Local and state representatives do not support it. Farmers, ranchers, timber workers, and recreationists do not support it. The North Cascades is close to high human population areas, city and rural alike. Farming, timber, and recreation will conflict with a highly dangerous predator. Cougars, black bear, and wolf predators do not pose the same danger as an unpredictable grizzly bear.

Especially to recreationists who frequent the North Cascades area for hunting, fishing and hiking. How many tourists and day hikers are going to carry bear spray? Not many I presume. Sleeping in a tent, which thousands of people do every year in North Cascades, provides no defense with bear spray, as cannot be effectively used. There was a recent incident this summer of 2023 in which a couple was mauled to death using 2 cans of bear spray. There are always encounters and injury every year in Alaska and Northern Rockies. I'm glad we have saved them from extinction but we don't need another area for encounters, please!

I'm sure farmers, ranchers, foresters and other local residents have their own justified reasons. With all groups, an unpredictable large human killing predictor should not be allowed to be reintroduced into the North Cascades. An area highly used by large human population areas.

Please withdraw plans or any experimental reintroduction plans to put grizzlies in the North Cascades, Washington,

Correspondence ID: 11111Project:112008Document:132104

Address: MOUNT VERNON, WA 98273
United States of America

Outside Organization: free lance animals rescue Business(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,05 2023 19:04:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Sick or injured bears often prey on livestock. Most depredating bears are males over the age of four. Although bears are often blamed for killing livestock, they may not always be responsible. Bears are known to scavenge or steal carcasses killed by other predators.

New houses have taken over their environment. It is crucial to protect them.

They are usually shy, and I have not heard of a bear attacking livestock, except if ill.

We have got to preserve the areas that they live in. They are essential for our ecosystem. They keep the Blackberry problem down, and they prefer fish.

I have heard they are attacking livestock. If this is accurate, something is wrong. My brother is a zoologist. They have to have their area. As I said, the grizzly is shy, and the same goes for the black bear. For any bear, the hunting has to stop. Most of the bears killed are for trophies, heads, and feet.

I ask you to consider this when making plans for this wildlife.

Respectfully,

██████████
██████████

Correspondence ID: 11113Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 19:08:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The draft proposal seems to rely heavily on an intention to reestablish and revive old traditions and cultural values. It doesn't seem to give in depth knowledge of how Grizzly bears will positively impact biodiversity. Let's change with the times and listen to the fact that local peoples do not find strong enough benefit of reintroducing Grizzlies. The risks outweigh the benefits.

I vehemently oppose this proposal to reintroduce the grizzly species into the Cascade mountain range.

Correspondence ID: 11116Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98105
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 19:22:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: It's high time to right our wrongs as humans. I don't want to live in a world where I have to explain to my children or grandchildren that there USED to be grizzlies, or southern resident orcas, or salmon, or any other iconic PNW wildlife, yet we are steamrolling our way to that point. As an avid hiker and conservationist, I support the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades. We can, and are obligated, to coexist.

Correspondence ID: 11124Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Malaga, WA 98828
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 19:53:24

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The Grizzly needs to be reintroduced back into it's natural environment to bring back the balance nature intended. The wolf was successfully reintroduced to Yellowstone for the same reason.

Correspondence ID: 11160Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Anacortes, WA 98221
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 20:46:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live in and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

Furthermore, the 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Thank you for taking the time to keep our North Cascades wild!

Correspondence ID: 11163Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98273
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 20:59:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of Grizzly bears in the North Cascades. Wilderness is for the wild. It's possible to coexist with bears. Most of the areas of reintroduction are remote and inaccessible by motorized means.

Correspondence ID: 11165Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Oakland, MD 21550
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 21:19:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is a very admirable cause and I appreciate all of the effort that has been put into it thus far. While I am not pursuing a career in conservation or biology, I am still very passionate about the environment and have started learning about the importance of grizzlies to many ecosystems. This is a very inspiring initiative and I hope to see it succeed!

Correspondence ID: 11166Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Oakland, MD 21550
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 21:19:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is a very admirable cause and I appreciate all of the effort that has been put into it thus far. While I am not pursuing a career in conservation or biology, I am still very passionate about the environment and have started learning about the importance of grizzlies to many ecosystems. This is a very inspiring initiative and I hope to see it succeed!

Correspondence ID: 11168Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Oakland, MD 21550
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 21:22:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is a very admirable cause and I appreciate all of the effort that has been put into it thus far. While I am not pursuing a career in conservation or biology, I am still very passionate about the environment and have started learning about the importance of grizzlies to many ecosystems. This is a very inspiring initiative and I hope to see it succeed!

Correspondence ID: 11172Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sedro Woolley, WA 98284
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 21:31:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am asking that this grizzly bear restoration proposal 10(j) not be instituted. Our family are those who use the North Cascade Mountains as much as possible in the beautiful PNW and introducing grizzle bears into these areas will be very dangerous Toni's and our livestock. Our access to many of these areas has already been inhibited by governmental control and this is just one more example of hindering us. I oppose any man made introduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascade Mountains.

Correspondence ID: 11173Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lake Chelan, WA 98816
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 21:36:55

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Not trying to be funny here, but has no one on this panel seen the movie "Grizzly Man"??? I used to think of all bears being big, furry, fluffy, berry and leaf eating creatures with no desire or taste for human flesh and that movie actually taught me that I was totally wrong and misinformed and that yes, yes they do have a taste for humans! (Cocaine Bear too) Listen, is there a problem without them here or a huge gap in the ecosystem where these grizzlys are desperately needed for the entire ecosystem to survive? by all means i guess id say yes, BUT keep the public educated and informed as to all things grizzly. If our ecosystem can survive without them here, than i give a BIG FAT vote NO! Please no grizzlys!

Correspondence ID: 11175Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Yakima, WA 98903
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 21:38:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We do not need to reintroduce grizzlies to the north cascades. They have thriving bear populations in Canada and this would pose a significant threat to hikers, residents and livestock.

Correspondence ID: 11202Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98273
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 22:10:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please don't allow grizzle's back into the north cascade areas. We have tons of trail systems and parks that are heavily populated. Our family enjoy these during the year. Unlike most wildlife, Grizzle's are not afraid of humans and will kill people. Allowing this will bring tragedies. People will be forced to carry firearms and this protected species will be killed.

Correspondence ID: 11208Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Woodinville, WA 98072
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 22:16:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Restoring a better balance of wildlife in our state should be a win for everyone-- the ecosystem sustains itself when it is an unbroken chain. I am aware of the major complaints around dangers to humans and livestock, but clearly places like Yellowstone have implemented very successful strategies to ensure that the grizzlies are not relying on humans for food or shelter, and therefore do not bother towns or camps anymore. This is an effort worth making!

Correspondence ID: 11209Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Woodinville, WA 98072
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 22:17:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I'm for the grizzly bear reintroduction into Washington state. We've successfully integrated the wolves, and it's beneficial to have a more diverse wildlife and ecosystem. For once I'd like to see us choose nature and life over the slightest inconvenience for people time and time again.

Correspondence ID: 11223Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Castro Valley, CA 94546-3653
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 22:41:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness. I also oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection. Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest. A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting

Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

Correspondence ID: 11225Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,05 2023 22:44:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The 2023 draft EIS has at least three serious deficiencies:

1. It fails to present the state of brown-bear (*Ursus arcticos*) populations worldwide, the state of the North American population for the regional subspecies known as the grizzly bear (*Ursus arcticos horribilis*), and the status of grizzlies in the closest realization to what is being proposed--namely the greater Yellowstone ecosystem--where repopulation of grizzlies began in 1975.
2. Most importantly, it is not a true impact statement because it fails to identify likely impacts. The needs for and benefits from reintroduction are not explained, particularly in context of North American populations. The need for restoring the grizzly to the NCE is never developed. The EIS has no analysis or prediction of what ecosystem changes the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE) introduction would cause. Beyond bringing back the grizzly to the NCE, no case is made for any other enhancement of diversity or increased resilience. The EIS lists species of plants and animals eaten by grizzlies but makes no effort to identify which of those resources is present, and more importantly abundant, in the north Cascades today and which are likely to be affected at the population level by the reintroduction.

The document continually repeats that only a few bears will be introduced at a time, so the impacts will be small (a camel's nose approach), without addressing who will be affected or what effects are expected when the grizzly population reaches carrying capacity--other than a tourist bonanza. A credible EIS must make explicit the likely effects, short and long term, of the proposed introductions. What does success look like and how will it be measured?

3. The EIS makes little use of the very valuable and most direct comparison possible, that with the greater Yellowstone ecosystem, where wolf and grizzly repopulation efforts are more advanced and closer to new steady states. It is unfathomable that repopulation of Yellowstone with grizzlies is so little used to project and to steer the NCE repopulation.

The 2023 EIS specifies a target repopulation of about 280 grizzlies in the north Cascades ecosystem. Grizzlies reached a low of 136 individuals in the greater Yellowstone ecosystem in 1975 after dumps were closed and trash cans were bear proofed. Their numbers were supplemented starting in 1975, reached 757 bears in 2014 and for the last two years have been near 1,000 individuals, perhaps approximating their carrying capacity. What are the reasons behind the difference between the putative north Cascades carrying capacity for grizzlies and the apparently much higher carrying capacity of the greater Yellowstone ecosystem? It is not a simple difference in acres.

Essential information to inform non-mammologists is that brown bears number about 200,000 individuals worldwide at high latitudes in the northern hemisphere, with about 60,000 of the grizzly subspecies in North America (about half in Alaska and half in BC). Their success (making them the most abundant and geographically widespread bear species in the world) is attributed to their omnivory. Brown bears in general and grizzlies in particular are in little danger of extinction.

Bear physiology is unique. During hibernation, adult female bears gestate, give birth, and give milk without themselves drinking or eating. Fat stores are the source of energy and water, and fats receive much of the attention. Carbon dioxide and water (called metabolic water) are the end products of fat metabolism. Animals, however, store fats much better than they store protein, making protein supply just after and just before hibernation an important issue along with calories. Carnivory by bears usually peaks in both of those periods. Bears spend up to 20 hours a day eating during the two months before hibernation. Most conflicts with grizzlies occur then, particularly in years when natural foods are unusually scarce and bears forage further into denser human populations.

Results at Yellowstone should inform what might happen. Yellowstone grizzlies fed on spawning runs of cutthroat trout in the streams; trout populations crashed by 2008 because of competition from and predation by lake trout introduced to Yellowstone Lake. Grizzlies subsequently increased their dependence on neonate elk after hibernation. In the late 1980s, black and grizzly bears took 12 percent of elk calves. By the mid 2000s, it was 41 percent. A widely cited paper (Middleton et al. 2013) documents the switch in a top-tier journal but is conspicuously absent from the draft EIS. Surely it can offer

insights into what might happen to the NCE upon grizzly reintroduction.

The following sentence about the NCE appears in both the 2017 and 2023 draft EIS: "Mule deer and black-tailed deer numbers have declined somewhat since the historic highs in the mid twentieth century, but populations in the ecosystem remain robust." That sentence may have been appropriate in 2017 but probably should be removed from the 2023 draft because the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife is closing many of its 23,306 acres across five wildlife area units in the Methow Valley to public access from January to April. The reason is low survival of mule deer fawns. The EIS needs to identify NCE foods likely to be used by bears upon emergence and just before hibernation and to project likely impacts from that use.

Middleton, A.D., Morrison, T.A., Fortin, J.K., Robbins, C.T., Proffitt, K.M., White, P.J., McWhirter, D.E., Koel, T.M., Brimeyer, D.G., Fairbanks, W.S. and Kauffman, M.J. 2013. Grizzly bear predation links the loss of native trout to the demography of migratory elk in Yellowstone. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences 280: 20130870.

Correspondence ID: 11226Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 22:49:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am against reintroducing Grizzlies to North Cascades. Please abandon this project.

Correspondence ID: 11230Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bremerton, WA 98312
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 22:58:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I don't have all the answers nor a final verdict on the grizzly bear reintroduction. Of course I'd love to see a more complete ecosystem. however, modern people are pretty dumb when it comes to wildlife. I've had to negotiate between neighbors and raccoons for goddsakes! Imagine if people break out in a cold sweat and go hysterical over a raccoon, imagine that same person faced with a grizzly? Humans are pretty out of touch these days and this could go sideways fast. Perhaps a 20 years long reeducation campaign on how to interact with wild animals should come first before reintroducing grizzlies. Get the local tribes involved who historically lived in areas with such animals. I just don't think most people have even the faintest clue how to navigate this, and it shows.

Correspondence ID: 11236Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98273
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,05 2023 23:23:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: While I greatly appreciate nature being wild, and wish to be good stewards of the land, I believe this venture is misguided. Yes, all animals have their role and contribute to the well being of the ecosystem. However, the Cascades are quite heavily used and I believe you know as well as I do that a run-in with a brown bear is inevitable. We have only to look at AK for confirmation. I love these mountains and use them regularly. My husband often hikes alone. Whenever we take a trail we always come across solo hikers. I implore you to rethink this idea and put the well being of humans over the bears.

Thank you!

Correspondence ID: 11250Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Concrete, WA 98237
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,06 2023
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation (Preferred Alternative).

Correspondence ID: 11256Project:112008Document:132104
Address: East wenatchee, WA 98802
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,06 2023
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Going ahead with this I'll conceived plan that will put washington's active outdoor population in unnecessary peril is insane. Showing how out of touch these burocrats are with the voting public.

Correspondence ID: 11265Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Shelton, WA 98584
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,06 2023
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am for the reintroduction and restoration of Grizzly Bear populaions in the North Cascades. The enviromental benefit far out weighs the perceived threat. We are in an enviromental crisis and balance of evasive animal species that we are experiencing as well as the natural transfer of plants and other foilage is not occuring. We need these animals to return and should do everything we can to support this reintroduction. These nay sayers need to look at the benefit versus the minimal threat that they would pose given the large and geographicly isolated area proposed for reintroduction. We can safely coexist and is evident in areas where grizzly are living.

Correspondence ID: 11273Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellevue, WA 98007
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,06 2023 01:47:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Bears are smart and fast learners also they have instinct. These Bears can be found down Sequoia and Yosemite and are a charrished site. As a young boy had them walking behind me a night and others. They didn't attack anyone. But they will go into a tent or rip off a door for sweets. So just some common respect and sense. I also swam in a very cold pond they liked, the worst thing is while watching the rainbow trout and gold flakes a couple of snakes swam over head...even they were cool. So be one with the land and animals or at least try. I grew up with Monte the brown bear as a kid. In a park house zoo near Rutgers... Johnson Park. I can say repairing the damage man caused is doable and their may be unseen benefits too.I have been around other Bear in Virginia. New Jersey etc. life comes with risks. You learn and face your fears and treasure those special times. Looking back my greatest accomplishments are tied to being brave and sometimes it backfires. Things aren't always controlled or perfect or ruled by many. Sometimes it takes care of itself if able, sometimes it needs some help... nature!

Correspondence ID: 11281Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Lacey, WA 98503
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,06 2023 03:13:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: There is more than enough space in the ecosystem around the North Cascades National Park to successfully recover grizzly bears. Plus, grizzlies are good for the ecosystem.

Grizzly bears have been considered "threatened" since 1975, according to the Endangered Species Act. The recommendation to add more bears to the North Cascades originated in 1997, but there were no funds available for the Park Service to do so. On the Canadian side of the Cascades, grizzlies are "critically endangered."

We don't want to lose the grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 11282Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Drain, OR 97435
United States of America

Outside Organization: Organization Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 03:20:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: * I believe that we should restore grizzlies to the Pacific Northwest. They were here. We eliminated their existence. Let's return the population and see the eco system respond. 👍

Correspondence ID: 11300Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Baltimore, MD 21214
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 06:31:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am strongly in favor of the reintroduction of grizzlies to the Northern Cascades environment. It is essential that we restore as many functional, biodiverse ecosystems as possible. Every ecosystem requires its apex predator in order to remain in balance and to thrive. The restoration and preservation of this large and pristine environment provides immense benefits: carbon sequestration, biodiversity protection, recreation opportunities, and respecting the rights of indigenous populations.

I am in favor of including some potential control measures to reassure the local population in the case of bears that threaten humans or kill farm animals.

Returning grizzlies to their original range, from which they were removed by overhunting to extinction, is the right thing to do.

Sincerely,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 11308Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kernersville, NC 27284
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 07:08:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly support the National Park Services preferred Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation.

FROM DIANE WALLACE, FORSYTH County, North Carolina Resident- Lets protect ALL species and retain their habitats. Once the permafrost thaws past a certain point then the temperature of the Ocean will rise such that plankton will die

off leading to an oxygen poor atmosphere starting above sea level.

This plan will both effectively restore grizzly bears in North Cascades National Park and give people the tools they need to thrive in and around grizzly bear country. Grizzlies belong in the North Cascades, as they enhance the park's ecological integrity and contribute to its wildness.

Grizzly bears play a vital role in maintaining ecosystem balance, cycling nutrients, dispersing seeds, and changing the behavior of species around them. Restoring them would benefit the park and the people who use it.

A restored population of grizzlies will boost the park's appeal and attract nature enthusiasts, scientists, and tourists from around the world. This would provide economic benefits to local communities and support the park's mission to protect park resources in perpetuity.

Alternative C, with the 10(j) rule, provides managers flexibility to address community concerns while protecting the grizzly population. It ensures coexistence between humans and bears.

Please consider the positive ecological and economic benefits and support Alternative C. Restoring grizzly bears will secure the park's natural heritage and conserve an iconic species for current and future generations.

Thank you for your dedication to our national parks.

Correspondence ID: 11329Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98579
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 08:28:21

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Bringing Grizzly bears back in Washington state would be a mistake. To say they are to help with deer and elk population control is untrue. That is why we have permitted hunting. We have the most poorly managed hunting in the best state. Putting grizzly's back here without it happening naturally is acting like you are God. There are dangers to putting them here, to live stock, to other populations of animals. There is a reason grizzly's are not prolific here. I am apposed to bringing them to Washington state. Do not do this.

Correspondence ID: 11330Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Snohomish, WA 98290
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 08:32:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Sirs,

I am 100% in favor of reintroducing a sustainable Grizzly population to the North Cascades and I support "Alternative C" of the DEIS.

I am an avid hunter and fisherman and enjoy my time in the wilderness. In my opinion, it's not true wilderness without top, apex predators. I believe these creatures deserve their rightful place in the Cascades and I believe any issues or risks associated with reintroduction can be managed effectively.

Regards,

Correspondence ID: 11335Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Greensboro, NC 27408
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,06 2023 08:47:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support grizzlies. Even though I find them terrifying when I hike in Montana at my sister's, we need to save them, even if it means decreasing the number of cattle that are grazed on federal lands.

Correspondence ID: 11336Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Ephrata, WA 98823
United States of America
Outside Organization: Farmer/Rancher Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,06 2023 08:50:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Let's exercise some common sense and not do this

Correspondence ID: 11345Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,06 2023 09:04:47
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the return of grizzlies to the north cascades. As climate change and continued human development reduce their already dramatically diminished range, anything we can do to reopen viable habitat especially within their historic range like this, should be done to ensure future viable populations persist.

Correspondence ID: 11350Project:112008Document:132104
Address: BIGFORK, MT 59911
United States of America
Outside Organization: Self employed Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,06 2023 09:11:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please restore the Grizzly population in the Cascades. Work with Montana FWP to transplant Grizzly to this area. An intact ecosystem equals a more healthy ecosystem.

Also, Wolves should be fully restored too, for the same reasons. Also, restoring these species will add tremendously to the eco-tourism watchable wildlife industry. Ten years after Wolves were brought back in Montana, the University of Montana conducted a Regional Economic Impact Analyses and estimated that more than \$35.5 million (confidence interval of \$22.4 to \$48.6 million) are generated via wolf-centered ecotourism in the Yellowstone Park's surrounding gateway communities.

Thanks,

██████████, MS, MPA
Swan Valley, Montana.

Correspondence ID: 11356Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98125
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,06 2023 09:24:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please restore a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades! Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I am an avid hiker of the north cascades, and want the grizzlies back to fill their niche in the ecosystem!

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live in and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

Furthermore, the 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Thank you for taking the time to keep our North Cascades wild!

Correspondence ID: 11365Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Redmond, WA 98052
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 09:51:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Pacific Northwest is very famous place for hiking and all different outdoors activities.

People take kids and animals to the woods a lot which would put them at more risk now.

I would ask to leave everything as is and let the nature to do it naturally if needed. If in time they cross the border, it's ok, but forcefully move these species to north Cascades just does not make sense to me.

Correspondence ID: 11368Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98273
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 09:55:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I hike, hunt and vacation over in the proposed release area and still will for many years. I have no desire to have grizzly bears around. The area is thriving just fine as is with out the introduction of grizzly bears. Locals will be affected by this with out a doubt. The majority of people who desire to introduce these predator bears into the area will not be affected in any way.

Correspondence ID: 11372Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Waretown, NJ 08758
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 10:03:24

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think that it's a great idea to restore grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem in Washington State. The grizzly bears once roamed here and should be restored to their former habitat. This action would help to restore a healthy eco-system as well. We need to learn to live with all wildlife that we share the planet with.

Correspondence ID: 11373Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Blaine, WA 98230
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 10:03:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We should absolutely NOT introduce more grizzlies into washington. This would have a devastating effect on the already suffering ungulate population. This would also create unnecessary risk to humans through involuntary interaction with such an animal. If they make their way into the state naturally, that is one thing, but we must not introduce grizzlies into washington. I and other outdoor enthusiasts in this state are in complete disagreement with introducing more grizzly.

Correspondence ID: 11374Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Aberdeen, WA 98520
United States of America

Outside Organization: Olympic Public Access Coalition Non-Governmental(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,06 2023 10:04:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Thank you for this opportunity to comment on this proposal.

Olympic Public Access Coalition supports Alternative A - No Action.

- 1) Grizzlies are reported to be in the North Cascades. They have been there for decades.
- 2) The North Cascades has proven to not have an adequate food source. Otherwise, there would be more grizzlies. Additional grizzlies will decimate the elk and deer in the area, then starve.
- 3) In 1995, Washington State created legislation (RCW.77.12.035), declaring, "grizzly bears shall not be transplanted or introduced into the state."
- 4) This plan is a product of the US Fish and Wildlife, but takes place within National Park Service boundaries. National Park Service policy prohibits extirpated species from being reintroduced that pose a threat to park personnel.
- 5) As the population grows and disperses across the region, human and bear conflicts that arise, and will arise, will be mitigated disproportionately against the human environment and will have a direct impact to present and potential recreational opportunities.
- 6) A comprehensive impact study of management options on recreation has not been performed in the Draft Environmental Impact Study.

Respectfully,

Olympic Public Access Coalition
Board of Governors

Correspondence ID: 11376Project:112008Document:132104

Address: North Bend, WA 98045
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 10:10:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I fully support reintroducing grizzly bears back to the North Cascades. I've seen the benefits of reintroducing predators into their natural ecosystems and the positive that's done, and I think the same could happen here.

I acknowledge the concerns and fears people have around bears, especially grizzly bears, but I think we need to be more aware of how our activities destroy the local ecosystems and anything we can to bring them back to a more sustainable state is a pro to me.

Correspondence ID: 11389Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Deming, WA 98244
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 10:36:37

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears are meat eaters when they run out of berries. Very active and hungry in the spring. They are of a very aggressive nature not at all like the brown or black bear. The Grizzly is not the least afraid of humans. They will stalk a person and they are a very silent predator. To defend yourself from a Grizzly attacking, it takes a large bore weapon, which hikers and campers do not carry. The horse trails and hiking trails will be in danger. You will have to hire an armed guide for your recreation. The state revenue will fall off as people do not want to expose themselves to danger. It will cost the state millions in education for the people to be able to limit their exposure to attack. The cattlemen that have lost cows to predators have rarely been reimbursed from the state. The authorities look, rule inconclusive to a kill site which can be up to a month old for free range organic cattle, then the rancher does not get paid. This can be a huge loss of thousands of dollars and cause the ranger/farmer to go broke. You will notice the quality of the grocery store beef to decline even more as local ranchers/farmers quit. Grizzly bears follow creeks and rivers to the game. Since there is more deer sightings in cities and in the foothills, I would expect to see Grizzly bears move toward the cities very quickly. Examples would be Winthrop, Leavenworth, Snohomish, Marysville, Bellingham and all outlying small towns. No to more Grizzly.

Correspondence ID: 11395Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Pomeroy, WA 99347
United States of America

Outside Organization: Rancher Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 10:51:03

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The public's focus on restoring Grizzly Bears in WA state is truly not there; there is no logical reason to waste money, time, and effort on this project. There are so many more areas/challenges/problems in WA state that need to be addressed and must be prioritized.

The listing would include the homeless, the drug addition, the mental health challenges, the economy, and the list goes on and on, yet we have no solutions for all of the above, but we can find time and funding to waste on placing Grizzly bears back into the North Cascades? What ever happened to common sense? Will the state's challenges that I've listed above be cured/fixed by putting bears into the woods? Do we not have enough bears currently?

Please appeal to common sense for once...the new carbon credit tax has put a huge strain on everyday WA citizens, and the new revenues will now be used to help fund the bear challenge? What on God's earth are you folks thinking??? Move on, fix the existing problems with all of the unfair funding the state is collecting, and leave the Grizzlies in MT.....if you really feel like you want to see a grizzly bear, go to AK or MT and take your camera...let's get back to fixing the areas that are way more important.

Correspondence ID: 11398Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Las Vegas, NV 89138-1501
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 10:53:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I enthusiastically support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades. The North Cascades are beautiful, wild and unique; I have backpacked in the area and know their special charm. The restoration, however, must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 11403Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Naples, FL 34113
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 10:59:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 11404Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Puyallup, WA 98374
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 11:00:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of grizzly bears in the Northern Cascades. I see more benefits than drawbacks. I am reminded of Yellowstone's reintroduction of wolves. The predators made the landscape better. I hope the same will happen in the Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 11405Project:112008Document:132104

Address: chelan, WA 98816
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 11:05:03

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have no desire to have grizzlies reintroduced into wilderness that me and my family love to enjoy. Personally I would think it would do way more harm than good. The grizzlies will encounter people in the north cascades quite often, ensuing attacks will give the bears a bad name, and will cause many people to stay away from visiting the cascades. Please keep the grizzlies out of our state.

Correspondence ID: 11410Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Coarsegikd, CA 93614
United States of America

Outside Organization: Retired Law Enforcement Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 11:08:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We live in the foothills of the eastern side of the Sierra Nevada mountains. I'm a hunter/Fisherman/hiking and camping enthusiast. I'm in the woods a lot. I have always gone into nature whenever and wherever I could. I'm on the right wing of most social issues, except when it comes to conservation of natural resources. That's where I stand with the left side of the door enthusiast. If we don't save the habitat, then nobody gets to appreciate the wonders of nature; left wingers or right wingers. And wherever you have a chance to complete an ecosystem with an Apex predator as God intended then by all means, bring that species back to the ecosystem. I love being in the mountains where wolves are now free. And the few times, I have been a grizzly bear country, it does add to the experience. There are not many places left where the grizzly can be re-introduced. I mean look at our state flag of California. Front and center on that flag is a grizzly bear. It has become extinct and our golden state. I'm a transplanted Hozier, but I have adopted this state as my own. I truly wish we could have the grizzly bear back and it's old domain. I would like to see the grizzly introduced to the north cascades ecosystem thank you.

Correspondence ID: 11411Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tacoma, WA 98405
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 11:08:52

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support Alternative C for the Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan. Section 10(j) designation would allow conservation efforts to proceed on a limited experimental basis while the issues involved are being studied.

Correspondence ID: 11418Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellevue, WA 98004
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 11:17:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Officials:

I agree with your reasons for Section 10(j) management, and support your preferred Alternative C. Section 10(j) management is especially important to give managing agencies the flexibility they may need to avoid and/or deal with potential conflicts.

It should also offer some comfort to folks concerned about grizzly recovery.

As the author of a book on grizzly bear recovery (Grizzly Wars: The Public Fight Over the Great Bear - Easten Washington University Press 2008) I want to applaud your draft environmental impact statement. It is comprehensive and accurate. It addresses all the relevant issues. You have done an excellent job.

One of the few places where you might have said more was in your discussion about the interaction between grizzlies and black bears at pages 86-87. You might have added that in areas of less suitable habitat, black bears are likely to exclude grizzlies because the habitat will not still support both in a dietary competition. Mattson, Herrero, Merrill, Are black bears a factor in the restoration of North American grizzly bear populations? Ursus 16(1): 11-30 (2005). I doubt this would change any of your conclusions. Black bears and grizzlies coexisted in the North Cascades for centuries. Grizzly recovery may take longer in view of the robust black bear population that now exists, but grizzlies will gradually regain their former status.

Grizzlies cannot recover on their own in the North Cascades. Other populations are too far away and face too many obstacles to repopulate the North Cascades naturally. Even if it were legal (which it is not) to rely on migration of bears from the British Columbia part of the North Cascades, the BC grizzly population in the Cascades is too small to make a biologically significant difference.

The North Cascades are the only Grizzly Bear Recovery Area outside of the Northern Rockies. Before grizzlies can be delisted nationwide, viable populations must be restored in diverse locations. Having them in the North Cascades as well as the Rockies is an important hedge.

Grizzly recovery reminds us of the comment by former US Fish & Wildlife Service director, Mollie Beattie: "What a country chooses to save is what a country chooses to say about itself."

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 11419Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98177
United States of America
Outside Organization: Nice World Industries Business(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,06 2023 11:22:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Having just returned from an inspiring trip to Glacier National Park, and experiencing an encounter with a Grizzly, I believe that it's important to restore these magnificent creatures to their historic habitat.

Seeing the young grizzly in the wild was awe inspiring and an experience I will never forget.

Correspondence ID: 11421Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Washougal, WA 98671
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,06 2023 11:26:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: There is a reason the Grizzlies were eradicated from the lower 48 in the first place. They are DANGEROUS !

Correspondence ID: 11423Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 11:28:08

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please bring back the grizzlies. They were here first. I am an avid backpacker and am not the least bit concerned about encountering them in the wild. The most basic precautions like bear bells or traveling with others are highly effective deterrents.

Correspondence ID: 11425Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Okanogan, WA 98840
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 11:28:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I was born and raised in the Okanogan valley. My family's ranch and orchard has been in operation since the late 1800s. We have worked alongside nature all that time, which includes wolves (recently), cougars and black bears on our property. We have experienced death loss to these predators, which is a hardship financially and emotionally, but have never killed one of these predators as they usually move on. Introducing yet another predator, which is even more aggressive towards humans is entirely irresponsible. I have personally had an encounter with a grizzly mother and her cub in Washington. It was nothing but a stroke of luck that I escaped unharmed as she definitely had the high ground.

Grizzly bear introduction will certainly have negative impacts on prey species (salmon, deer, elk), public use of public lands, detrimental agricultural economics, create a need for more money for government oversight, as well as a very real danger to residents on their own property. There is literally no benefit.

It seems as if this is attempted every few years. It is always rebuffed because it simply does not make sense.

Correspondence ID: 11430Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Las Vegas, NV 89117
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 11:33:01

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of grizzly bears into their historic range. Top predators make the area inherently more interesting, and they provide important ecosystem services, as was shown in the Yellowstone region. This should be a simple decision -- let's get it done.

I strongly support the National Park Services preferred Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation.

This plan will both effectively restore grizzly bears in North Cascades National Park and give people the tools they need to thrive in and around grizzly bear country. Grizzlies belong in the North Cascades, as they enhance the park's ecological integrity and contribute to its wildness.

Grizzly bears play a vital role in maintaining ecosystem balance, cycling nutrients, dispersing seeds, and changing the behavior of species around them. Restoring them would benefit the park and the people who use it.

A restored population of grizzlies will boost the park's appeal and attract nature enthusiasts, scientists, and tourists from around the world. This would provide economic benefits to local communities and support the park's mission to protect park resources in perpetuity.

Alternative C, with the 10(j) rule, provides managers flexibility to address community concerns while protecting the grizzly population. It ensures coexistence between humans and bears.

Please consider the positive ecological and economic benefits and support Alternative C. Restoring grizzly bears will secure

the park's natural heritage and conserve an iconic species for current and future generations.

Thank you for your dedication to our national parks.

Correspondence ID: 11431Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Woodinville, WA 98072
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 11:34:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in strong support of the reintroduction of grizzly bears into the North Cascades Ecosystem. Done in the fashion that has been proposed, this action will be a first step in repairing and restoring this ecosystem that humans so unfortunately decimated.

Correspondence ID: 11432Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Fontana, CA 92335
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 11:37:48

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live in and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

Furthermore, the 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

The North Cascades Grizzly Bear Recovery Zone (NCGBRZ) is the second largest of six such designated areas at nearly 10,000 square miles. Combined with contiguous protected areas in British Columbia, including Manning Park, there are 14,000 square miles of productive, wild habitats, wilderness, and roadless areas.

People and grizzly bears can coexist and thrive. They do so in British Columbia, Montana, and Wyoming where grizzly populations and back and front country recreation continue to grow hand in hand, providing a vital economic boost to those areas' gateway communities.

Grizzly bears lived in Washington for thousands of years. We still have a small population in the NE WA Selkirk Mountains. However, currently, there are no grizzly populations in the United States or Canada that are large enough or close enough to serve as a source to naturally repopulate the North Cascades.

Having wiped out the grizzly bear over the past 150 years we now have the unique opportunity and the ethical obligation to restore them to their native home, where suitable habitats still exist.

Grizzly bears are ecologically and culturally significant and are vital to the overall health of the North Cascades ecosystem and its biodiversity. They are considered an indicator of ecosystem health.

Restoring grizzly bears as an "Experimental, non-essential" population under a well-crafted Section 10(j) rule of the Endangered Species Act makes sense. Such a designation will provide flexibility for wildlife managers to prevent and address human-bear conflict and a greater level of comfort for people who are concerned about the impacts of wildlife

recovery on economic and recreation activities. Agencies have used the Section 10(j) Rule in the past to restore black-footed ferrets, California condors, wood bison, and many others.

Correspondence ID: 11439Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Federal Way, WA 98023
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 12:06:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As an avid hiker and trail runner I do not want grizzly bears introduced into the North Cascades Ecosystem as described in the draft Restoration Plan. I do not want to fear having an encounter with a dangerous predator. If I want to interact with grizzly bears I can go to ecosystems that currently have grizzly populations.

Correspondence ID: 11440Project:112008Document:132104

Address: La Conner, WA 98257
United States of America

Outside Organization: private citizen Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 12:08:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I lived in Alaska for 50 years. I have lost track of how many moose , caribou and deer I have taken in those 50 years. I remember exactly however the number of brown bear I killed. I also remember the distance from me the bears were when I shot and killed each one. Both were about 20 feet from me when I shot. The first bear was shot through it's right eye and then the bullet went on thru and broke it's jaw. I shot it three more times to finish it. I killed the second bear on Kodiak Island when I was packing out deer meat. I could hear the sow coming as she grunted whenever her front legs swept backward. The first bullet from my 375 H and H went in just over her head this stopped her and put her back end down and scooting backward. I shot her three more times in her neck and chest at which she went down dead. Soon after this her two yearling cubs showed up. I left. I came back the next day to take the hide as required by law in Alaska. The two cubs were already feeding on their mama and so I left and later reported all this to Alaska Fish and Game.

I am now 85 years old and not running around in the mountains so much myself , but I am very concerned for others. If bears work down into the Cascades from Canada then so be it they are welcome. But I can see no valid reason to reintroduce them artificially.

That first line up there got screwed up. It should say that I lived, worked and hunted in Alaska for 50 years and am a trained biologist.

Correspondence ID: 11441Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: same Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 12:08:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Select Alternative A

The Grizzly EIS is repetitive, and lacks support of a scientific/research-study that justifies Grizzly reintroduction into the North Cascades Ecosystem. Clearly the reintroduction is an emotional choice/reasoning (confirmed by Wayne Kasworm, Montana Biologist), and truly an Unnecessary Experimental effort. The desire of a few agency individuals does does not justify the significant impact of certain human, domestic animal, ecosystem conflicts.

Correspondence ID: 11442Project:112008Document:132104

Address: seattle, WA 98117
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,06 2023 12:14:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I'm concerned that the bears will have trouble adjusting to the new area or that they will come in contact with humans or livestock and be at risk.

Correspondence ID: 11443Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Henderson, NV 89011
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,06 2023 12:15:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please help protect the Grizzly Bear. They are an essential part of the ecosystem bringing balance as a keystone species.

Correspondence ID: 11446Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Santa Barbara, CA 93101
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,06 2023 12:21:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please allow for the natural migration and repopulation of grizzly bears in the North Cascades ecosystem in Washington state. It's best to avoid transplanting bears from other locations, and the use of helicopters flying over wilderness areas. As a city dweller, I know how loud, stressful and disruptive helicopters flying overhead can be.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 11448Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98102
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,06 2023 12:24:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As someone who recreates in the North Cascades, I full support the effort to re-introduce the Grizzly Bear to its native habitat.

Correspondence ID: 11463Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Sedro Wooley, WA 98284
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,06 2023 12:45:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: It should be noted significant habitat changes have occurred in the Upper Skagit watershed since 1900. Prior to the 1930's salmon could access the upper watershed, (management unit #1). The dams stopped fish migration, which were in large numbers, similar to Alaska rivers. This changed the habitat. A detailed inventory (plant species) needs to look at the bears requirements. To over winter, Alaska bears rely on fish, Yellowstone bears on elk. The WSU Grizzly Bear Center has evaluated the dietary requirements of the bears and should be consulted on food supply requirements..
Take what ever time is necessary to complete research for the sake of bears and people.
Thank You,



Correspondence ID: 11464Project:112008Document:132104

Address: San Francisco, CA 94132
United States of America

Outside Organization: Wilderness Watch Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 12:48:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears belong in the North Cascades, and there should not be any human intervention ever. Helicopters and other human activities to monitor and control them is not wilderness. I oppose any interventions by people. Let them be free and unmolested.

Sincerely,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 11466Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98106
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 12:50:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am against the reintroduction of Grizzly bears west of the Cascades as it puts at risk the hikers and individuals that enjoy the outdoors. Grizzly bears are substantially more dangerous and aggressive toward people. I would argue that if the NPS reintroduces these bears they should be held liable for and people that are maimed or killed and livestock that is killed.

This would not have been the case before their reintroduction, but since the NPS would be taking an active role and changing the current status quo, they should be held liable for those actions.

Please vote for Alternative A. No action.

Correspondence ID: 11467Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98501
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 12:50:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The Grizzly Bear Restoration is a HORRIBLE idea. Our family also has a large ranch in MT and the bears are out of control. Feel free to pull up data on Powell County! A camper who was riding her bike through the area literally had her head ripped off. At brandings we have multiple calves w bear bit marks on them we had to treat. A ranger was killed this summer in Glacier and they had to shut down. There are too many bears and now numerous attacks on humans and animals. Let nature do it's thing, the wolf re-introduction back fired in MT too and now our family is legally hunting them with the re-introduction.

The government paid to put bear fencing around our friends home so their kids were ok in their own yard, when they go feed cattle it is dangerous. My sister just had bears in her back pasture out where we had kids playing a week prior.

We do NOT need Grizzly in WA!

Correspondence ID: 11468Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bainbridge Island, WA 98110
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 12:52:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly support the reintroduction of grizzlies to the forested regions of WA state.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 11470Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Concrete, WA 98237
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 12:58:58

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: On Oct. 31, 2023, the US Fish and Wildlife made a grizzly presentation to the Skagit County Commissioners. At that presentation, Andrew LaValle from the US Fish and Wildlife, was unable to answer the question of the Highway 20 boundary of the North Cascades ecosystem. The picture of the ecosystem from the Draft Proposal shows that the western boundary of the ecosystem, along Hwy 20, is just east of Lyman. The proposed ecosystem would include Concrete, Rockport, and Birdsvew, where farms, ranches and homeowners are already dealing with the Washington Fish and Wildlife's elk population. The elk are a burden to the farmers and homeowners of the area, but the addition of this dangerous predator is asking too much. Any interaction between humans and grizzlies will not turn out well for the human.

The National Park service webpage claims that grizzlies once thrived in the N. Cascades ecosystem. This is misleading. The N. Cascades ecosystem has been so poorly managed, that it no longer really exists. If you dropped grizzly bears into that "empty habitat," (Mr. LaValle's words), they would not thrive. Yes, they would find some huckleberry plants to munch on, but there are few sources of protein. The ungulates have all but disappeared. So where are the bears going to get their protein? You'd think that our abundant salmon would be a logical source, but the Skagit river fish runs have also been mismanaged, so there are few salmon in the river anymore. The easiest source for these opportunistic bears would be domestic pets, barnyard birds, cattle, sheep, and goats.

The N. Cascades ecosystem is already open to the entry of grizzlies from Canada, Montana and Idaho. If the ecosystem could support a thriving population of grizzlies, they would already be there. This proposal is not a viable option for increasing the grizzly population and removing them from the endangered species list.

We cannot introduce more grizzlies into the North Cascades, even under the "preferred" 10j rule. The collar technology is not adequate to the job, as it does not give real-time data on the whereabouts of the bears. And not all grizzlies will be collared, nor do the collars last forever. All actions of the government with these re-introduced grizzlies will be reactive, not proactive. What good will it be to have more tools and flexibility in dealing with the grizzlies if even one person is harmed or killed because of the delay in monitoring their whereabouts? And what about the response time for a grizzly-human interaction? How quickly will the federal government be able to respond? This draft proposal for the re-introduction of the grizzly to the N. Cascades ecosystem has the potential for disaster. The ONLY OPTION IS TO DO NOTHING. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 11471Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Port Orchard, WA 98366
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 13:02:56

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I believe that, despite everyone is entitled to give an opinion, the opinion of people who has lived in Grizzly territory, must have more weight. I know that, because when I first moved into Grizzly Bear territory in Alaska, I was coming directly from a 5 million people city in the Caribbean, and for those who don't know it, there's no grizzlies in the Caribbean, and yes, I was terrified to death to have an encounter with a Grizzly. Bears are usually shy of humans, as long as they hear you coming, they will run away. After a while of living in Alaska, and educating myself about bears, I calmed down, I never lost the fear of a bear encounter completely of course, but I wasn't stressing about it either. One of the things that caught my attention while living in Alaska, was Moose roaming streets of the city of Anchorage, where I lived. I asked the locals if they knew why was that, and they told me, "They know that Bears and Wolves" don't like to go into populated

areas where humans live, they stay away from us.

So, in conclusion with my comment, if the new comers of Darrington are stressing about the re-introduction of Grizzlies in Washington State, educate yourself a little bit and relax, even though, at the end I wanted to, p I never got to see a Grizzly once in all the years I lived in Alaska.

Correspondence ID: 11472Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America
Outside Organization: same Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,06 2023 13:03:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Select Alternative A

The process is severely flawed.

How to reintroduce the Grizzly, not whether to reintroduce at all - usurps public opinion.

Alternative C has been identified as the preferred alternative. Thus, indicating that the agencies have already made up their minds, and not listening to the public comment.

The process has been under the radar, thus minimizing the opportunity for public review.

There is no quantifying of public opinion, just a general sense of responses. Since the action effects all of the State of Washington (except the NE lower Selkirks) a standard 7 percent population sample size is necessary (550,000 responses). The accumulation of meeting numbers and comments is woefully inadequate.

There is no designation as to who/agency will make the final decision (re: Wayne Kasworm, Montana biologist). This hinders the publics opportunity to respond.

Agency facts and responses have been distorted biasing in favor of the agency's position. Impacting full disclosure to the Public (ie that RCW 77.12.035 is a Washington State Law that prohibits the reintroduction of the Grizzly,

Human and domestic animal conflict is woefully understated. Suggesting that visitors will increase to see grizzlies in the wild - ludicrous.

Correspondence ID: 11473Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Chevy Chase, MD 20815
United States of America
Outside Organization: none Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,06 2023 13:08:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hi,

My name is Elizabeth Brandt, I am originally from Whatcom County, Washington. My family has lived in Whatcom County for more than 100 years, spending most of that time farming around Lynden, Washington. My grandmother also worked for the Mt. Baker National Forest. I am in support of reintroducing Grizzly Bears to the North Cascades area.

Apex predators create balance in nature. Where I currently live, in Maryland, we totally lack this balance and struggle with deer overpopulation and tick borne diseases. Many people are concerned about the potential brutality of bears, particularly ranchers, but this has led to a different brutality- a systematic elimination of an important species in the North Cascades ecosystem.

For years I lived alongside a large Grizzly population in Sitka, Alaska. The bears taught us to be mindful of how we stored

trash, where we cleaned fish, and where we ate in campsites, but they were in no way a menace that struck fear in our hearts. I would often smell the grizzlies when I was out hiking, but I quickly learned that they avoid people nearly all the time. I am surprised by how frequently I saw bear sign and how infrequently I saw bears.

I think that choosing an option for flexible reintroduction that helps surrounding communities accept the return of Grizzlies is a good thing- largely because I don't think the plan will be enacted if people fear that bears will freely roam farms and mainstreets wreaking havoc. Fear is a real barrier here, and ranchers can at times have an outsize voice in land use decisions. Please do make the concessions needed to help people accept this program- but also please move quickly to reestablish Grizzlies in their North Cascades home.

Thanks,

Correspondence ID: 11474Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Burlington, WA 98233
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 13:09:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support having an Apex Predator to control the elk population affecting the North Cascades. It is imperative to have the latest tracking technology in place to give control over potentially affected cattle and human interactions. On-going monitoring and avenues for reporting unwanted movement into human population areas and working cattle ranches must be considered and acted upon immediately!.

Correspondence ID: 11475Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: same Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 13:10:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Select Alternative A

The EIS is inadequate, and full of supposition. Where is the scientific study and research?.

Correspondence ID: 11476Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 13:11:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The EIS does not contain estimated population loss and displacement impacts on humans and on other wildlife. There is a significant population of mule deer in the Methow valley area which has declined in recent years calling for a restriction on winter activities in many popular snowmobile and x-country ski areas. The population is stressed and would be stressed further by introducing any new predators into the ecosystem. The EIS fails to address the impact on mule deer and other wildlife. Refer to the Early Winters EIS 19900047 as an example were a considerable amount of effort was focused on mule deer impacts and mitigation.

Recent articles published by bear experts in the northern Rockies indicate fatalities are estimated at about 11.5% of all human-grizzly encounters. The 2022 GBRP Annual Report includes many points about recovery goals and criteria but does not report on human-bear interaction occurrences or fatalities. The EIS should include goals including maximum estimated encounter and fatality rates in order to provide an accurate and complete picture of impacts.

It is my understanding that pre- and post-hibernation activity generally involves bulking up on food sources. This would

coincide with some of the mule deer migration and would occur when the mule deer are concentrated in the valley heading to or from their winter range. Deer salvage permit information from the state of Washington, and warning signs regarding deer kill and nighttime 45 mph speed limits document the prevalence of deer in populated areas. Dead deer are likely to attract the bears down to the roadways. One specific example follows.

I personally experienced having a horse die in the middle of an outfitters camp. It collapsed and died just as darkness fell on the camp. There was nothing to be done that evening so a tarp was laid over the horse. Before the next morning, a grizzly sniffed out the horse, removed the tarp and was having a nice breakfast a few yards away from a group of people.

I would not recommend the forced reintroduction and would prefer allowing it to occur naturally. However, that is a preference and since we are not voting on this I would ask that you please consider allowing this to happen naturally. At the very least include the omitted impacts noted above so that everyone understands what the estimated cost will be in terms of other wildlife and human injuries and casualties.

Correspondence ID: 11478Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 13:19:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in agreement with bringing grizzly bears into the North Cascades. I have done dozens of camping and other travels in the region and believe the risk to people from bears is very minimal. Usually, the " bear problems " I have heard of are most often a result of people's poor actions. To me, they are part of nature and belong there. Thank you for taking the time and efforts to restore these beautiful animals to our area.

Correspondence ID: 11483Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Westlake Village, CA 91361
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 13:26:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: 2. As someone who frequently hikes, the thought of an increased grizzly bear population in the North Cascades is concerning. Observing the events in places like Montana and Idaho, it's clear that more bears can lead to more dangers. Grizzlies have every opportunity to migrate from BC or Idaho without human intervention. I urge you to let nature dictate its path.

3. The North Cascades have always been a haven for outdoor enthusiasts like me. It's come to my attention that grizzly bears already exist in this range, as noted by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. Introducing more would not only threaten the fragile mule deer population but also increase the risk for those of us who love the outdoors. I'm against any plans to reintroduce grizzlies in Washington.

4. The recent incident in Stevens County, where a grizzly bear was captured, is a testament to the growing predator challenges in Washington. Our state is already grappling with managing wolves, cougars, black bears, and more. Considering the strain on our ungulate populations, I cannot support the idea of reintroducing grizzlies into the state.

5. I felt compelled to voice my concerns about the potential reintroduction of grizzly bears in Washington. It's undeniable that grizzlies are already making their way into the state from neighboring regions. The absence of physical barriers means they can migrate naturally. Given the state's challenges in managing its existing wildlife, introducing another apex predator seems counterproductive.

6. The American Bear Foundation of Washington has always been at the forefront of advocating for bear welfare. Yet, we cannot support the reintroduction of the grizzly bear. The state already hosts this formidable predator. With the challenges the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife faces in managing the rising numbers of black bear, cougar, and wolves,

introducing a larger and more aggressive predator seems like a step in the wrong direction.

7. As a regular visitor to the North Cascades, the potential increase in grizzly bear population is alarming. The incidents in states like Wyoming serve as a cautionary tale. With no barriers preventing grizzlies from migrating from places like BC, it's best to let nature take its course.

8. The beauty of the North Cascades has always drawn me in. However, the knowledge that grizzly bears are already present, as confirmed by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, makes me apprehensive. Introducing more would jeopardize not only the mule deer but also the safety of countless individuals. I'm firmly against the reintroduction proposal.

9. The recent capture of a grizzly bear in Stevens County underscores the challenges Washington faces with its predator populations. With the existing issues surrounding wolves, black bears, and cougars, it seems imprudent to consider adding grizzlies to the mix. I strongly advise against this reintroduction.

10. The presence of grizzly bears migrating into Washington from places like BC and Idaho is undeniable. Without any physical barriers, they can naturally inhabit the state. Given the difficulties in managing the current wildlife populations, I believe it's in the best interest to refrain from reintroducing more apex predators.

11. The American Bear Foundation of Washington is unequivocal in its position: reintroducing the grizzly bear is not in the best interest of the state. The challenges posed by the increasing numbers of black bear, cougar, and wolves are evident. Introducing a predator of the grizzly's stature would exacerbate these challenges, putting both humans and wildlife at risk.

12. The American Bear Foundation of Washington wishes to express its reservations about reintroducing grizzly bears to the North Cascades. Recent events, such as the grizzly incident in Stevens County, highlight the existing challenges. We advocate for natural migration and believe that the current pressures on our wildlife, especially ungulates, make this reintroduction inadvisable.

13. As a frequent visitor to the North Cascades, the idea of more grizzly bears is concerning. The experiences of states like Montana and Idaho serve as a warning. Grizzlies can naturally migrate from neighboring regions, so I believe we should let nature take its course.

14. The North Cascades offer a unique experience for outdoor lovers. However, the presence of grizzly bears, as confirmed by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, poses a threat. Introducing more bears could harm the mule deer population and increase risks for visitors. I'm against this reintroduction.

15. The recent grizzly bear incident in Stevens County is a clear indication of the challenges we face with predators in Washington. Our state is already stretched thin managing various predators. Given the pressures on our ungulate populations, reintroducing grizzlies seems unwise.

16. I'm writing to express my concerns about reintroducing grizzly bears in Washington. Their natural migration from regions like BC and Idaho is evident. With the state's current wildlife management challenges, adding another apex predator seems ill-advised.

17. The American Bear Foundation of Washington believes that reintroducing the grizzly bear is not in the state's best interest. The challenges posed by the rising numbers of other predators are evident. Introducing grizzlies would only add to these challenges, endangering both humans and wildlife.

18. The North Cascades are a haven for many, but the potential reintroduction of grizzly bears raises safety concerns. The incidents in states like Wyoming are a testament to the risks. Grizzlies can naturally migrate from nearby regions, so human intervention seems unnecessary.

19. The North Cascades are a sanctuary for many outdoor activities. However, the existing grizzly bear population, as noted by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, is already a concern. Adding more bears could jeopardize the mule deer and increase risks for visitors. I oppose this move.

20. The grizzly bear situation in Stevens County highlights the predator challenges in Washington. With the existing predator population and the pressures on our ungulate herds, reintroducing grizzlies seems counterproductive.

21. I wish to voice my concerns about the potential reintroduction of grizzly bears in Washington. Their presence, migrating from regions like BC and Idaho, is already noticeable. Given the state's wildlife management challenges, reintroducing more apex predators is concerning.

22. The American Bear Foundation of Washington is clear in its position: reintroducing the grizzly bear poses significant challenges. The state's current predator management issues are evident. Introducing grizzlies would exacerbate these issues, putting both humans and wildlife at risk.

23. The potential reintroduction of grizzly bears in the North Cascades is alarming for many of us who frequent the area. The experiences of states like Montana serve as a cautionary tale. Grizzlies have every opportunity to migrate naturally, so human intervention seems unwarranted.

24. The North Cascades are a favorite for many outdoor enthusiasts. However, the presence of grizzly bears, as confirmed by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, is concerning. Introducing more bears could harm the mule deer population and increase risks for visitors. I'm against this proposal.

Correspondence ID: 11484Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,06 2023 13:28:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Its about time to bring back the Grizzly!

I would suggest contacting Doug Peacock who has had over 1000 encounters with Grizzly's and has never been injured.

Humans need to be responsible in the wild. If you go there learn what to do to NOT see a bear at all.

Bring em back!

DO IT!

Correspondence ID: 11492Project:112008Document:132104
Address: North Bend, WA 98045
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,06 2023 13:44:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I favor the re-introduction of grizzly bears in the NEP and I slightly favor Alternative C over Alternative B.

Correspondence ID: 11494Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Portland, OR 97201
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,06 2023 13:51:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As an avid hiker who enjoys the NCNP I am in full support of returning this species to the ecosystem we pushed them out of. As hikers we should be prepared for the inherent dangers of the wilderness we are recreating in to include the wildlife population. Thank you for working on restoring them.

Correspondence ID: 11504Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Glen Rock, NJ 07452
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 14:09:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please allow re-introduction of grizzly bears into the North Cascades! This was original grizzly bear habitat, they were here until humans eradicated them from this (and most parts) of the contiguous US. Grizzlies play an important part in the natural balance of ecosystems where they are allowed to live, and re-introduction will benefit the entirety of the Cascades. I also support treating all grizzlies in the US as a threatened species, including those that are re-introduced to this area..

In addition, a large majority of Washington State residents agree with me! Grizzly bears should be preserved for future generations in the North Cascades Mountains.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 11508Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Longview, WA 98632
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 14:18:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I feel that Alternative C is the best option for restoring grizzly bears to the North Cascades. This allows the Fish and Wildlife Service to designate the bears to the US portion of the North Cascades and be considered a nonessential experimental population in which the FWS can then determine whether they are essential or nonessential to the survival of their species. Designating the bears to the North Cascades allows for the advancement of recovery objectives by providing an opportunity to reestablish a self-sustaining grizzly bear population. Although Alternative B could be a good option, Alternative C combines the management tools presented by Alternative B and adds many other beneficial tools like authorizing deterrence, research and recovery actions, relocation of grizzly bears and many more. Alternative A also just does not seem like it would be very beneficial to the survival of grizzly bears as it would be reliant upon the natural recovery of the species. Since humans have pushed them further and further out of their natural habitat, it seems only right to reintroduce them back into the North Cascades rather than waiting on them to repopulate it themselves. Using Alternative C will have the most benefits in ensuring the grizzly bears will benefit the ecosystem and their species population.

Correspondence ID: 11509Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kailua, HI 96734
United States of America

Outside Organization: -- Select -- Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 14:19:12

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm concerned about bears from other locations being removed from their homes as "experiments ". They would be then vulnerable to being killed if conflicts with humans or livestock develops. This seems like a really bad idea.

Correspondence ID: 11515Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Prosser, WA 99350
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 14:26:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am not in favor of releasing grizzly bears anywhere in Washington state. This would be a horrible decision in so many ways, destruction of property, livestock predation and ultimately attacks on human life. We do not need them here!

Correspondence ID: 11518Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bothell, WA 98011
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 14:42:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is absolutely terrifying as a smaller woman who hikes alone. However, if they belong in the ecosystem and we are the reason they are gone. I support reintroducing them. Bear spray is expensive, but definitely necessary if they are reintroduced.

Correspondence ID: 11534Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Concrete, WA 98237
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 15:16:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: When I first heard this proposal about two years ago I just assumed it was somewhere east of Diablo, bordering on Canada, deep in the Okanagan wilderness ... I thought, maybe mark off some territory for "hikers to beware" and "East of Lyman" makes me think someone at their desk doesn't realize people live & work in the east valley and reminds me of shopping in Mt. Vernon with the store owner saying, "Where's Concrete?" I'm totally against this plan for the following reasons:

- 1) Grizzlies don't want to live in my backyard & I imagine they'd be confused if not downright upset to find themselves placed here.
- 2) This is the Skagit Valley, the pride of which is our farming industry. Are you trying to force them into bankruptcy or is this the long range plan to reduce the elk population, if the Grizzlies can beat the cougars & Wolves to that food source?
- 3) too expensive with little to no chance of success for the Grizzly

I vote NO on this proposal.

Correspondence ID: 11535Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98118
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 15:16:45

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Just wanted to state that I'm in favor of grizzly reintroduction !

Correspondence ID: 11536Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 15:17:08

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Well you've definitely put the cart before the horse. Ive read the documents provided and introducing bears into an environment that has a depleted food source is a terrible idea. Based on the data and documentation provided.

When grizzly bears were in the North cascades, the amount of fish and game was abundant. It's not anymore. There very few deer, no caribou, few elk, few moose, no bison and few fish. How about reintroducing the elk, caribou, moose, bison etc? And then when those species become sustainable re-re-evaluate bringing grizzly bears? Seems logical, right? It's just senseless bringing bears into an area with limited food and expecting them to flourish even considered.

I've lived in the Methow for over 60 years. It's an obvious divide of those in favor of Bears and those not in favor. The large majority of this in favor of the bears have moved to the Methow within the past 5-10 years. They have little knowledge of the area or concern for the animals still here. And those who oppose the bears are most often long time residents who do have a knowledge of the are and care about the negative effects the bears will have on the other animals in this area.

Correspondence ID: 11537Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tacoma, WA 98422
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 15:19:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I grew up camping and hiking in the North Cascades. Grizzly bears are DANGEROUS!! They were eradicated for a reason!!! Please DO NOT reintroduce them to the North Cascades! You are putting hikers, campers, fisherman and livestock at risk.

Look at the effects Idaho had from reintroducing wolves 25 years ago. Not good results. Elk and deer populations are down, farmers and ranchers are still dealing with these predators that we also ERADICATED FOR A REASON!

NO GRIZZLY BEARS FOR WASHINGTON STATE. They can stay in Alaska. Visitors to Alaska wilderness areas are required to take a mandatory bear safety class-for a reason!! Bears are dangerous, especially grizzly's.

Correspondence ID: 11539Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Old Fort, TN 37362
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 15:22:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in full support of the reintroduction of Grizzly Bears into North Cascades. When done properly, the bears can have a life where they once thrived and be able to coexist with humans and other native species. Many reintroductions of native species have been very successful and this one should be no different.

Correspondence ID: 11540Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wasilla, AK 99623
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 15:22:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: A Grizzly transplant is entirely unwarranted. Humans have taken over top tier of the food chain in the area.

Their is no room or need for an apex predator in the area.

Correspondence ID: 11541Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Curlew, WA 99118
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 15:23:10

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm not sure I would want to take my family for a wilderness camping experience in an area that has even 2 much less 200 grizzlies. Not everyone is or can expected to be a seasoned woodsman or camper so it is likely there will be more bear attacks as a consequence of reintroducing this animal. My guess is that more bears will ultimately mean fewer back country visitors. Admittedly, it's a romantic thought to imagine an environment that existed in the 1700 and 1800, but that is not reality and never will be. Too many variables and too many people influences. I support no reintroducing grizzlies in the north cascades. Let them migrate in from Canada.

I was once a strong supporter of ESA but have since watched it morph into a muddled program shaped by self serving court cases, poor science, contradictory and ineffectual management schemes and horrendous public cost to the government and to land owners who have had to deal with it. It needs not to be repealed but reworked to address these short comings.

Thank you for allowing comment. Put me on your mailing list.

Correspondence ID: 11542Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Millersville, MD 21108
United States of America

Outside Organization: Saint Francis University Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 15:26:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am currently taking a class on Wolves, Bears, Whales and Coyotes. We are learning just how important these species are to the environment. So hearing about projects such as this are amazing to hear. Having an environment for the bears is an amazing project and I hope others will support this project. Bears should have their environment protected and expanded. I hope to hear more of this project in the future.

Correspondence ID: 11547Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Eugene, OR 97401
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 15:35:48

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I agree with the following pts that Wilderness Watch presents. Any reintroduction needs to be as natural as possible and good for wilderness and bears.

*I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

*Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

*I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

*Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

*A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting

Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

*For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

*An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

*The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 11548Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Poulsbo, WA 98370
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 15:39:10

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the no action alternative in the plan. Grizzlies have been protected in NCCP for 55 years as well as surrounding wilderness areas. They have had access to repopulate this area from Canada to the north. And yet, they haven't. There must be a good reason. Perhaps thi
Could it be that this area is to small to support a population of
grizzly bears without
significant adverse interaction with hikers, back road bicyclists, farmers and
hunters. I think forcing the reintroduction of these large carnivores is a mistake
and a recipe for disaster.

Correspondence ID: 11551Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America

Outside Organization: retired SPS teacher Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 15:53:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am opposed to the current grizzly reintroduction plan to the US portion of the NCE due to my concerns for the well-being of the bears and humans. The 10(j) designation will increase the likelihood of bears being killed since the 10(j) bears will not have the full protection of an ESA species. I'm also concerned about the potential for dangerous and potentially fatal human-bear interactions. The trails in the North Cascades are crowded as evidenced by how hard it is to find solitude on trails along highway 20 for example. Recreationalists in the NCE are generally not grizzly aware which will increase the potential for human mistakes in such things as safe food storage. While the NCE is a historical habitat for grizzlies, the bears do have significant protected habitat in many other areas of the western US, Alaska, and Canada. I believe our focus should be on protecting current grizzly habitat and bear populations and not setting up a situation with potential harm to both bears and humans.

Correspondence ID: 11554Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spokane, WA 99203
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 15:56:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Yes, although the North Cascade Ecosystem was historically grizzly habitat, I am opposed to transplanting grizzly bears into the North Cascades Ecosystem. The grizzly bear population in the North Cascades Ecosystem is in the process of a slow natural recovery. I am 70 years old. Occasional sightings of grizzlies in the North Cascades is not a new thing in my lifetime. Grizzly bears are able to move into the North Cascades Ecosystem via British Columbia and northern (north eastern) Washington.

The North Cascades Ecosystem being predominantly wilderness will allow for the eventual reestablishment of a stable grizzly bear population without intervention. Proponents for transplantation of grizzly bears into the North Cascades appear to be impatient, unwilling to wait for natural re-population. The effort should be directed to planning for this re-population and answering questions such as:

- (1) What is the best way to deal with the interaction of the bears with humans who recreate in the Ecosystem?
- (2) What is the best way to deal with bears that will travel into populated areas surrounding the Ecosystem?
- (3) What is the best way to maintain the connection of the North Cascades grizzly population with adjacent populations by optimizing the bears' ability to migrate into and out of the Ecosystem?

I have hiked, backpacked, climbed and photographed in the North Cascades since 1974. I feel that forcing a change on the grizzly population by transplanting bears from places like Montana, Idaho or Wyoming in the Northern Rockies Ecosystem is a bad idea for the following reasons:

- (1) Plans for transplantation call for many helicopter flights over Wilderness Areas, and into Wilderness Areas which violates the Wilderness Act.
- (2) A ridiculous amount of money would need to be spent. Does this only serve to appease those who want grizzlies in the Ecosystem immediately? Surely the agencies have other needs where funds are needed with a much higher priority. As a taxpayer, I am opposed to the use of tax dollars for grizzly transplantation in the North Cascades Ecosystem.
- (3) The North Cascades Ecosystem is heavily used for recreation, especially by people who live in the nearby population centers in the Puget Sound area. Although I have spent many days and nights in Wilderness Areas in the Northern Rockies, and treasure the fact that the Northern Rockies are inhabited by grizzly bears, I appreciated the wildness of the North Cascades without the risk of likely grizzly encounters.
- (4) In comparison to the northern Rockies, there is limited grizzly habitat in the North Cascades Ecosystem, and therefore the North Cascades Ecosystem cannot support a large population of grizzlies.
- (5) Natural migration allows for bears to be more naturally acclimatized to the geography and environment of the North Cascades, which are substantially different from the Rocky Mountains.
- (6) Increasing the population of grizzly bears by transplantation will create a situation where bears travel into populated areas that surround the North Cascades Ecosystem. There is not a good buffer around the North Cascades.
- (6) I believe that managers will feel that troublesome bears, bears that have become habituated to human presence and food, from the Northern Rockies can be relocated to the North Cascades.

Please allow for natural processes to occur without intervention!

Correspondence ID:	11555Project:112008Document:132104
Address:	spokane, WA 99207 United States of America
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual
Received:	Nov,06 2023 15:57:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The DEIS for the Grizzly Bear Recovery Plan provides a good overview of the outcomes following the different recovery plans. I think it does a good job of explaining the impact that the recovery plans would have on the ecosystems and people visiting the park, which is ultimately the goal of this report. I think that option C seems like the best plan offered. While it is very similar to B and has the same socioeconomic impacts due to the same number of bears being released, it has more room to manage and minimize human-grizzly conflicts with both lethal and non-lethal measures. Option C would also reduce the costs of implementation and the impacts on businesses like ranches nearby. Other than this, the impacts on public safety would also be the same under both B and C. I think that having more available measures to mitigate these conflicts is very important to people who reside in the areas or who recreate in the forests and would encourage more support for grizzly bear recovery given that there might be less impact on humans. I think the increased safety of this while also still encouraging and providing education of bear safety is extremely important following this recovery plan. In addition to these comments, my main concern or question is on the effect of the transportation on both the people involved in transport and the wildlife affected by it. The case recognized that the noise and the helicopter might be distressing to mammals in the area but did not offer any solutions or ways to mitigate this impact. I also am not sure how the bears will be trapped and transported and if this will be dangerous for those involved and whoever is flying the helicopter. I think these are important questions to be addressed when creating the plan and deciding what to choose. Ultimately, I think this is a good and very detailed outline that addresses the impacts of each alternative and I think that alternative C might be the most effective and safest option.

Correspondence ID: 11556Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Burlington, WA 98233
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 15:58:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I oppose the introduction of Grizzly bears into the North Cascades.

It is a dangerous, expensive and unnecessary plan.

If it were to go forward, people and domesticated animals would be put in jeopardy, governmental agencies would have another impossible monitoring task, and the elk problem is already uncontrollable,

I completely oppose this plan.

Correspondence ID: 11558Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Richland, WA 99352
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 16:04:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm against Grizzly Bears being re-introduced to Washington.

It will be costly and the cost will be born mostly by the residents of Washington and not by everyone. This is not only foolish it is unfair.

Correspondence ID: 11559Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98144
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 16:07:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm a parent who cares about wildlife, and I want my children to experience grizzly bears as an important part of our regional culture. I have many memories from childhood seeing grizzlies in the wild and I would like my children as well as all other children to have a similar opportunity for such an experience.

Correspondence ID: 11560Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 16:10:52

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzlies are a part of this land's natural ecology and should be returned. Consider it reparations. Fear if them -- which is outsized compared to true risk -- should not be a factor. Humans must learn to Luce with and share our wild spaces.

Correspondence ID: 11561Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Stillwater, OK 74074
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 16:11:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello! I was wondering what I, as a citizen, can do to help support this restoration project? I have heard that some elected officials are seeking to prevent the reintroduction, so I am concerned that the project will get struck down. What can I do to help even though I'm half the country away?

Correspondence ID: 11563Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tonasket, WA 98855
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 16:16:12

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Prefer the release of grizzlies to be on the West side of the Cascades where I'm sure most of the desire is for the big old sweet fuzzies. In other words, not in my back yard please.

Correspondence ID: 11578Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mt Vernon, WA 98273
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 16:45:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is simply an outrageous grizzlies would cause a humongous. I have lived in Alaska in the interior and the bear attack was a constant threatThe city folksthat think they are pretty or cute are right but they need to decided if it would be a good idea to have them in their backyard.

Correspondence ID: 11581Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellevue, WA 98008
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 16:55:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Humans are the reason there are no grizzly bears in the Cascades. Therefore, it is our responsibility to protect them by safely reintroducing them to Washington. We will promote conservation efforts for the species and by bringing back a crucial animal we will help the ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 11583Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Everett, WA 98208
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,06 2023 16:57:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We already have plenty of wildlife. Why introduce an apex predator where people like to hike? If people want to see grizzly bears, share a fish, berry or snack or lunch from home with them, send them to enjoy that in the Olympics! There are grizzly bears there. For the rest of us, who are not comfortable with a grizzly bear mauling, attack or death, please politely refrain from the insanity of introducing grizzlies into the Cascades. No thank you.

Correspondence ID: 11587Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Quincy, WA 98848
United States of America
Outside Organization: Hadley Properties Business(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,06 2023 17:16:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am opposed to reintroducing grizzly bears to Washington State and urge you to avoid doing this.

Just this past weekend, a friend who lives in Alaska showed me photos of a grizzly bear that tried to get into his cabin and that he had to drop for the protection of his family.

It is undisputed that these animals and people do not co-exist well. Although Washington is part of the historical range of these animals, that was a long time ago when the human population was much lower. Reintroducing them now ignores this reality and will lead to a loss of human lives, of bear lives, and of livestock lives.

Correspondence ID: 11590Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Coupeville, WA 98239
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,06 2023 17:19:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: This is a terrible idea. Downright terrible. Has Washington state not learned anything from its failed attempts at bringing wolves back? Promising locals that there won't be any issues and then having to turn around and cull wolves on the tax payers dime for something you guys did in the first place? To the point where the derelict that window licker Jay Inslee who has no experience in wildlife biology what so ever stepped in and said you guys need to figure out how to solve the wolf problem without killing anymore.

Yes wolves and grizzlies "WERE" native to the state. But it has developed a ecosystem that has gotten used to not having those animals in them. Then when you "reintroduce" them you're throwing the balance of the ecosystem off. Reintroduction doesn't make them native....that makes them invasive. The damage that wolves have done to this state should already be evident enough that is potential for catastrophe. I'm 35 now and have been hunting in this state since I was 13. And I have seen what wolves have done to the game population over in Eastern Washington. The mule deer that used to be abundant over there have gotten scarce. And the fact that there has already been vast problems with wolves and human interaction, why would you create a situation to only create more problems? You guys have already proven incapable of controlling a plan you created once before so why do it again?

Correspondence ID: 11592Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Arlington, WA 98223
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,06 2023 17:32:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am very much against introducing grizzlies into my local wilderness areas. The other bears black brown etc will be displaced and cause more problems in the neighborhood than they already do. Recreational activities which is a major reason I even live in the greater Darrington area will be impacted greatly. I have zero wishes to live and recreate amongst the grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 11593Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kingston, WA, WA 98346
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 17:40:03

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support reintroduction of the bears. I know this presents some risks and challenges. I own livestock and this year lost a prize doe to a cougar. I have to take some responsibility but I did not know there was a cougar roaming locally and due to neighbors shooting illegal fireworks constantly for days I had brought my farm dog inside.

What I would like to see included in Alternative C is assistance provided to those that do raise livestock to include education as well as financial assistance (low cost loans?) for equipment to deter bears. This might include perimeter alarms, fencing, bear spray systems, etc. I train animals and I know that one way to reduce risk to all is to create a system that teaches the bears that humans, livestock, and pets are a poor choice. We live in an age where there are more alternatives for protection from a rogue or errant bear or cougar. I also believe that serious investigations and penalties should be applied for the shooting of bears since there will be the yahoo that tries to claim they were protecting themselves when in fact they are out looking to bag a bear.

Thanks

Correspondence ID: 11594Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Three Rivers, CA 93271
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 17:43:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I totally support the plan to bring grizzly bears into the North Cascade Mountains. The grizzly bears have lived in the North Cascades for thousands of years with the Native American people. I support the alternative B method but I also support the alternative C method if it helps restore the grizzly bears to the North Cascade Mountains. Grizzly bears are an important animal that helps the North Cascade mountains ecosystem thrive and prosper. Grizzly bears interact with all the other plants and animals to bring balance and health to the natural world. The North Cascade ecosystem is all connected. There is a tremendous amount of land area that has all the animals and plants for the grizzly bears to eat and live. There is plenty of space in the North Cascades for the grizzly bears to be away from people. Grizzly bears in Glacier National Park and surrounding areas has been very successful with lots of people visiting the park to see these beautiful animals. The tourism to see the North Cascade grizzly bears would help Washington States economy. I believe the grizzly bears can be managed safely because they are managed all over the world in many countries. People need to know the grizzly bear if they live or travel in land occupied by grizzly bears. In order to be safe, people need to stay away from mother bears with cubs, stay away from dead animals, human and pet foods need to be kept away from bears as well as dogs and pets. People should never run from a bear and they should travel in a group with bear spray. A grizzly bear should not be threatened. Grizzly bears fear being hurt because they will die so they avoid people which they view as dangerous unless they have been human conditioned and have lost their fear of people. I believe people can live with the grizzly bears and people can be safe if people learn the precautions and rules to protect themselves. I thank you for doing a DEIS for recovering the grizzly bears to the North Cascade Mountains. I fully support the grizzly bears recovery to the North Cascade Mountains.

Correspondence ID: 11595Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Roy, WA 98580
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,06 2023 17:44:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the: Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Environmental Impact Statement for the North Cascades Ecosystem

As a member of Back Country Horsemen of Washington, I am very concerned with the ability to continue to recreate in the North Cascades should a small population of heavily protected grizzly bears be mechanically moved into the region that we recreate in. The DEIS does not sufficiently analyze the impact to recreation or present any options for how trails can be maintained open in the presence of protections implemented to reduce human-grizzly interactions.

1. The Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail runs through the core habitat and has permitted distance hikers of around 10,000. When considering the other trail users in and along the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE) since this is one of the most populated areas around any bear ecosystem, the use likely exceeds a quarter million visits. However, the DEIS indicates that the use is insignificant. It is very significant and will likely result in many human-bear interactions.
2. The Pacific Northwest National Scenic Trail also runs through the NCE as well as other bear ecosystems to the east, including the Cabinet-Yaak (CYE). The CYE has a more established population of bears but still has resulted with challenges to the very existence of the trail due to the limited number of bears in the CYE (20-40). Opposition to the National Scenic Trail in the recovering bear population area as well as the connecting landscapes between ecosystems has also been expressed by USFWS staff, the same agency putting forth the NCE proposal through which the same trail will pass.
3. Without a more detailed analysis of how to retain the carrying capacity of the trails, trailheads, and campgrounds without resulting in long term or permanent closures, there is no way to effectively review this DEIS.
4. Furthermore, the NPS and USFWS have pointed out that the Canadian counterparts and First Nations are preparing to release grizzly bears in the northern part of the NCE. IF that was the only release point, it would move the core recovery/release area north and away from the more densely human populated areas of Washington State. It also would be in line with Washington State law as well since no bears would be translocated directly into Washington, and there also would be predictability on how many bears are being moved into the entire NCE which overlaps both countries. The BC government has noted that their Recovery Plan is being developed jointly with the USFWS even though this US EIS only addresses the Washington effort.
5. As a trail horse rider in the NCE, I ask that the No Action Alternative be selected. The areas we ride in includes the Mt Baker Snoqualmie National Forest, the Okanogan Wenatchee National Forest including the Pasayten Wilderness, and the North Cascades National Park. We have many horse camps along the boundary of the NCE. We cannot support either Action Alternative without more substantive analysis on impacts to recreation as well as knowing more on the joint planning with Canadian counterparts.

Correspondence ID: 11597Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winlock, WA 98596
United States of America
Outside Organization: BCHW Non-Governmental
Received: Nov,06 2023 17:45:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a trail horse rider in the NCE, I ask that the No Action Alternative be selected. The areas we ride in includes the Mt Baker Snoqualmie National Forest, the Okanogan Wenatchee National Forest including the Pasayten Wilderness, and the North Cascades National Park. We have many horse camps along the boundary of the NCE. We cannot support either Action Alternative without more substantive analysis on impacts to recreation as well as knowing more on the joint planning with Canadian counterparts.

Correspondence ID: 11599Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Owings, MD 20736
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,06 2023 17:48:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please don't reintroduce grizzly bears to the NCE. I would like to go hiking there without constant fear.

Correspondence ID: 11601Project:112008Document:132104

Address: SEATTLE, WA 98118
United States of America

Outside Organization: [REDACTED] Business(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,06 2023 17:50:48

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the: Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Environmental Impact Statement for the North Cascades Ecosystem

As a member of Back Country Horsemen of Washington, I am very concerned with the ability to continue to recreate in the North Cascades should a small population of heavily protected grizzly bears be mechanically moved into the region that we recreate in. The DEIS does not sufficiently analyze the impact to recreation or present any options for how trails can be maintained open in the presence of protections implemented to reduce human-grizzly interactions.

1. The Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail runs through the core habitat and has permitted distance hikers of around 10,000. When considering the other trail users in and along the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE) since this is one of the most populated areas around any bear ecosystem, the use likely exceeds a quarter million visits. However, the DEIS indicates that the use is insignificant. It is very significant and will likely result in many human-bear interactions.
2. The Pacific Northwest National Scenic Trail also runs through the NCE as well as other bear ecosystems to the east, including the Cabinet-Yaak (CYE). The CYE has a more established population of bears but still has resulted with challenges to the very existence of the trail due to the limited number of bears in the CYE (20-40). Opposition to the National Scenic Trail in the recovering bear population area as well as the connecting landscapes between ecosystems has also been expressed by USFWS staff, the same agency putting forth the NCE proposal through which the same trail will pass.
3. Without a more detailed analysis of how to retain the carrying capacity of the trails, trailheads, and campgrounds without resulting in long term or permanent closures, there is no way to effectively review this DEIS.
4. Furthermore, the NPS and USFWS have pointed out that the Canadian counterparts and First Nations are preparing to release grizzly bears in the northern part of the NCE. IF that was the only release point, it would move the core recovery/release area north and away from the more densely human populated areas of Washington State. It also would be in line with Washington State law as well since no bears would be translocated directly into Washington, and there also would be predictability on how many bears are being moved into the entire NCE which overlaps both countries. The BC government has noted that their Recovery Plan is being developed jointly with the USFWS even though this US EIS only addresses the Washington effort.
5. As a trail horse rider in the NCE, I ask that the No Action Alternative be selected. The areas we ride in includes the Mt Baker Snoqualmie National Forest, the Okanogan Wenatchee National Forest including the Pasayten Wilderness, and the North Cascades National Park. We have many horse camps along the boundary of the NCE. We cannot support either Action Alternative without more substantive analysis on impacts to recreation as well as knowing more on the joint planning with Canadian counterparts.

Correspondence ID: 11603Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Gardnerville, NV 89410
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 17:54:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: vote YES !!!

Correspondence ID: 11604Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Prosser, WA 99350
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 18:02:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am against Grizzly Bear introduction. When there are conflicts, and there will be, the consequences fall on the locals while the entities play politics.

Correspondence ID: 11606Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Snohomish, WA 98296
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,06 2023 18:14:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Wildlife was here long before humans. I support returning grizzly bears to Washington!

Correspondence ID: 11607Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Asbury, NJ 08802
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,06 2023 18:20:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Greetings! I am a young person, who cares greatly about safeguarding our beautiful and natural resources. Thank you for all that you do, to ensure that our beautiful wildlife and lands are safeguarded for future generations. In keeping with this, I respectfully ask you to support the reintroduction of grizzly bears in our beautiful area. Many environmentally minded folks are passionate about reintroducing wild carnivores like grizzly bears. They will balance the ecosystem. Thank you for your time and consideration!

Correspondence ID: 11609Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Nordland, WA 98358
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,06 2023 18:24:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the: Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Environmental Impact Statement for the North Cascades Ecosystem
As a member of Back Country Horsemen of Washington, I am very concerned with the ability to continue to recreate in the North Cascades should a small population of heavily protected grizzly bears be mechanically moved into the region that we recreate in. The DEIS does not sufficiently analyze the impact to recreation or present any options for how trails can be maintained open in the presence of protections implemented to reduce human-grizzly interactions. The Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail runs through the core habitat and has permitted distance hikers of around 10,000. When considering the other trail users in and along the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE) since this is one of the most populated areas around any bear ecosystem, the use likely exceeds a quarter million visits. However, the DEIS indicates that the use is insignificant. It is very significant and will likely result in many human-bear interactions. The Pacific Northwest National Scenic Trail also runs through the NCE as well as other bear ecosystems to the east, including the Cabinet-Yaak (CYE). The CYE has a more established population of bears but still has resulted with challenges to the very existence of the trail due to the limited number of bears in the CYE (20-40). Opposition to the National Scenic Trail in the recovering bear population area as well as the connecting landscapes between ecosystems has also been expressed by USFWS staff, the same agency putting forth the NCE proposal through which the same trail will pass. Without a more detailed analysis of how to retain the carrying capacity of the trails, trailheads, and campgrounds without resulting in long term or permanent closures, there is no way to effectively review this DEIS. Furthermore, the NPS and USFWS have pointed out that the Canadian counterparts and First Nations are preparing to release grizzly bears in the northern part of the NCE. IF that was the only release point, it would move the core recovery/release area north and away from the more densely human populated areas of Washington State. It also would be in line with Washington State law as well since no bears would be translocated directly into Washington, and there also would be predictability on how many bears are being moved into the entire NCE which overlaps both countries. The BC government has noted that their Recovery Plan is being developed jointly with the USFWS even though this US EIS only addresses the Washington effort. As a trail horse rider in the NCE, I ask that the No Action Alternative be selected. The areas we ride in includes the Mt Baker Snoqualmie National Forest, the Okanogan Wenatchee National Forest including the Pasayten Wilderness, and the North

Cascades National Park. We have many horse camps along the boundary of the NCE. We cannot support either Action Alternative without more substantive analysis on impacts to recreation as well as knowing more on the joint planning with Canadian counterparts.

Correspondence ID: 11616Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98107
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 18:32:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I would like to express my support for the reintroduction of grizzlies into the Cascades, as an avid hiker, biker, and backpacker in the wilderness of Washington. Having worked and played in Grand Teton National Park for many years, I know first hand the additional burden, responsibility, and fear that comes with exploring in grizzly country. From my education, I also know what a gift is to have the resiliency in an ecosystem that I enjoy visiting, a robustness that comes from the presence of a top predator and keystone species like the grizzly. For too long, managers have curated a "wilderness" for the recreation and preferences of humans. The results of that style of management has been imbalance and degradation of species richness and habitat. With compounding threats of climate change and habitat loss, it's time for bold leadership in natural resources management that prioritizes ecosystem stability and sustainability even in the face of human fear and discomfort. It's time to reintroduce grizzlies to Washington.

Correspondence ID: 11618Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America

Outside Organization: Woodland Park Zoo Conservation/Preservation

Received: Nov,06 2023 18:34:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzlies and black bears are different species, and each species has a unique role to play in nature. We need to maintain as much biodiversity as possible in wild places like the North Cascades in order to keep them resilient, especially given threats from climate change.

Although grizzlies are often thought to be voracious predators, most of their omnivorous diet consists of insects, sedges and leafy vegetation, plant roots, and berries, whose seeds are distributed through their droppings. A large portion of the meat that is consumed by grizzlies comprises ground squirrels and other small mammals, and carrion killed by other predators, such as wolves, or harsh winters. Grizzly bears are prolific diggers in their search for roots and burrowing small mammals, thereby aerating the soil and maintaining vibrant meadows.

Culturally and spiritually, grizzly bears are important to many of the Indigenous peoples in the Pacific Northwest, who have coexisted with grizzlies for thousands of years. We are grateful for the knowledge and deep respect these peoples hold on behalf of grizzly bears, who are often seen as teachers, guides, and symbols of strength and wisdom.

Last, we have a moral obligation to restore grizzlies as a wilderness icon and a key part of our natural heritage.

Correspondence ID: 11621Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mokena, IL 60448
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 18:39:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Great plan. If history indicates that these grand beasts were part of the North Cascades landscape, by all means, do everything possible to make sure that they can successfully come home to their natural environment.

Correspondence ID: 11622Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Maple Valley, WA 98038
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 18:39:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hi there,

My name is [REDACTED] and I support Alternative A the no action alternative in the draft grizzly bear restoration plan. Myself, my family, and friends, horseback ride and hike in the North Cascades. I feel that Grizzly Bears are dangerous animals and the human risk involved in active restoration of the population is not worth the benefit of more Grizzly Bears in that area.

If Grizzly Bears are endangered, then that tells me that they are not overpopulating an area that they would be caught from and relocated to the North Cascades. I feel the more remote a Grizzly Bears habitat the better for the bear and for humans and pets.

Thank you for allowing me to share my opinion.

Correspondence ID: 11624Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Tieton, WA 98947
United States of America
Outside Organization: Back Country Horseman - Member Non-Governmental
Received: Nov,06 2023 18:44:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the: Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Environmental Impact Statement for the North Cascades Ecosystem

As a member of Back Country Horsemen of Washington, I am very concerned with the ability to continue to recreate in the North Cascades should a small population of heavily protected grizzly bears be mechanically moved into the region. It has been my personal experience that grizzly bears already inhabit the North Cascades, apparently moving south out of Canada in small numbers. They are doing just fine to "re-inhabit" the area on their own and do not need government assistance. Further, the DEIS does not sufficiently analyze the impact to recreation or present any options for how trails can be maintained open in the presence of protections implemented to reduce human-grizzly interactions.

1. The Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail runs through the core habitat and has permitted distance hikers of around 10,000. When considering the other trail users in and along the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE) since this is one of the most populated areas around any bear ecosystem, the use likely exceeds a quarter million visits. However, the DEIS indicates that the use is insignificant. It is very significant and will likely result in many human-bear interactions.
2. The Pacific Northwest National Scenic Trail also runs through the NCE as well as other bear ecosystems to the east, including the Cabinet-Yaak (CYE). The CYE has a more established population of bears but still has resulted with challenges to the very existence of the trail due to the limited number of bears in the CYE (20-40). Opposition to the National Scenic Trail in the recovering bear population area as well as the connecting landscapes between ecosystems has also been expressed by USFWS staff, the same agency putting forth the NCE proposal through which the same trail will pass.
3. Without a more detailed analysis of how to retain the carrying capacity of the trails, trailheads, and campgrounds without resulting in long term or permanent closures, there is no way to effectively review this DEIS.
4. Furthermore, the NPS and USFWS have pointed out that the Canadian counterparts and First Nations are preparing to release grizzly bears in the northern part of the NCE. IF that was the only release point, it would move the core recovery/release area north and away from the more densely human populated areas of Washington State. It also would be in line with Washington State law as well since no bears would be translocated directly into Washington, and there also would be predictability on how many bears are being moved into the entire NCE which overlaps both countries. The BC government has noted that their Recovery Plan is being developed jointly with the USFWS even though this US EIS only addresses the Washington effort.
5. I have not seen any report on how the proposed mechanical release of grizzly bears in the NCE supports the North American Wildlife Management Model. I am concerned with the increase of all apex predator populations and the negative effect it is currently having on what was a settled habitat that very successfully provided for all wild species as well as domestic grazing opportunity and relatively safe public recreation. Evidence of predator pits are apparent. Incidents of apex

predator attacks on domestic herds, pets and humans are increasing. I am concerned that an artificial increase of the grizzly population in the NCE will only exacerbate the current challenges.

6. As a trail horse rider in the NCE, I ask that the No Action Alternative be selected. The areas we ride in includes the Mt Baker Snoqualmie National Forest, the Okanogan Wenatchee National Forest including the Pasayten Wilderness, and the North Cascades National Park. We have many horse camps along the boundary of the NCE. We cannot support either Action Alternative without more substantive analysis on impacts to recreation as well as knowing more on the joint planning with Canadian counterparts.

Correspondence ID: 11626Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Port Angeles, WA 98362
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 18:50:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Although the information below was written by BCHW, I wholeheartedly agree with it as I have plans to ride my horses and hike in the areas that could suddenly become a lot more dangerous. These areas ARE used and even one fatality is too much - which will happen.

As a member of Back Country Horsemen of Washington, I am very concerned with the ability to continue to recreate in the North Cascades should a small population of heavily protected grizzly bears be mechanically moved into the region that we recreate in. The DEIS does not sufficiently analyze the impact to recreation or present any options for how trails can be maintained open in the presence of protections implemented to reduce human-grizzly interactions.

1. The Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail runs through the core habitat and has permitted distance hikers of around 10,000. When considering the other trail users in and along the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE) since this is one of the most populated areas around any bear ecosystem, the use likely exceeds a quarter million visits. However, the DEIS indicates that the use is insignificant. It is very significant and will likely result in many human-bear interactions.

2. The Pacific Northwest National Scenic Trail also runs through the NCE as well as other bear ecosystems to the east, including the Cabinet-Yaak (CYE). The CYE has a more established population of bears but still has resulted with challenges to the very existence of the trail due to the limited number of bears in the CYE (20-40). Opposition to the National Scenic Trail in the recovering bear population area as well as the connecting landscapes between ecosystems has also been expressed by USFWS staff, the same agency putting forth the NCE proposal through which the same trail will pass.

3. Without a more detailed analysis of how to retain the carrying capacity of the trails, trailheads, and campgrounds without resulting in long term or permanent closures, there is no way to effectively review this DEIS.

4. Furthermore, the NPS and USFWS have pointed out that the Canadian counterparts and First Nations are preparing to release grizzly bears in the northern part of the NCE. IF that was the only release point, it would move the core recovery/release area north and away from the more densely human populated areas of Washington State. It also would be in line with Washington State law as well since no bears would be translocated directly into Washington, and there also would be predictability on how many bears are being moved into the entire NCE which overlaps both countries. The BC government has noted that their Recovery Plan is being developed jointly with the USFWS even though this US EIS only addresses the Washington effort.

5. As a trail horse rider in the NCE, I ask that the No Action Alternative be selected. The areas we ride in includes the Mt Baker Snoqualmie National Forest, the Okanogan Wenatchee National Forest including the Pasayten Wilderness, and the North Cascades National Park. We have many horse camps along the boundary of the NCE. We cannot support either Action Alternative without more substantive analysis on impacts to recreation as well as knowing more on the joint planning with Canadian counterparts.

Correspondence ID: 11627Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Snohomish, WA 98290
United States of America

Outside Organization: BCHW Non-Governmental

Received: Nov,06 2023 18:51:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing today to voice my opposition to moving Grizzly Bears into the North Cascades. The area is too populated by people living and recreating in the vicinity for there not to be bear/human interactions. I worry that not only human life could be endangered but the Grizzlies too. If such an interaction were to occur and a human were hurt then the bear would have to be found and shot. Your plan seems very shortsighted to me.

Correspondence ID: 11628Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sedro Woolley, WA 98284
United States of America

Outside Organization: Back Country Horsemen of Skagit County Non-Governmental

Received: Nov,06 2023 18:56:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: At this point I must oppose bringing Grizzlies into the North Cascades though we do need Predators for the mismanaged Elk herds that have already been brought in I feel it is going to greatly impact the lives of people who recreate and the North cascades. I'm sorry about Grizzlies losing their territory in the first place but now there are so many people and so few places to recreate I do not feel it's worth the risk.

Correspondence ID: 11632Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 19:10:31

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support Draft Environmental Impact Statement 'Alternative C' as the most comprehensive plan that ensures both active restoration and pragmatic management in recovering the North Cascades grizzly bear.

I also support the proposed 10(j) Rule designating a recovering North Cascades grizzly bear population as Experimental-non-Essential.

Correspondence ID: 11634Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Chelan, WA 98816
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 19:18:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Balancing of ecosystems must be measured also with evidence and data based on outcomes of human/grizzly interaction. North Cascades are highly visited and utilized for recreation, as well as livelihood. I would significantly reconsider hiking and camping in our region especially family trips where grizzlies may be present. Please analyze data on outcomes of interactions when making this decision.

Correspondence ID: 11635Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Port Angeles, WA 98362
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 19:21:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I absolutely support the Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan in the North Cascades! Hopefully this will be successful and then they will need to be protected so that human hunters aren't gunning them down in their hibernation as seems to sometimes be the case in our human dominated world! Also the public visiting the area will need to be educated so that they stay away from them and don't endanger themselves or the bears. Thank you for receiving public comments on this! I really hope that this goes ahead! Other animals have as much right to live and thrive on this planet as the human animals and most of our diverse species are rapidly on their way to extinction! We should help these bears not disappear!

Correspondence ID: 11637Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98136
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 19:26:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have been an avid hiker, climber, and backcountry skier in the North Cascades for over 45 years. I am fully in favor of reintroducing grizzly bears to that part of our state. I believe one of the best ways to promote a robust ecosystem is to have it contain all of the wildlife that historically lived there. Grizzly bears (along with wolves and wolverines) need to have a presence in the North Cascades as they did before their populations were decimated by human prejudice and shortsightedness. I have been fortunate enough to have encountered grizzlies in both Alaska and Yellowstone National Park, and know that with proper respect and caution on our part, we humans can coexist with these magnificent animals.

Correspondence ID: 11639Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Chehalis, WA 98532
United States of America

Outside Organization: Lewis County Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 19:32:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I ride and maintain trails through out the State of washington and Idaho, Why would anyone want to introduce another predator not only to big Game but also Humans,

There is no Big Game left in the State of Washington, so why bring in another predator that will not have anything to eat but bugs and grass, and humans,

The bears do not cross over into the north Cascades and stay because there is nothing to eat, we have people in this country that have to much time on there hands and nothing to do but dream up some idea.

Lets leave things alone and let mother nature take care of its course

Correspondence ID: 11640Project:112008Document:132104

Address: VANCOUVER, WA 98662
United States of America

Outside Organization: BCHW Non-Governmental

Received: Nov,06 2023 19:35:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: You will find the below comments, which are very thoughtful points provided by Back Country Horseman of Washington. My personal thoughts are this: I get habitat restoration and endangered species, but I really don't feel comfortable with taking any action until the impact of human-bear interaction is better addressed. Running into a black bear on a trail is one thing, but a grizzly would be terrifying.

And now the comments from the group (their awareness of hiking & riding habitat is why I joined them BTW):

1. The Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail runs through the core habitat and has permitted distance hikers of around 10,000. When considering the other trail users in and along the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE) since this is one of the most populated areas around any bear ecosystem, the use likely exceeds a quarter million visits. However, the DEIS indicates that the use is insignificant. It is very significant and will likely result in many human-bear interactions.
2. The Pacific Northwest National Scenic Trail also runs through the NCE as well as other bear ecosystems to the east, including the Cabinet-Yaak (CYE). The CYE has a more established population of bears but still has resulted with challenges to the very existence of the trail due to the limited number of bears in the CYE (20-40). Opposition to the National Scenic Trail in the recovering bear population area as well as the connecting landscapes between ecosystems has also been expressed

by USFWS staff, the same agency putting forth the NCE proposal through which the same trail will pass.

3. Without a more detailed analysis of how to retain the carrying capacity of the trails, trailheads, and campgrounds without resulting in long term or permanent closures, there is no way to effectively review this DEIS.

4. Furthermore, the NPS and USFWS have pointed out that the Canadian counterparts and First Nations are preparing to release grizzly bears in the northern part of the NCE. IF that was the only release point, it would move the core recovery/release area north and away from the more densely human populated areas of Washington State. It also would be in line with Washington State law as well since no bears would be translocated directly into Washington, and there also would be predictability on how many bears are being moved into the entire NCE which overlaps both countries. The BC government has noted that their Recovery Plan is being developed jointly with the USFWS even though this US EIS only addresses the Washington effort.

5. As a trail horse rider in the NCE, I ask that the No Action Alternative be selected. The areas we ride in includes the Mt Baker Snoqualmie National Forest, the Okanogan Wenatchee National Forest including the Pasayten Wilderness, and the North Cascades National Park. We have many horse camps along the boundary of the NCE. We cannot support either Action Alternative without more substantive analysis on impacts to recreation as well as knowing more on the joint planning with Canadian counterparts.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 11643Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellevue, WA 98006
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,06 2023 19:48:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hello,

I am very concerned with the National Park plan to introduce grizzly bears into the North Cascade park. The introduction of so many bears will pose a danger to the hiking community. Grizzly attacks are not easily managed with a bear spary. In addition, this will cause closures of some trails when there is Grizzly activity. Overall it will greatly impact the hiking community and will pose danger. Human safety comes first. I don't understand what is the rational of introducing the Grizzlies now and why that many. Possibly consider a staggered approach .

Correspondence ID: 11644Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Port Orchard, WA 98366
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,06 2023 19:51:23
Correspondence Type:Web Form
Correspondence: I support reintroducing the grizzly bears.

Correspondence ID: 11646Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Asbury, NJ 08802
United States of America
Outside Organization: Comeback Farm Organic Produce Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,06 2023 19:52:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hi there! I am a farmer, who cherishes the great outdoors. I greatly appreciate you for all that you do, to ensure our beautiful environment is protected well into the future. Also, I think we can all work together, to ensure that grizzly bears are reintroduced in a way that benefits and balances the ecosystem, while still honoring human needs and

concerns. I appreciate your time and consideration. I support reintroducing Grizzlies to our region. Together, we can ensure that both bears, other wildlife, and human communities can thrive and coexist together. Have a great day.

Correspondence ID: 11647Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Auburn, WA 98002
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,06 2023 19:53:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I OPPOSE the reintroduction of grizzly bears in the North Cascades National Park.

Correspondence ID: 11648Project:112008Document:132104
Address: mukilteo, WA 98275
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,06 2023 19:55:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My favorite area to hike and camp is the North Cascades. I am concerned and am voting NO with re-introducing more grizzlies into the area. There is always a concern about running into a black bear and I do not feel that this re-introduction will be the best for anyone.
I also fear that more people will start carrying guns into the area and then an accident is just waiting to happen.
I think that they will find their way into the area without us adding more and causing more anxiety among hikers and campers.

Thank you,
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 11650Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Marysville, WA 98270
United States of America
Outside Organization: N/A Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,06 2023 19:56:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I believe the responsible reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades will help the biodiversity of the region and ultimately be a positive act. Education of the public in these areas will be critical in the successful reintroduction. I look forward to this reintroduction and, if implemented responsibly and respectfully, expect it to yield many positive results. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 11651Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Kirkland, WA 98033
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,06 2023 19:56:47
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am strongly opposed to reintroducing grizzly bears to the North Cascades. There have been so few ("2 in 42 years") grizzlies killing people in the North Cascades due obviously to the sparse number of them!

If more grizzlies are introduced be prepared for more attacks against humans who hike in large numbers in our wilderness areas in the North Cascades. My late husband and I enjoyed many decades of backpacking and hiking without incident because there were so few grizzlies. Black bears are more timid and safer to be around!

Grizzlies are more lethal than black bears and they consume large quantities of salmon! Considering our very controversial

issue with salmon I cannot fathom why we would allow more grizzlies to consume huge quantities of salmon in our area!

I am totally for "Alternative A" and NOT introducing or transporting grizzlies to our wild and still relatively safe wilderness areas in the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 11652Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mukilteo, WA 98275-4408
United States of America
Outside Organization: Nathan Hart Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,06 2023 20:02:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzlies should be reintroduced to the North Cascades because they are a textbook example of when this type of reintroduction is necessary. We are the reason this key species is not widespread in the Cascades of Washington, and this change occurred during living memory. This species is necessary for proper function of these ecosystems and failure to reintroduce them means these are not truly natural systems. To have a National Park, roadless and presenting the best of our state, with an artificially absent key species, is akin to faking it. Rather than presenting a Disneyland for tourists, we should seek to present as close to natural an environment as possible, which includes an American icon. Yes, there may be rare impacts on humans, but this is what living in the woods, in nature, is. Otherwise, you're just faking it.

Correspondence ID: 11654Project:112008Document:132104
Address: BATTLE GROUND, WA 98604
United States of America
Outside Organization: BCHW Non-Governmental
Received: Nov,06 2023 20:03:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I hike, backpack and ride horses. I will not endanger myself or my animals by taking them into an area inhabited by Grizzly bears.

I do these things in areas inhabited by Black bears, cougars and coyote but not Grizzlies. Grizzlies are too unpredictable.

I have had encounters with Black bears and they always left when they heard my "bear bell" or noticed me. I have been stalked by a

cougar which was scary, but it never attacked. There have been a number of incidents involving Grizzlies in the past few years. The

North Cascades are very rugged and many trails do not allow escape from a predator. Grizzlies inhabit enough areas already. By

introducing them into this area more human bear interactions will be inevitable. This is unnecessary to improve the habitat. Please

reconsider any decisions involving humans and Grizzlies. **DO NOT REINTRODUCE GRIZZLIES INTO THE NORTH CASCADES!**

Correspondence ID: 11655Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Marysville, WA 98271
United States of America
Outside Organization: N/A Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,06 2023 20:05:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think it's a bad idea to reintroduce bears. The Grizzly's are gone for good reason and I believe we should let nature take its course in this case. I believe in game management, stock trout, manage Salmon, Deer, Elk, etc.. Thin out the wolf's and cats so the deer and elk stand a chance and PLEASE don't introduce another predator to out forests.

Correspondence ID: 11657Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Oak Harbor, WA 98277
United States of America

Outside Organization: Self Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 20:06:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I prefer that option A is chosen. That is no new grizzly bears shall be introduced into the North Cascades National Park then those that already exist or those that travel across the border from Canada.

Why:

- 1) hiking, backpacking, climbing in habitat with grizzly bears his totally different than hiking in habitat with black bears. With black bears, the hiker is told to stand tall and noisy and throw rocks to scare away the bear. With grizzlies, the hiker is told to turn sideways to the bear, not making eye contact, be submissive, Mumble quietly as he or she backs away. Obviously the hiker is at far greater risk with a grizzly bear then with the black bear.
 - 2) I have hiked and climbed in the Cascades extensively and have only seen the evidence of one black bear. Similarly, I have hiked in Yosemite and had many encounters with black bears. I have hiked extensively in Canada and Glacier National Park. I know from experience that my risk of harm is much greater with grizzly bears.
 - 3) hiking with a bear canister to minimize the chance of food reward to any kind of bear is totally impractical beyond one overnight for a small hiking party.
 - 4) grizzly bears require far more habitat per bear then do black bears. That area required per bear in the North Cascades, below glacier covered areas does not support 25 imported grizzly bears.
 - 5) realizing that grizzlies will migrate from Canada into the North Cascades National Park, to seek their own equilibrium of habitat available versus number of bears, is the best solution.
 - 6) there used to be grizzly bears on Whidbey Island decades ago. That doesn't mean we have to reintroduce bears there now. Similarly with the North Cascades.
-

Correspondence ID: 11658Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Centralia, WA 98531
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 20:11:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am against re-introducing the Grizzly Bear to our North Cascades. Why add an Apex Predator to an area that many people visit and use for recreation. I don't see a positive to this and if there is one, how can that trump the safety of those that might come in contact with a grizzly while hiking, hunting, camping etc. Please stop this reckless and unnecessary plan. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 11659Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mead, WA 99021
United States of America

Outside Organization: BCH Non-Governmental

Received: Nov,06 2023 20:12:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The Pasayten and North Cascades are a place where we have spent allt of time thru my entire lifetime. There has not been grizzlies in that territory for so long and there is no reason to reintroduce them. The deer population is much lower already than years ago and introducing yet another predator will decimate the wildlife population that us left. We are avid outdoorsman and hunters and have seen the decrease in the deer and elk population in Eastern Washington over the last few years where the wolves have been reintroduced. You can hike the whole weekend and not see a single wikh animal. WOLF tracks are seen everywhere. Not deer. Not elk. nothing. Why reintroduce another large predator where it is not

necessary or needed? Those who love the outdoors want to see wildlife but not feel the need to fear for our lives while out in the wilderness. We strongly vote against the reintroduction of grizzlies in the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 11660Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellevue, WA 98008
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 20:12:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support option A, to not re-introduce grizzly bears to the North Cascades. Even though I am an environmentalist, I disagree that grizzly's should be brought back to historic levels. I have camped and back packed in the North Cascades for decades now and realize this area is becoming more popular every year for novice campers and this will significantly increase in the future. We cannot go back to what it was before people came to the area. Grizzly's aren't as accommodating to hikers as black bears are and grizzly's will displace our black bears. Please use common sense and let the bears come on their own as some will eventually make the journey from Canada. Recognize that times have changed and we cannot go back to the past. Thank you, Jerry

Correspondence ID: 11661Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bonney Lake, WA 98391
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 20:19:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am opposed to the reintroduction of grizzlies in the North Cascades. There are plenty of grizzlies in the US and bringing them to Washington just because they used to be here is irresponsible. Let's not make the same mistake that we made when we reintroduced wolves.

Correspondence ID: 11662Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Maple Valley, WA 98038
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 20:20:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I already do not feel very safe going into the National Parks with the current number of Grisly Bears out there. They are much more aggressive & vicious than the black bears. With Canada bringing more bears to the Cascades they will naturally populate & move south to the more temperate climate of Washington. People like to hike & camp in the wilderness with their families & this will make the bears more accustom to humans, thus bringing them down into civilization looking for food, especially during the drought months & fire season. You are greatly endangering human lives by bringing in more Grisly bears. We already see many Black & Brown bears on homeowners cameras around their homes & communities on social media. People living off the grid will have a very hard time growing food, maintaining their livestock, protecting their families & pets with Grisly Bears all around. What will you do if in 2-4 years we have a hundred or more Grisly Bears coming down from Canada? They live around 20-25 years producing more & more Grisly Bears. WE DO NOT NEED MORE GRISLY BEARS so close to civilization. because they can travel & have a range of 600 square miles. Our state is only 360 miles long & 240 miles wide. They are very intelligent & can smell food from miles away. Our state has enough problems without bringing in Grisly Bears to upset the delicate ecosystem & possibly kill people & their livestock & destroy their possessions. PLEASE reconsider & do not bring any more of these dangerous animals into our state.

Correspondence ID: 11664Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 20:23:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to encourage the State of Washington to move ahead with plans to bring a grizzly bear population to the north cascades. As a life-long resident of Washington, I believe we should make these types of restorations whenever possible. While there are good arguments on both sides of this issue, the presence of these rare animals will do a small favor for the population that we decimated. Everyone should be bear savvy, and grizzlies in the north cascades should be welcomed by us. People grazing animals on public lands should be prepared for some predation, and I think that there are programs to compensate citizens for this type of loss.

Please do continue the work of restoring a grizzly population in our state. It's the least we can do.

Thank you for the opportunity to weigh in on this issue.


Bellingham, Washington

Correspondence ID: 11666Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sunderland, MA 01375
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 20:26:08

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness. I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Correspondence ID: 11667Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Maple Valley, WA 98038
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 20:26:10

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think it's a very bad idea. You do not need to put more predators in our state.

Correspondence ID: 11670Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Silver creek, WA 98585
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 20:31:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: If the grizzlies wanted to be here they would migrate them selves.. humans trying to interfere with nature has been abundantly clear ...it doesn't work..leave things alone.. if agencies put the time effort and money into real boots on the ground matters, there may be some value in that..when the city idiots started to improve the wilderness by not allowing grazing and no forest harvesting..we now have a total waste of wood products from fire.. not to mention animal habitat. These ideas need to be run by the real people in the woods that see what is going on day to day not some inflated self important egotistical moron who thinks there helping.. if you want to import a freaking grizzly start with Seattle, Portland,

San Francisco, Los Angeles, and other cities first..there's plenty of easy pickings for them. And green Spaces to habitate . Let the animals migrate where there instincts lead them.

Correspondence ID: 11676Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tumwater, WA 98512
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 20:43:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in support of the native nation proposal for re introducing grizzlies back to the North Cascades. I am an avid hiker and have run into several black bears in the wild and know how to handle it. I think most hikers know as well. Grizzlies are important part of the ecosystem. Tribal nations have a lot of knowledge about this. I would support option B

Correspondence ID: 11677Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Shelton, WA 98584
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 20:51:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My question is why would you want to add more carnivores to our ecosystem?? We already have too many wolves. Add Cougars, black bears, coyotes, and bob cats and our present population of ungulates do not have a chance. Why do all you so called environmentalist always want to protect the predators. And you never do what you say you are going to do! I recall reading several articles when the grey wolves were introduced in this state stating that they would be delisted after 15 breeding pairs were reached. Now I read in another article that we have 37 breeding pairs. Still not delisted?? The exact same thing would happen if Grizzly bears were introduced, and they are more dangerous than the Wolf. I responded to a rather long survey recently about what I thought of our Department of Fish and Wildlife, and if I thought they were doing good job and if I trusted their judgement. The answer to that is absolutely No I do not. And I don't see this changing until the Enviromental liberals are out of office.

The hunter and fishermen of this state provide a huge income to the fish and wildlife and we get nothing in return, but restrictions and more restrictions. If you didn't get my point, I say NO to the reintroduction of Grizzly bears to the North Cascade Mountains of Washington State.

Correspondence ID: 11678Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Vashon, WA 98070
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 20:54:24

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Nov.6,2023

I am writing to give my opinion on the possible reintroduction of the grizzly bear to the North Cascades. First of all, I am against this idea. The grizzly has been gone from this area for over 25 years. Why do we as humans feel like we have to change nature? Apparently because we can. What effect will this have on other wildlife that live in this vast area? I'm sure the land owners that live in the perimeters of this area are concerned if not against this idea. Bears in general have been consistently encroaching on humans land, yards and homes. What makes you think that in years to come the grizzly's won't be brazen enough to encroach on landowners home and property? Yes, a lot of questions. And if so, then maybe not the best choice for the North Cascades. I say leave nature alone. Remember, if you reintroduce grizzly's to this area, there is no control of them after they are established except for more human control.

Respectfully,

Correspondence ID: 11679Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Houston, TX 77099
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 21:00:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a mother and grandmother, I believe it is our duty to protect and preserve wildlife as precious natural resources held in trust for all future generations. I also feel a deep responsibility as a Steward for all of Earth's Divine Creation. That responsibility will always be more important than politics or profit.

So I strongly support the National Park Services preferred Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation.

This plan will both effectively restore grizzly bears in North Cascades National Park and give people the tools they need to thrive in and around grizzly bear country. Grizzlies belong in the North Cascades, as they enhance the park's ecological integrity and contribute to its wildness.

Grizzly bears play a vital role in maintaining ecosystem balance, cycling nutrients, dispersing seeds, and changing the behavior of species around them. Restoring them would benefit the park and the people who use it.

A restored population of grizzlies will boost the park's appeal and attract nature enthusiasts, scientists, and tourists from around the world. This would provide economic benefits to local communities and support the park's mission to protect park resources in perpetuity.

Alternative C, with the 10(j) rule, provides managers flexibility to address community concerns while protecting the grizzly population. It ensures coexistence between humans and bears.

Please consider the positive ecological and economic benefits and support Alternative C. Restoring grizzly bears will secure the park's natural heritage and conserve an iconic species for current and future generations.

Thank you for your dedication to our national parks.

Correspondence ID: 11681Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spokane, WA 99004
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 21:03:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Do not relocate grizzly bears to the Northern Cascades! Let them populate naturally, we in Washington state do a lousy job of managing predators and adding more to the mix is a terrible idea. We can't manage wolves in rural Washington so why would you do any better with grizzlies? No more predators please.

Correspondence ID: 11684Project:112008Document:132104

Address: East Wenatchee, WA 98802
United States of America

Outside Organization: N/A Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 21:13:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The 10(j) rule, allowing for greater flexibility in the operation of the program, is a checkmark in the plus column for the plan.

I would have liked to have been able to see the criteria for selection of bears to be relocated but, again, the program being under scrutiny, would not allow for bears that would become transient and gravitate towards the easy pickings of campground dumpsters nor bears that find it easier to attack chicken coops and kill livestock. The intent is for them to establish their natural tendencies towards killing deer / elk; scavenging other predator kills (wolf kills); eating roots, berries, and grubs; and fishing when seasonal. Another checkmark in the plus column here.

So what State law has already declared grizzly relocation illegal? I would have like to see that verbiage....is this a broad definition or something stated succinctly. On the one hand, it's great that the plan is so extensive, on the other hand, that makes it a little onerous for the typical citizen--even a citizen who is a voracious reader--to work through.

Oddly enough people do not realize the extent to which the bears' vegetative diet allows for them to deposit seeds over a wide area through their scat. With wolves becoming the apex predator in the absence of bears you also create a greater tendency for ungulate herds to multiply, stripping too much bark and vegetation as well as spreading things like wasting disease that can also contaminate ranchers' / farmers' cattle. Another checkmark in the plus column.

Doing the math as laid out in the article, at least as far as the bears being introduced, you're talking about a min of 15 over 5 years and a max of 35 over 5 years. Over 10 years there is a min of 30 and a max of 70. Of course, projections of new bear introductions can be altered based upon the addition of cubs over the years with, perhaps, the need to scale back new bear introductions in the later years. Would like to see the naturalists' projections of theoretical population increase over time....again a min / max.

With regard to back country hikers, etc. Almost all bear attacks on humans are due to the humans' stupidity. When going into bear country you must carry (each individual) a bear-size can of pepper spray. It is 99.9% effective and the worst thing that you can do is try to use a small "bargain-sized" can. The pepper spray has no lasting deleterious effect on the bear. You need to make noise when hiking...if 2 or 3 of you then keep talking, break a branch every now and then. If you have a walking stick have a bell on it. Bear attacks are precipitated by startling the bear, for instance coming around the bend in a trail and stumbling on a male grizzly stripping berries off of a bush, or, worst case, surprising a sow with cubs, which will always precipitate an attack. I consider this issue to be a non-factor in the argument.

Finally, steering the general public towards fear and negative emotionality on this issue is a real loser (and will be remembered at the next election, for sure). People make choices about where their residences are. Just as one considers earthquake zones in buying a house built into a hillside, one must make a choice about living in the wilds with compatibility with wildlife. To use a cliché....the animals were here first. Our desires to live in isolated or wilderness areas are not a good reason to curtail or eliminate animals of any species.

Correspondence ID: 11685Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 21:23:56

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support this reasonable and carefully considered plan to reintroduce and restore the grizzly bear to the North Cascades. Most of us who enjoy this wilderness area already take appropriate precautions and will not need to change anything going forward. Where we can, we must preserve and protect true wilderness and that by necessity includes the grizzly in the North Cascades. This issue needs to be driven by sound management and science, not fear. This plan does that. The groundwork is laid, we need to move forward.

Correspondence ID: 11686Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Moxee, WA 98936
United States of America

Outside Organization: ██████████ Livestock Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,06 2023 21:26:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please, please do not introduce more grizzlies. Grizzlies do already exist in the northern areas of Washington. You can just ask enough local people who live and work in the area. This introduction will ultimately create the same conflict we have now between the wolves and domestic livestock grazing on public AND PRIVATE lands. Grizzlies are a natural predator. How do you expect to contain them to a designated area? They will end up in areas where the food is easiest to obtain.

As a business that graze livestock in the Cascades, we fear these bears will soon be eating our sheep and lambs for breakfast.

Correspondence ID: 11692Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ellensburg, WA 98926
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 21:39:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please leave the grizzly bears alone. In the event you plan to relocate them you are only putting the bears at risk. They will be in unfamiliar territory and not know immediately where to find food. How many bears will end up dying to get the point across that they have acclimated to where they know and are surviving just fine without human interference. Leave the bears alone and if they wish to move then let them do it on their terms!

Correspondence ID: 11693Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mazama, WA 98833
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 21:41:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Sir or Madam,

I'd like to SUPPORT reintroduction of Grizzly bears in the North Cascades ecosystem. I believe humans have a responsibility to restore the ecosystem to what it was before human intervention. I support Alternative C and the implementation of the 10(j) rule. This would slowly reintroduce grizzly bears to the North Cascades and provide park and forest service management with tools to minimize actions harmful to both the bears and humans.

I live in the Methow Valley and frequently hike in the North Cascades Park and surrounding forest. Bear and human interaction is a delicate balance. We have black bears that regularly visit and walk through our property during the spring-fall. We have adapted to their presence by securing our garbage, compost and bird feeders. I believe humans can adapt to an encounter with this species as well although education would need to occur

I realize my congressional representative is actively campaigning against the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades ecosystem. Dan Newhouse does not represent my views. He rarely makes an appearance in this part of his congressional district.

Please consider my comments when making a decision on reintroducing this species to its historical roots.

Warm regards,

██████████
██████████.
Mazama, WA 98833

Correspondence ID: 11694Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ephrata, WA 98823
United States of America
Outside Organization: Yes Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,06 2023 21:41:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: No on grizzly bear introduction into the North Cascades

Correspondence ID: 11695Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Tulalip, WA 98271
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,06 2023 21:44:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do not introduce grizzly bears into the north cascades. If they eventually migrate in from Canada, that's one thing and natural. Learn from the mistakes of other states who made the choice to introduce a specific wild life group into an area (ex: wolves in Idaho) and regretted it later.

Correspondence ID: 11696Project:112008Document:132104
Address: La Porte, IN 46350
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,06 2023 21:49:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: .

Correspondence ID: 11699Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Port orchard, WA 98366
United States of America
Outside Organization: Back country Horsemen of Washington Non-Governmental
Received: Nov,06 2023 22:03:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Plan A- take no action. More research is required for the impact on recreation.

Correspondence ID: 11701Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Issaquah, WA 98029
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,06 2023 22:07:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Plan C seems to be the best compromise. People already need to be wary of wildlife whenever they go out or live near the outdoors. We should recognize that living or visiting near expanses of forest has inherent risk but this will allow those most impacted to feel some sort of way to "feel safe." Grizzlies deserve to return. They will come over the Canadian border anyway.

Correspondence ID: 11703Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98177
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,06 2023 22:13:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My vote is either Option B or C - whichever is more liberal to promote the return of grizzlies.

I strongly support reintroduction of grizzly bears into the North Cascades ecosystem. They belong here, this has been their home for millennia, and they play an important role in balancing the wildlife ecosystem.

I have regularly hiked and backpacked in the North Cascades National Park for 40 years. Hikers are familiar with black bears and use of bear boxes, bear cannisters, and keeping a clean campsite or rest break area. However, additional training and information would be needed once a grizzly population is established in the NCE, as the impact of an interaction with a grizzly can be much greater than a black bear.

It is heartening to read that these bears are 90% vegetarian, and the impact on ranches and stock is estimated to be minimal.

Unfortunately, the draft EIS is not entirely clear as to whether Option C is more liberal, or more restrictive in regards to promoting grizzly restoration. I support options that allow for creative conflict resolution in relation to grizzly management: "10(j) NEP would provide authorized agencies with greater management flexibility should conflict situations arise." That is good, and I support it.

However, Option C 10(j) NEP designation also lists grizzlies as "nonessential experimental population" - which appears to make it easier to kill them off for any number of conflict reasons - including the construction of logging roads (!) or if a landowner feels threatened; simply for the goal of "promot[ing] social tolerance." That is too permissive and seems counterproductive to the ultimate goal of grizzly restoration.

Thus, if Option C actually makes it easier and gives more freedom to "take" grizzlies - just to keep the ranchers and loggers happy, I do not support it, and would elect Option B. However, if Option C primarily provides for more options for "deterrence ... preemptive relocation to prevent a conflict that appears imminent or in an attempt to habituated behavior of bears...", without excessive "take" of grizzlies, then I support Option C.

Whatever is decided from this Public Comment process, my understanding is that reintroduction efforts across the border in Canada will result in grizzlies crossing into Washington - so sooner or later, they will be here someday!

Correspondence ID: 11704Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Carnation, WA 98014
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 22:13:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As we look forward to the coming years and the growing impact of climate change and human development in our state and globally, it becomes more and more apparent that we need to intercede to protect the animals and ecosystems so vital to healthy forests and land. We know the importance of a healthy ecosystem and the north cascades missing an apex predator has drastic effects to the rest of the animals of the north cascades. I encourage us to look at reintroduction of grizzlies in a thought out and planned way. It is a step in the right direction to create a healthy ecosystem in the north cascades.

Please withhold identifiable information.

Correspondence ID: 11707Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98513
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 22:26:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears are nomadic creatures. They will not just stay in the place that they are transplanted to. This is well documented in other Grizzly projects in the West. There are many people who love ideas when they do not impact

them or their families. I guarantee that most people supporting this cause don't ever plan to be within proximity of these apex predators. I would also bet that they don't recreate within the cascades or have experienced a bear charging them.

see absolutely no reason to place these animals in the Cascade Mountain range. If they do, the only thing guaranteed is a significant impact on other animal populations and human-bear encounters resulting in life-altering injuries or death.

The thought of managing these animals happening at any time is also a huge joke. Regardless of their impact, this will never happen. You can look at wolf reintroduction plans across the West and thresholds set within agreements to manage populations through state fish and wildlife departments. Time and time again reintroduced predator populations meet those thresholds and then the lawsuits start to delay and stop management from taking place. It is almost laughable to spend time discussing due to the track record on the topic.

I absolutely fear the idea of grizzly bears being introduced into the Cascades for a plethora of reasons. The biggest fear is for my family's lives while we are recreating in our state. There is no other predator in the West that has a higher documented rate of killing humans. As a resident of this great state, please do not move forward with any form of transplanting grizzly bears into the Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 11708Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Marysville, WA 98270
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 22:27:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hell no to the Grizzlies. The last thing I would want to do is go hiking, backpacking, trail riding, equestrians and camping if these bears were introduced. We have enough worries with the Cougars.. And these people who talk a bunch of rhetoric about having tools to manage. They can go live in Yellowstone then or Alaska.

NO, NO AND NO

Correspondence ID: 11709Project:112008Document:132104

Address: BELLEVUE, WA 98006-5696
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 22:27:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I want to voice concerns regarding reintroducing Grizzly Bears in the North Cascades. My wife and I go hiking almost every weekend during the Spring, Summer and Autumn. This pastime is shared by millions of Americans. If this plan goes though it will drastically increase the risk of this activity, which will translate into less hikers and reduced health outcomes for the population at large.

Please reconsider this and avoid reintroducing Grizzly Bears here.

Correspondence ID: 11710Project:112008Document:132104

Address: bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 22:28:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am AGAINST grizzly bear relocation/restoration to the North Cascades Ecosystem. If they can gradually re-populate areas on their own that can support them, it would seem to be a more natural process, an equilibrium that I'd be OK with. Actively restoring or relocating--no. As an avid hiker, owner of a small, off-grid cabin for over 50 years, and admirer of all wildlife found in the Cascades (including other predators like cougars and black bears) grizzlies are just too powerful for me to want to coexist with.

Correspondence ID: 11712Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Garden Valley, ID 83622
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 22:33:41

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am not familiar with grizzly reintroductions or impacts on people (I.E hikers, hunters, etc.) or on ungulates (deer, elk, bighorn sheep, mountain goats, etc). But I can tell you what really happened here with the wolf introduction, and I can't help but think Washington would run into the same problems with Grizzlies.

In the early 90's, the Idaho Fish and Game in conjunction with federal wildlife agencies did an environmental impact study on how many wolves our state as a whole could support with the current (at that time) ungulate population, primarily deer and elk. When they did the study, we had a healthy deer and elk population. At that time, they decided the entire state could support 100 wolves without having a detrimental impact on their prey species.

Then the winter of '93 happened, and we lost (in our area) at least 60% of our deer and elk population. They did not take that into account when they introduced the wolves. They introduced the same amount that they had planned on. Truthfully the whole plan should have been scratched once they knew how bad that winter was.

Fast forward to 1995 when they introduced the first Canadian Grey wolves into Idaho, not more than 15 air miles from where we live. There's a specific quote from a woman who was present at the introduction that is very relevant. I cannot remember if she was a federal employee or a member of a special interest group, maybe the Sierra Club. She said...and I quote "This is the beginning of the end of hunting in the state of Idaho."

That should have forecasted what was to come. We then went through 10 years of the wolves multiplying by leaps and bounds and having a devastating impact on our game populations.

Once the introduction had reached all the milestones that were originally set forth, Idaho Fish and Game tried to delist the wolves and take over management of them as a big game species. As soon as that happened, the environmental groups started suing the state. Claiming that they had not met all the criteria for delisting and management, and even made up some new shit. All they needed was to find the right federal judge who was sympathetic to their claim, and he would file an injunction to stop all state management or hunting.

So here is what I have learned from all this. DO NOT trust the environmental groups that are behind any introduction. They have an agenda, and it is not about the animal in question. They will use that animal as a pawn to complete whatever they want.

If you are concerned with human-grizzly interaction, just do a search in eastern Idaho on how many issues there are. Every year someone gets mauled over there. If you are concerned about what it will do for hunting, the Idaho wolf introduction that I have spelled out should open your eyes.

IT'S NOT ABOUT THE BEARS OR THE WOLVES!!!! It's a lie. It's about their agenda!!!

Correspondence ID: 11713Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Greenbank, WA 98253
United States of America

Outside Organization: Back Country Horseman of Washington Non-Governmental

Received: Nov,06 2023 22:37:55

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Re the Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan: We fully support reintroducing Grizzlies into the North Cascades. We have hiked, & kayaked in the park for many years, and believe it is one of the most special places certainly in the US, if not the world. As BCHW members, we are probably in the minority when it comes to supporting their

reintroduction. The simplest reason - Grizzlies were part of the ecosystem long before we as horseman had access to trails built by humans.

We have ridden many times on the Pacific Crest Trail between the North Cascades Highway & Stehekin.

We believe that it is our responsibility to the best of our ability to avoid encounters with bear, take all known precautions when camping etc. It is also our responsibility to accept the risk of an encounter, when placing ourselves in their territory.

We also believe that wolf population should be supported by whatever means for the same reason that they have been part of that ecosystem, before being decimated by humans.

Thanks for your consideration of our opinion.

Correspondence ID: 11716Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98513
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 22:45:58

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a hiker, the thought of sharing the trails with grizzly bears sends a shiver down my spine. These massive, powerful creatures are the undisputed rulers of the wild, and their presence can transform a peaceful hike into a nerve-wracking ordeal. While I appreciate the beauty and importance of these apex predators, I cannot deny the negative impacts they have on humans, particularly those who venture into their territory.

The most immediate concern is the potential for physical harm. Grizzly bears are known to be protective of their young and their food sources, and they can become aggressive if they feel threatened. Hikers are at particular risk, as they may unknowingly stumble upon a bear or its cubs, triggering a defensive attack. The consequences of such an encounter can be devastating, with injuries ranging from scratches and bites to maulings and even death.

Beyond the physical danger, grizzly bears also pose a psychological threat. The mere knowledge that these formidable creatures are lurking in the shadows can heighten anxiety and make it difficult to relax and enjoy the natural surroundings. The constant fear of a sudden encounter can ruin the tranquility of a hike, transforming it into a test of endurance and vigilance.

For those living or working in grizzly bear country, the threat is even more pervasive. Farmers and ranchers often face the daunting task of protecting their livestock from bear attacks, which can cause significant financial losses and emotional distress. The fear of bears can also restrict outdoor activities, limiting children's playtime and disrupting the normal routines of daily life.

The presence of grizzly bears can also have a negative impact on local communities. Tourism, a vital source of income for many rural areas, can be hampered by the perceived danger of bears. This can lead to economic hardship and a decline in the quality of life for residents.

While I understand the importance of preserving grizzly bears and their habitat, I cannot ignore the negative impacts they have on humans. As a hiker, I would feel apprehensive about venturing into an area with a high grizzly bear population. The constant fear of an encounter would overshadow the beauty of the surroundings and turn a recreational activity into a nerve-wracking ordeal.

The plight of farmers and ranchers is equally concerning. They must constantly be on guard to protect their livestock and property from bears, a task that is both dangerous and emotionally draining. The fear of bears can also restrict outdoor activities, disrupting the normal routines of daily life.

Please do not move forward with any project to place grizzly bears into the Cascades or any other part of Washington State.

Correspondence ID: 11718Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kennewick, WA 99337
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,06 2023 22:49:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The campaign against grizzly bear reintroduction to the Cascades plays on fear and flies in the face of statistical, fact-based analysis. The vast majority of Washingtonians will never encounter a grizzly in the wild while the historical record says grizzly attacks are overwhelmingly because humans get between a mother and her cubs. Bring grizzly bears back to their native habitat and spend the energy on educating people how to co-exist with nature instead of scaring them.

Correspondence ID: 11719Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lynnwood, WA 98087
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,06 2023 22:58:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm against bringing back any grizzlies. People like to hike, I don't want to hear of fatalities from a grizzly attack. NO GRIZZLIES please. Thank-you

Correspondence ID: 11720Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Shoreline, WA 98133
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,06 2023 23:01:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I want grizzlies back in the North Cascades, and I want them there yesterday! Their reintroduction is long overdue, and they should have never been forced out (by the actions of white settlers) to begin with. The people who are against grizzlies being in their natural habitat can go fuck their feelings. Move to the cities if you are afraid of coexisting with wildlife.

Correspondence ID: 11722Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Shoreline, WA 98155
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,06 2023 23:07:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I love bears but don't want myself or daughter who hike extensively in our mountains killed by a Grizzly. Black bears good. Grizzly not good

Correspondence ID: 11723Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tacoma, WA 98409
United States of America

Outside Organization: 2533920964 Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,06 2023 23:09:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Introducing grizzlies will endanger people, hikers, hunters, families enjoy any outdoor activity.. They will also push black bear into residential areas as well as effect the elk and deer population. Not to mention what it would do to farmers livestock. We have enough predatory animals in the north cascades and adding grizzlies would serve no purpose. I feel that it would make people more fearful to enjoy the great outdoors that we all love here in Washington. They have no benefit on the ecosystem.. they will kill off Salmon, chase the black bear out and will not help with the cougar population.. Adding grizzlies into the North Cascades is a horrible idea and will poss more threat than it will serve purpose.

Thanks
Concerned Washingtonian

Correspondence ID: 11724Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Puyallup, WA 98373-1030
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 23:09:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the Draft Environmental Impact Statement alternative option C to reintroduce grizzly bears into the North Cascades Ecosystem as an experimental population with a 10(j) rule. I appreciate the time and effort the National Park Service and Department of Fish and Wildlife along with other collaborative organizations have given to drafting a plan for the grizzly bear recovery in Washington state.

Thank you and may these majestic mammals once again live and thrive in nature's balance.

Correspondence ID: 11725Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Yakima, WA 98908
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 23:11:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I oppose transporting grizzlies into the state. It is counterproductive to risk even one human life by introducing an apex predator into a national park. An area preserved for the enjoyment of the people, not proven killers of the people. Part of the national park service's function is to provide safe places for the people to enjoy the wilderness. I suppose in a time long long ago, grizzlies roamed the areas around Washington DC. I propose we put a few on the White House lawn.
Sincerely

Correspondence ID: 11728Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98144
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 23:14:56

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is a bad and dangerous idea. I love nature and all animals, including grizzly bears. However, the introduction of grizzlies to the North Cascades would pose a serious and persistent threat to human life. It will result in a spike of firearms being taken on trails by hikers and campers. I myself would never hike that region again without being armed. I am already doing research on the type of caliber, ammunition, and holster I will need to procure if this passes.

I was fortunate enough to be able to hike these areas without fearing that I would be mauled to death or eaten, and I think my 2-year-old daughter should be able to have that privilege as well. I strongly urge the National Park Service not to bring grizzly bears to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 11735Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spanaway, WA 98387
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 23:27:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Bring back grizzly bears! They are a vital piece of creating and maintaining a healthy ecosystem. People and bears CAN coexist! Please be sure to also make a plan to protect these bears, an investment in our woks Washington from those who will try to unlawfully kill them out of spite.

Correspondence ID: 11736Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 23:28:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am against the new Grizzly Cascades Release Plan. I think in sparsely populated areas such as Montana and Alaska where they thrive and are able to have less human interactions is great for people and great for the bears. The fact is that Washington is not in a place where it was many years ago when there were still grizzlies. It is one of the fastest growing states and people have grown up not knowing how to coexist with grizzlies here. Additionally, NPS/NFS/DNR do not have the proper amount of resources or personnel to ensure the success of this program and be responsible stewards to the citizens of WA State. Too often we have seen programs "fire-and-forget" and locals are left to pick up the pieces (ex: catastrophe that was the wolf program management). I hope to see our taxes invested in sustainable programs such as salmon recovery.

Correspondence ID: 11737Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Redmond, WA 98053
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 23:29:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To be clear, I am vehemently opposed to this so called "plan" by conservationists that are completely out of touch with the people that will be effected by it.

Here are a number of points to support my opinion:

1. **Impact on Human Safety:** Reintroducing grizzlies in the North Cascades poses a significant risk to human safety. These dangerous and powerful apex predators are dangerous if they come into close proximity with humans. Encounters between grizzlies and people lead to injuries or even fatalities, especially for those who live, work, or recreate in the area. It is your responsibility to prioritize human safety above all else.
2. **Economic Ramifications:** The reintroduction of grizzlies will have severe economic consequences for local communities. Tourism and outdoor recreation are major industries in the North Cascades, attracting visitors from around the world. The presence of grizzlies will deter tourists and outdoor enthusiasts, resulting in a decline in revenue for businesses and a loss of jobs. It is essential that you consider the economic impact of such a decision and not just think about your conservationist ideals.
3. **Threat to Livestock and Agriculture:** Grizzlies are known to prey on livestock, such as cattle and sheep. Reintroducing them in the North Cascades will lead to increased attacks on domestic animals and cause significant losses for ranchers and farmers. This will disrupt the local agricultural industry, leading to higher prices for consumers and potential financial hardships for those involved in farming.
4. **Impact on Wildlife Management:** The reintroduction of grizzlies will disrupt the delicate balance of wildlife management in the region. It will result in increased predation on other native species, leading to a decline in populations of animals already struggling to survive. We should prioritize the conservation of existing species rather than introducing a new predator that will exacerbate the challenges they face.
5. **Limited Suitable Habitat:** The North Cascades does not have sufficient suitable habitat to support a viable grizzly population. The area is already fragmented and faces various environmental challenges. Insufficient food sources, habitat loss, and climate change will further hinder the grizzlies' ability to thrive in the region. It is crucial to focus your conservation efforts on areas where grizzlies have a higher chance of survival.

In conclusion, while the idea of reintroducing grizzlies in the North Cascades may seem appealing for conservationists like you but there are valid concerns from real people that cannot be ignored. Human safety, economic impacts, livestock predation, wildlife management, and habitat suitability make this plan deplorable and also raise significant doubts about the people that created this plan.

Remember, you work for the tax payers and the people that will be negatively impacted by your short sided conservationist ideals.

Correspondence ID: 11738Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tacoma, WA 98409
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 23:32:41

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Reintroducing Grizzlies to the North Cascades of Washington State is one of the most absurd & reckless considerations imaginable. This state and especially that region of this state has a massive population of outdoor enthusiasts, from the through hikers of the PCT to back country campers which are fantastically ill equipped mentally to respect that animal and it's potential for harm. Beyond the threat to humans, is the incredibly irresponsible and grave harm grizzlies would impose on populations deer, elk, even salmon as well as the massive threat to livestock in and around the area. The presence of Grizzlies also create a hardship for the already staggering over populated black bear which now have to move closer into residential areas in search of food. This consideration is massively irresponsible concerning the environment, safety of Washington residents and population of prey animals. As a recreational hiker and lover of our outdoors and democrat voter I should add, I staunchly oppose this horrible consideration. This is absurd to say the least.

Correspondence ID: 11739Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Elk Grove, CA 95624
United States of America

Outside Organization: Howl for Wildlife Non-Governmental

Received: Nov,06 2023 23:33:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Reintroducing grizzly bears to Washington State should be avoided. The reintroduction of the grizzly(especially with protected status) bear will bring an added threat to outdoor enthusiasts as well as the game populations in the state. There are enough predators in the state of Washington without artificially adding a climax predator to the mix. From what I have read about this issue there are grizzly's already migrating into this area. If the reintroduction is to happen let it happen in a natural and manageable way such as this.

Correspondence ID: 11740Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Issaquah, WA 98027
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 23:35:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please bring them back to the North Cascades in WA. We have such a rich ecosystem here, and it's only right to seize the opportunity to restore their population here. We took them away in the first place.

Correspondence ID: 11742Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Phoenix, AZ 85015
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 23:38:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I fully support this and would like to see the reintroduction of grizzly bears in this area. It will be a benefit to the ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 11743Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kirkland, WA 98034
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 23:41:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am very concerned with this initiative since we can be sure that human casualties are inevitable as a result.

I am totally against it.

Please scrape this program entirely.

Otherwise, you'll be responsible for every grizzly-related incident in this region.

Every human life is precious, and preserving it should be our highest priority.

Correspondence ID: 11748Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kirkland, WA 98083
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 23:52:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am opposed to reintroduction of brown bears ("grizzlies") to the Washington North Cascades by the U.S. and strongly in favor of Proposal A.

I don't feel, "there's already black bears here" hold much water, as they ignore the fact that brown bears are well known to be a far more aggressive species. Others such as, "well they used to be here" simply aren't sufficient to mitigate the danger that they could pose to people today. The risks are quite clear, as any region where encountering grizzlies is a possibility always recommends carrying bear spray.

Grizzlies are considered at G4 levels globally, which hardly puts them into a threatened category outside of solely the U.S. I do not feel that reintroduction just for the sake of reintroduction is a good enough reason to put people at additional risk. This is especially true given the wide range of outdoor wilderness activities which a much larger volume of people participate in today than in the past.

There's also the concerns raised over danger to the already strained salmon populations. Claiming that the bears are coming from regions where they forage on berries and somehow wouldn't pose a risk isn't sufficient. Bears learn and adapt. It's not exactly a stretch of imagination that they could learn to fish salmon. Not to mention the impacts to other wildlife, including black bears, which have adapted to the lack of grizzlies.

What is the actual ecological evidence-based reason why introduction is absolutely needed? So far I haven't seen a good reason beyond "just because." Even in the "North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan" draft, everything seems to center around "restore for history's sake" motif rather than outlining true ecological benefits. In fact, all supposed benefits and impacts in the draft appear speculative at best, often hinging on "it could go this way, or that way, but we're unsure."

As for people experiencing grizzlies in their natural habitat, I'm willing to bet there's a far greater number of people who would rather not have such encounters than those who would.

Correspondence ID: 11749Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Renton, WA 98057
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,06 2023 23:59:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As part of a family who have hiked and camped in the North Cascades and many areas in WA, we strongly object to intentionally returning grizzly bears to the North Cascades or anywhere in the Northwest. It is insane and unnecessary to put outdoors folks in danger of being mauled or killed while hiking or camping.

The Forest Service people have not given one good reason for repopulating bears. Why is it even being considered ? Do they think it's cool to have huge bears out there. It is NOT. We keep reading statistics that over many years only a small number of people have been attacked and even less killed. Well ANY number is too many people to be harmed. Would those Forest Service people like to be attacked or have their families attacked ? Doubt it. Wake up government and leave Nature alone.

Correspondence ID: 11750Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Issaquah, WA 98027
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not introduce grizzly bears. This will reduce tourism money coming in with the increased risk to humans. With the increased mountain lion population, there is no need for additional predators. There are other measures to take to maintain the environment and this is another attempt at human intervention that will cost taxpayers tons of money while scaring people from these beautiful places -- which in turn reduces the human connection to these places and reduces human willingness to protect them. No grizzlies please! I'm saying this from experience encountering grizzlies while camping in Montana.

Correspondence ID: 11751Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Issaquah, WA 98027
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is a terrible idea - it's so great being able to hike and explore without ever having to worry about Grizzly's. It would completely change the dynamic of people utilizing the Cascades.

There are already plenty of predators in the region that aren't grizzly bears and I don't understand why there is some desire to restore this natural predator. If people were really concerned about restoring the natural environment they should probably start worrying a bit more about all the invasive species of animals and plants before caring about adding an insanely dangerous natural predator back into this region.

Correspondence ID: 11754Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Arlington, WA 98223
United States of America

Outside Organization: None Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Absolutely no to grizzly reintroduction in the North Cascades. Grizzly bears are nothing like a black bear. Black bears run when they see you. Grizzly bears fear nothing. We do not need more predators in the woods. Too many humans are hiking, camping, hunting here in Washington. One life taken would be too many. Go look at pictures from bear attacks in Wyoming and Montana. No thank you.

Correspondence ID: 11757Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Quesnel, UN V2j3c5
Canada

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: You don't want to relocate them to your state, they will eventually get there on their own.

We had two in our neighborhood and one was in and out of our yard for two days, very frightening and told by the RCMP to stay indoors. Over the next couple of weeks there were numerous sightings of grizzly bears throughout our city. Grizzlies have never been in the city, now that they have been here and have found good sources we can almost guarantee they will be back. Don't bring them into Washington, you'll be sorry.

Correspondence ID: 11758Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Oroville, WA 98844
United States of America

Outside Organization: Okanogan Co. Commissioners Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a lifetime resident of the Okanogan County, it seems ridiculous that this is still an issue that for some reason remains unresolved. The local residents have repeatedly let everyone know that the transplanted Bears are not wanted in the area and now is not the time for their reintroduction the reintroduction of the wolves has once again proven that we as a society do not seem to be capable of doing a good job of monitoring their progress and controlling. them when they get out of control. Is it fair to the animals to trust them into an area and then punish them when they venture out of the area, we have designated for them. Do you think this "experiment" will turn out any different you are kidding yourself. Putting a creature with a ranging area of up to 800 square miles in an area of limited food sources and a relatively close proximity to humanity is just asking for conflicts which is not fair to the animals or the people that reside there. This is often compared to Yellowstone Park but there are several significant differences 1st the park area is smaller, 2nd the Bears in Yellowstone are completely acclimated to their surroundings not transplanted to the location, 3rd Yellowstone is not surrounded by 20,000 acres of soft fruit orchards (a bear's favorite snack). As the bear chases its food sources out of the area it will follow them closer and closer to the valley floors. I guess the ultimate question we should be asking is how many crops need to be destroyed, livestock killed, pets killed, bears and humans injured or killed before this is considered a bad idea because it would be a matter of time before all of these things would happen. I also find it quite ironic that the majority of the people that live in the area are against this plan, but the support grows the farther away you get. It is easy to support an idea that you don't have to live with, which is exactly what it seems all of the Federal Agencies are doing, proposing something with no real plan on how to deal with the results. The 10j rule will not be effective when all of the animal rights groups sue to stop you from doing what should be done. The bottom line is PLEASE do not transplant Grizzly Bears they already live in the area in small numbers which is all the area can realistically support.

Correspondence ID: 11761Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98133
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 01:38:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am enthusiastically in favor of this plan. Having grown up in eastern Idaho near the Yellowstone National Park border I am well aware of the risk and benefits of coexisting with grizzly bears, they are an important predator and so important to a healthy ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 11766Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98101
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 02:34:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do not bring grizzlies. We have bears already. Dangerous!

Correspondence ID: 11767Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Starbuck, WA 99359
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 02:35:19
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Save America from the endangered species act. Refuse any more funding for the encroachment of "endangered species" introduction, or maintenance of so called species. The application of that law is nothing but guess work, no matter how bright or enthusiastic people are who propose the reintroduction of bears, wolves, or the "Inland Empire Giant Angle worm." The Endangered Species Act needs a major overhaul in wording and application, to include future possible harmful consequences of any plan. I sound rough. I read the Endangered Species Act shortly after it was written. It was not good reading. Predators do not recognize boundaries, bears or wolves, or badgers. There are no salmon in the rivers. They will munch on elk calves as they are dropped. They will eat fawns as they are birthed. They will splash in the rivers , and find no fish So they will invade human environments and live out of garbage bins. Bears are happy where they now live. Why mess with them to upset their lives, by planting them in an area strange, and warmer than home. Also they will anon disease, tape worms, after subsisting on mice, rats, and ground squirrels. If they are happy where they are, leave them be. [REDACTED]. Starbuck WA.

Correspondence ID: 11768Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Redmond, WA 98053
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 02:41:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am against bringing grizzlies back to the North Cascades
. I believe land owners should have a right to protect their livestock

Correspondence ID: 11769Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Snohomish, WA 98290
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 02:57:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: It is our duty as humans to bring back the grizzly population that we are responsible for decimating without proper conservation practices. It is also our duty to respect the culture of our tribal communities. I'd also like to comment that grizzly bears already migrate into the north cascades from Canada - it is already fact and I have seen evidence.

The fact people fear them is not a valid reason to decline reintroduction - it was their choice to live in the wilderness of Washington that is home to wildlife and makes the state such a beautiful place to live and recreate. These people need to learn how to coexist and better protect themselves and their livestock. It's not difficult to build physical barriers that would prevent a grizzly from entering a grazing area for livestock, and it is the landowner's responsibility to protect and care for them.

Correspondence ID: 11773Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Renton, WA 98059
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 04:45:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please reintroduce grizzly bears to the North Cascades with Alternative C. We the public would approve of a more aggressive reintroduction plan if brought to a vote.

Correspondence ID: 11777Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98502
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 07:02:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello,

I am concerned about grizzlies being reintroduced to the North Cascades. I am an avid hiker and the north cascades area is one of my favorites. My concerns is for the safety of people and the safety of the bears. And I have many questions. Why did we exterminate them from the area before? Because we can? We wanted to hunt and kill for the sake of hunting and killing? If it was out of safety, has that safety issue been resolved? Will we just kill them again because we didn't learn from our mistakes?

Please consider the welfare of the animal when human interaction will go wrong. We've proven ourselves time and time again. We make stupid choices and we can't be trusted.

I

Correspondence ID: 11783Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ephrata, WA 98823
United States of America

Outside Organization: ██████████ LLC Business(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,07 2023 07:52:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I oppose reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades.

As a beekeeper, I provide honey bees for pollination in North Central Washington. I am currently dealing with one to three incidents per year of bee hive destruction by bears in this area. In spite of efforts to place bee hives for crop pollination in areas of low bear traffic, bears continue to destroy several hives per year. The bears which currently destroy my hives are usually dissuaded by electric fences and bee stings, but not always. When this happens, I lose bee hives and the grower loses the pollination service which was supposed to be provided by the destroyed hives.

My father used to operate bee hives in Northern Alberta, Canada. Unlike bears which destroy a few of my hives annually, grizzly bears in that area are not dissuaded by electric fences or by bee stings. They can destroy entire apiaries in spite of these defensive measures. When a grizzly makes repeated visits to the same apiary, officials from Alberta Fish and Wildlife Enforcement would issue my father a permit to shoot them when they appeared at the apiary. I would rather not have my apiaries destroyed or be forced to shoot bears.

Therefore I oppose reintroduction of these bears to Washington state.

Correspondence ID: 11784Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Issaquah, WA 98027
United States of America

Outside Organization: Back Country Horseman Non-Governmental

Received: Nov,07 2023 07:54:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We do NOT need grizzly bears in ANY areas where we horseback ride!!

Correspondence ID: 11785Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Poulsbo, WA 98370
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 07:58:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I feel it not a good idea to introduce Grizzlies into our area due to the danger factor of all Horse back riders, hikers, bike riders and all who are out enjoying our beautiful trails.. We are already pushing black bears, cougars and other animals even onto our personal land because of influx of people and building. Cougars are already a threat to our families, horses, cats and dogs because we are taking over their homes!

Correspondence ID: 11786Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bremerton, WA 98310
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 08:03:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I absolutely think grizzlies should be brought back. They are great for ecology, spreading seed, etc. One can see lasting damage in areas where grizzlies have left.

Correspondence ID: 11787Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bremerton, WA 98310
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 08:05:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Bring Grizzlies back

Correspondence ID: 11788Project:112008Document:132104
Address: LOON LAKE, WA 99148
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 08:08:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: NO grizzlies in our forests. They are far too dangerous!!! Let's introduce rattlesnakes to everyone's bedroom!!!

Correspondence ID: 11789Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 08:11:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Count me as a "hell yes" for grizzly reintroduction. My husband and i hike and backpack in the North Cascades and believe that helping restore the grizzly population will make a long term difference in bolstering the ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 11790Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Redmond, WA 98053
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 08:20:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My family with children are avid hikers in the North Cascades. We oppose the deadly introduction of a human predator. Grizzlies are not friendly like black bears. Black bear population is pretty large here but they are not as deadly if we encounter them. If we were to encounter Grizzlies you need a gun. More hikers will start carrying firearms for protection.

Correspondence ID: 11791Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98125
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 08:22:55

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please restore brown bears to the north cascades. As appropriate, offer one-time bear mitigation compensation and ongoing training to adjacent ranchers.

Correspondence ID: 11793Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Cashmere, WA 98815
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 08:32:12

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support Alternative A: the No Action Alternative.

Correspondence ID: 11794Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98106
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 08:32:37

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support bringing Grizzly Bears back to the Cascades

Correspondence ID: 11797Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Colville, WA 99114
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 08:40:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears do not need re-introduction within the state of Washington. These bears have already been re-colonizing part of their original territories for years. Residents have already been dealing with increasing bear conflicts, and without a better management plan for preventing further conflicts, a re-introduction of more grizzly bears into the mix is a recipe for disaster. It's bad for the people and the bears of Washington state. I do not support this proposed re-introduction.

Correspondence ID: 11799Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bow, WA 98232
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 08:45:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I initially was skeptical to the idea of introducing grizzly bears to the North Cascades. Most of what we hear are about severe and often fatal interactions between bear and human. However, having looked at what they can do for the environment and the low risk that an encounter would be, partly based on the geography where the introduction would

happen, and partly on the fact that bears prefer to avoid us if possible, my mind has been changed. I am now in favor of having limited numbers of grizzly bears reintroduced into the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 11801Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Vancouver, WA 98686
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 08:50:03

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Yes. I'm a strong Yes about reintroducing Grizzlies back in The Cascades. Back to the balance Nature intended. Cattle & other harmful industries Should relocate to more appropriate locations. Better business plans. You don't build businesses in places you have to destroy to be successful. I heard a hiker saying he was concerned for his safety. Honestly. Yes they're wild but educating yourself on wildlife would help. Public parks if ignorant about the woods. Mother Nature has paid enough! Bring the Bears back! The only Educated, Balance of Nature decision in my opinion. Strict JAILTIME for hunters who take the situation in their own hands!

You're doing the right thing, or trying. Thank You

Correspondence ID: 11803Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Woodinville, WA 98072
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 08:56:24

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Oh please NO!!! Do NOT reintroduce grizzlies in WA State. Keep WA safer for hiking/exploring!!! The environment has done just fine without them for over 25 years!!!

Correspondence ID: 11804Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98118
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 09:00:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Bring back the grizzly bears. It's more their land than ours. They need to make a comeback to be an umbrella species and keystone animal.

Correspondence ID: 11808Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Redmond, WA 98053
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 09:15:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We don't want to release grizzly bears in the North Cascades NP as this will lead more people to carry firearms into the parks. We don't need to avoidable accidents. Most people in the wild are bad at identifying animals and it will lead to case of false sightings and shootings. This will endanger hikers and potentially the current black bear populations.

Correspondence ID: 11810Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98273
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 09:26:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly urge the government to not follow through with this proposed plan to re-introduce grizzly bears to our state due to the dangers it would pose to our farmers, ranchers, and others who frequent the wilderness areas for recreational activities.

Correspondence ID: 11811Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98273
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 09:44:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm writing as an annual camper at the newhalem national park campground where I go with my kid. I fully support bringing grizzlies back to the north cascades for the ecosystem, economy and future generations. Camping in bear county is safe with the good educational support of national park staff. Thank you!

Correspondence ID: 11813Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Salkum, WA 98582
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 10:02:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: If this has been successful in Montana already, it should be something that can be done safely in Washington state to help the environment rebuild the ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 11814Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98126
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 10:08:01

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the policy to reintroduce grizzlies into the north cascades. Other parts of the country has been able to cohabitate with bears. People just don't like change and are fear mongering. Bring the bears back.

Correspondence ID: 11815Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98112
United States of America

Outside Organization: Literacy Source Business

Received: Nov,07 2023 10:13:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the plan to reintroduce Grizzlies to the N Cascades. I believe the ecosystem will benefit hugely. The danger to humans is negligible and ranchers have far more worries concerning their livestock than the grizzly bear. I support the idea to bring this bear back. I lived in Montana for many years and while one needs to have a healthy awareness of bear in the wilderness I believe that this is all part of the natural order of life.

Correspondence ID: 11817Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Puyallup, WA 98372
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 10:16:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I would very much like Grizzly bears to be returned to the North Cascades wilderness. I think it's very important for us as humans to share the land better with our non-human neighbors. It sounds like they are an important part

of the ecosystems in our area and they have just as a much right to live here as we humans do. It also seems like ranchers in other areas of the country (like Montana) get along ok with grizzlies so hopefully there is opportunity to protect the livelihood of ranchers as well as provide a safe home for such majestic animals as the grizzly. I fully support bringing grizzly bears home to the north cascades.

Correspondence ID: 11818Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98121
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 10:16:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Bring back the grizzlies to the North Cascades! Canada is reintroducing them soon across the border - let's make sure we are prepared partners in the restoration efforts. Montana seems to have a great model that we could learn from. This is prime habitat for grizzlies that should be returned to a threatened species.

Correspondence ID: 11819Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Cambria, CA 93428
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 10:19:12

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, but only if this restoration is conducted in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. Both action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are presently many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection. Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest. An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

For any long-term grizzly restoration programs to succeed, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives. The need for wilderness degrading activities, are also ultimately bad for bears. Partnership with British Columbia should be included in any plan to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border. This would help to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 11822Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98102
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 10:20:56

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I lived for many years on the Rocky Mountain Front in Montana. We coexisted with the bears. Many people are proud to live in grizzly country. Bringing Grizz back to Washington is the right thing to do and I am in full support of it.

Correspondence ID: 11824Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ravensdale, WA 98051
United States of America

Outside Organization: BCH Non-Governmental

Received: Nov,07 2023 10:30:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I would only support grizzlies in the North Cascades if they migrate on their own with no human help much. Like wolves are doing.

I have in the area and the packers say there isnt enough food for more than a very few grizzlys. There are already black bears there and there would be competition for limited game and food sources. That would push them on the ranchers similar to wolves and cause more problems.

We never saw elk sigh and some trips few deer.

So unless we planned to help feed them no grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 11825Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98105
United States of America

Outside Organization: Lovrovich Orthodontics Business(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,07 2023 10:30:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please help restore the grizzlies into the ecosystem .

Thank you

Correspondence ID: 11826Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 10:32:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support alternative C and the reintroduction of the grizzly bear to the north cascade ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 11827Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 10:32:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To whom it may concern,

My family are ardent supporters of America's National Parks. In the past two years we have visited more than 15 National Park managed sites in the Western United States. Many of those parks are home to grizzly bears. While it can be scary to camp in an area with young children knowing there could be grizzlies around it is inspiring as well. We are focused and attentive to our surroundings in a way we aren't in other settings. We are connected as a family as we take in the awe and wonder of nature.

I believe reintroducing Grizzlies into North Cascades National Park should move forward for several reasons. First, North Cascades is uniquely situated with significant open space in the park and surrounding area to support and successfully recover grizzly bears. North Cascades is some of the most prime wild space in Washington state that has been saved from development and thus has space to support the reintroduction of grizzlies.

Second, Grizzlies provide significant positive ecological benefits to the ecosystems they are found in. Grizzlies provide

critical support to the plants and forests they live in - they aerate the soil with their large paws and claws, making space for plants, trees and flowers to grow.

Lastly, over the many years of this project public comment has resoundingly supported this effort. A small but vocal minority has been speaking out with non-scientific claims that they are afraid of the grizzlies and the harm they may have on surrounding communities and ranchers. There are provisions in place to support more effective coordination with local communities now than has been in place in the past. The concerns of this minority have been heard and incorporated.

Grizzlies deserve an opportunity to be reintroduced into North Cascades National Park. We humans deserve an opportunity to see these majestic creatures in nature. Please move forward with the effort to reintroduce grizzlies into North Cascades National Park.

Correspondence ID: 11828Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Pe Ell, WA 98572
United States of America

Outside Organization: 3167924 Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 10:33:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hi, I love to ride horses and hike. It's insane to put grizzly bears where humans are recreating..instantly causing the potential for death to humans and bears. How dare you try to limit our access to OUR lands and our possibilities for recreation for health and mental well being. Where do you live? we should put a grizzly bear where you live and see how you like that.

I supports Alternative A the No Action Alternative.

The Draft EIS lacks any substantive effort to address recreation planning and the future management of recreation. I cannot support either Action Alternative, B or C without more substantive analysis on impacts to recreation.

Correspondence ID: 11830Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98112
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 10:39:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As an avid North Cascades hiker I would love to see Grizzlies return to the North Cascades where they belong. What an incredible way to make such a beautiful place even more beautiful. Hiking and camping can be done safely in Grizzly territory with the right precautions!

Correspondence ID: 11833Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98516
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 10:41:52

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the: Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Environmental Impact Statement for the North Cascades Ecosystem

As a member of Back Country Horsemen of Washington, I am very concerned with the ability to continue to recreate in the North Cascades should a small population of heavily protected grizzly bears be mechanically moved into the region that we recreate in. The DEIS does not sufficiently analyze the impact to recreation or present any options for how trails can be maintained open in the presence of protections implemented to reduce human-grizzly interactions.

1. The Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail runs through the core habitat and has permitted distance hikers of around 10,000. When considering the other trail users in and along the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE) since this is one of the most populated areas around any bear ecosystem, the use likely exceeds a quarter million visits. However, the DEIS indicates that

the use is insignificant. It is very significant and will likely result in many human-bear interactions.

2. The Pacific Northwest National Scenic Trail also runs through the NCE as well as other bear ecosystems to the east, including the Cabinet-Yaak (CYE). The CYE has a more established population of bears but still has resulted with challenges to the very existence of the trail due to the limited number of bears in the CYE (20-40). Opposition to the National Scenic Trail in the recovering bear population area as well as the connecting landscapes between ecosystems has also been expressed by USFWS staff, the same agency putting forth the NCE proposal through which the same trail will pass.

3. Without a more detailed analysis of how to retain the carrying capacity of the trails, trailheads, and campgrounds without resulting in long term or permanent closures, there is no way to effectively review this DEIS.

4. Furthermore, the NPS and USFWS have pointed out that the Canadian counterparts and First Nations are preparing to release grizzly bears in the northern part of the NCE. IF that was the only release point, it would move the core recovery/release area north and away from the more densely human populated areas of Washington State. It also would be in line with Washington State law as well since no bears would be translocated directly into Washington, and there also would be predictability on how many bears are being moved into the entire NCE which overlaps both countries. The BC government has noted that their Recovery Plan is being developed jointly with the USFWS even though this US EIS only addresses the Washington effort.

5. As a trail horse rider in the NCE, I ask that the No Action Alternative be selected. The areas we ride in includes the Mt Baker Snoqualmie National Forest, the Okanogan Wenatchee National Forest including the Pasayten Wilderness, and the North Cascades National Park. We have many horse camps along the boundary of the NCE. We cannot support either Action Alternative without more substantive analysis on impacts to recreation as well as knowing more on the joint planning with Canadian counterparts.

Correspondence ID: 11835Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98125
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 10:53:24

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Stop the self-serving dreams of PhD biologists. Since the NCNP was created in 1969 there has been no permanent migration of Grizzlies from British Columbia into the NCNP (or Pasayten Wilderness.) That's a science experiment of 50 years!

If bears wander down across the border and like it here, great! But in the last 50 years it hasn't happened. Give it up.

Correspondence ID: 11836Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Prosser, WA 99350
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 10:53:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am opposed to the reintroduction of Grizzly Bears into Washington State. These animals are a serious danger to livestock and humans. Recent Grizzly Bear attacks in nearby Montana are proof that people are in danger of being killed. This would be a foolish move by WDFW. There are plenty of Black Bears in our state. We don't need the dangerous Grizzly.

Correspondence ID: 11837Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98107
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 10:54:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a frequent hiker and backpacker I object to the idea of reintroducing grizzlies in the north cascade. This would pose a danger and threat to backpackers and hikers and would make recreating in the outdoors more dangerous and less appealing. Please keep our outdoor areas safe for us by not adopting this plan.

Correspondence ID: 11838Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Port Angeles, WA 98362
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 10:59:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: While I recognize the dangers reintroduction of Grizzly's has on hikers, campers, and residents, I believe restoring the Grizzly Bear to its habitat and restoring the ecosystem is the right thing to do. How can we justify enjoying the land if we are 'editing' the wildlife populations to our favor only?

Correspondence ID: 11840Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Saint Louis, MO 63119-1805
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 11:01:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support Alternative B.

Although I live in Missouri, I regularly hike in the North Cascades (for example, I did a weeklong trip in the Glacier Peak Wilderness this past summer). I have also backpacked in Yellowstone NP, and seen grizzly bears in the backcountry.

I am concerned that Alternative C would allow opponents of the reintroduction of grizzly bears to concoct an excuse to shoot them.

As Yellowstone NP learned from wolf re-introduction, the health of the North Cascades ecosystem will be enhanced by re-introducing a keystone species like the grizzly bear.

Correspondence ID: 11841Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mukilteo, WA 98275
United States of America

Outside Organization: retired Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 11:02:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in favor of returning grizzly bears to the State of Washington. I would strongly prefer these bears to be released within the Pasayten Wilderness area.

It would be desirable to have the Grizzly Bears remain east of the Cascade elevation divide.

It would be desirable to have the bears fitted with radio tracking devices if possible.

Troublesome grizzly bears would first be removed to a remote area. However, in certain cases, troublesome grizzly bears could be confined to a zoo or be killed.

If the troublesome grizzly bear were to be killed, this action should be handled by the National Park Service, the National Forest Service, the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife, or by contracted individuals who have been granted this authorization by a state or federal agency.

I prefer the public should be forbidden to kill a Grizzly Bear except in a clear case of self defence.

Correspondence ID: 11843Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 11:05:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I'd like to see grizzly bears reintroduced to the North Cascades. We also know that they will arrive from Canada due to the reintroduction of grizzly bears there. They are important to have a healthy balanced ecosystem and they are endangered.

Correspondence ID: 11845Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Vashon, WA 98070
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 11:07:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The North Cascades ecosystem needs grizzly bears. They have been a part of it until they were hunted out. They need to be restored.

Correspondence ID: 11847Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Yakima, WA 98908
United States of America
Outside Organization: Back Country Horsemen of WA Non-Governmental
Received: Nov,07 2023 11:08:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: In addition to many horse camps and trails being designated as non-horse or multi-user trails, this would limit the areas of stock recreation. Encounters with bears is an unnerving experience for humans and stock as it now stands, adding another dimension of incidences, the result could be closing of more areas that are still now accessible. Many of our camps and areas of riding have already been closed due to unfunded maintenance requirements. As a trail horse rider in the NCE, I ask that the No Action Alternative be selected. The areas we ride in includes the Mt Baker Snoqualmie National Forest, the Okanogan Wenatchee National Forest including the Pasayten Wilderness, and the North Cascades National Park. We have many horse camps along the boundary of the NCE. We cannot support either Action Alternative without more substantive analysis on impacts to recreation as well as knowing more on the joint planning with Canadian counterparts.

Correspondence ID: 11849Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 11:09:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a resident of Bellingham and close to the North Cascade National Park and Mt. Baker National Forest, it is time to reintroduce this apex predator. Over and over research has shown that to maintain a healthy natural balance of animals, predators are crucial. One just has to see the positive response to the overall health of Yellowstone National Park after the reintroduction of wolves. Not only a natural balance of animals restored but a positive impact to vegetation and less bank erosion and flooding. I am a hiker and Mt. Baker National Forest is my playground while knowing that grizzlies will be meandering from British Columbia and the North Cascades National Park. It means I will have to be more careful when hiking if I wish not to encounter a bear. This philosophy should apply to mountain bikers or any outdoor enthusiast as well. Ranchers will yell the loudest but grizzlies are loners and not rabid livestock killers. It is time and I have been writing letters and attending meetings since 2017. Just do it!

Correspondence ID: 11850Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Federal Way, WA 98122
United States of America
Outside Organization: Community Roots Housing Business(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,07 2023 11:10:02
Correspondence Type:Web Form
Correspondence: I would like to see our Cascade eco system whole.

Correspondence ID: 11851Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Puyallup, WA 98373
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 11:10:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: What do human gain by reintroducing these killing machines? With all the interaction that has happened with human in the past year in Montana, Wyoming and Idaho that has ended badly for the humans should ask why put the possibility of an encounter between humans and bears is worth it. Then there is the issue of the deer populations that will suffer. I have been hunting elk in the panhandle of Idaho for the past 15 years and have seen what the wolf introducing has done to the elk population there. What has humans gained by that reintroduction of wolves there? Same thing will happen with the bears in Washington. What will humans gain, I ask.

Correspondence ID: 11852Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98122
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 11:10:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please help the grizzlies get reintroduced to the North Cascade region. It's crucial to our environment to have a thriving ecosystem

Correspondence ID: 11854Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Spokane, WA 99223
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 11:13:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Why doesn't anyone understand that killing our animals will destroy our ecosystem? Quit being helicopter people and understand the earth is for all animals to live.

Correspondence ID: 11855Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Redmond, WA 98053
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 11:13:42
Correspondence Type:Web Form
Correspondence: Please vote for bear restoration

Correspondence ID: 11858Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Covington, WA 98042
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 11:17:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am against reintroducing grizzly bears to Washington State for several reasons. Their populations are currently exploding in the areas they already habituate and now those areas are in disagreement with how to handle the issues brought on due to the ever increasing population and the conflicts brought on by it - human conflict, livestock conflict, financial burdens, etc. I don't think they should ever repopulate our area but at an absolute bare minimum it should at least wait until the current areas have an established AND long standing proven effective plan on how to manage the current issues, not just haphazardly add to the problem. The ecosystem of our state is flourishing as is without grizzly bears, there is no need to change what is already working. If nature intends for them to repopulate our area let it happen naturally. It would also definitely end many families spending time outdoors enjoying nature for fear of an encounter which is something we don't need added to an already struggling generation of kids who need to be out enjoying nature more. I would no longer feel secure letting my child go camping with a friend, ride his mountain bike, dirt bike riding and many other outdoor activities. We lived in Idaho for a while and this was a constant fear in the back our minds so we spent zero time in the woods. Prepared or not a grizzly bear attack happens in a split second most often without time to even react. Please don't take our woods away from us. Let nature run it's course on it's own.

Correspondence ID: 11860Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Camano Island, WA 98282
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 11:21:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am strongly in favor of establishing a grizzly bear population in the North Cascades.

I have hiked, camped and backpacked in the North Cascades for years. Many of my best experiences have included views or even signs of wildlife. The bears belong. Bring them back.

Correspondence ID: 11862Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Freeland, WA 98249
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 11:23:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Do not touch your hair on any grizzly bear or any other bear. It is their land. It is their home.

Correspondence ID: 11866Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98592
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 11:41:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a resident of northwest Washington State, I feel that the grizzly bear should be re-introduced to the Pacific Northwest. The grizzly was an integral component of the environment in the past. It needs to be reintroduced to complete the natural chain of the species. Without the grizzly, the other predators don't have an enemy to fear and will over populate the area. We need to remember that the grizzly bears were here long before we, people, were here.

Correspondence ID: 11868Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98107
United States of America

Outside Organization: Retired Unaffiliated Individual(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,07 2023 11:43:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Restoring grizzlies to the PNW would be good, just needs the population to be monitored. But not slaughtering sows and cubs in their dens to "manage"

Correspondence ID: 11869Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Marysville, WA 98270
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 11:43:21

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please bring back the bears to their habitat

Correspondence ID: 11870Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Camano Island, WA 98282
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 11:45:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I fully support the measure. We need to retire the balance of nature by bringing back the native bears

Correspondence ID: 11872Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Port Orchard, WA 98386
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 11:47:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please bring these majestic animals back to our beautiful state. They belong here along side us.

Correspondence ID: 11874Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Gig Harbor, WA 98329
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 11:49:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a resident of Washington State, I am excited at the prospect of grizzly bears returning to the North Cascades ecosystem. Wherever grizzlies thrive, so does wildness, clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife. That's why I support restoring grizzly bears to the North Cascades via Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation - provided that the accompanying 10(J) rule promotes the recovery of the population, ensures management is humane, prioritizes non-lethal management tools and enables humans and grizzly bears to coexist. Properly developed and implemented, the 10(J) rule will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Correspondence ID: 11876Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellevue, WA 98006
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 11:50:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have personally witnessed the improvement of the ecosystem with the return of an Apex predator(gray wolf) to its original range in YNP. I believe to restore the balance, all preexisting fauna should inhabit its original range. If the Grizzly used to roam and live in the cascades then they should be re-established in the area.

Correspondence ID: 11877Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America
Outside Organization: Seattle University Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 11:51:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Let's attempt to restore what we can of real wildlife in the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 11879Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Suquamish, WA 98392
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 11:53:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We should do all we can to restore grizzlies to north cascades. Not doing anything should not be a option. Since we as humans destroyed these bears,

we should attempt to restore these bears to north cascades.

Please help these bears live in the wild

Thank you, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 11881Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 11:58:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzly bears and other large mammals are essential to ecosystems. They not only add to biodiversity themselves, but their activity alters ecosystems, creating support and opportunities for other plant and animal species.

We are all part of an interconnected web, and every species is essential to its balance. Humans' fear of a particular animal due to our encroachment on their habitat should not prevent supporting those species and protecting, restoring and maintaining their habitats and communities.

Thank you,
[REDACTED]
Writer for EcoWatch

Correspondence ID: 11882Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Melbourne, FL 32940
United States of America
Outside Organization: - Select - Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 12:00:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I greatly support restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades; but I do not agree with either of the alternatives as they would both violate the Wilderness Act.
The use of helicopters and heavy machinery should be avoided at all costs. The use of 10j is not acceptable as it means that grizzlies protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in Montana would be taken from their home and safety and dropped into the North Cascades thereby losing their protection. The Endangered Species Act and the Wilderness Act MUST be strictly followed for the protection of our Wildlife and Wilderness Areas. Montana grizzlies have not yet naturally

recovered to a healthy eco-system under the ESA.

A natural recovery system alternative must be fully developed and analyzed in spite of the length of time to repopulate.

Natural recovery is ALWAYS the answer to bring a species back to a normal, healthy level.

The natural recovery system MUST be incorporated into both of the proposed alternatives. Recovery could also be examined by natural recovery with augmentation under FULL protection.

The no action alternative has some benefits with the scientifically known practice of coexistence measures that prepare and teach residents and visitors how to handle conflict humanely and efficiently. This can be done.

Humans are moving more and more into bear regions and they have to respect the wildlife in full.

The Wilderness Act and the ESA are the stalwarts of Wildlife and Wilderness areas. They CANNOT be violated.

Correspondence ID: 11883Project:112008Document:132104

Address: ELLENSBURG, WA 98926-8133
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 12:05:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The vast majority of people living and recreating in or near the proposed reintroduction area are totally against any reintroduction of grizzly bears. It's absurd the federal government is considering forcing them upon us. Please do not reintroduce these bears. It will be a matter of time until someone in our communities will be attacked and killed.

Correspondence ID: 11884Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kent, WA 98031
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 12:06:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a long time resident of Washington State, I am excited at the prospect of grizzly bears returning to the North Cascades ecosystem where they helped create it over centuries, while I've had to watch humans destroy 80% of its evolution, function, and health in the blink of an ecological eye. Wherever grizzlies thrive, so does wilderness, clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife, and the very evolutionary ecosystems upon which humans rely on to survive! That's why I support restoring grizzly bears to the North Cascades via Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation - provided that the accompanying 10(J) rule promotes the recovery of the population, ensures management is humane, prioritizes non-lethal management tools and enables humans and grizzly bears to coexist. Properly developed and implemented, the 10(J) rule will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape."

Please WAKE THE HELL UP TO HUMANS BEING A PART OF THIS PLANET'S ECOLOGY, ENVIRONMENT, and EVOLUTIONARY DEVELOPMENT and RESTORE THAT BALANCE RATHER THAN CONTRIBUTING TO HUMAN GENOCIDE BY STUPIDITY, ARROGANCE, and RELIGIOUS DELUSIONS OF GRANDEUR.

Correspondence ID: 11885Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sequim, WA 98382
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 12:08:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Many years ago, grizzly bears roamed the North Cascades region of Washington, carrying on a vital role in the ecosystem as a keystone species. Today, even as other grizzly bear populations struggle toward recovery from near extinction, grizzlies are still functionally extinct in the North Cascades. It's time to bring them back. As a resident of Washington State, I am excited at the prospect of grizzly bears returning to the North Cascades ecosystem. Wherever grizzlies thrive, so does wilderness, clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife. That's why I support restoring grizzly bears to the North Cascades via Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation -

provided that the accompanying 10(J) rule promotes the recovery of the population, ensures management is humane, prioritizes non-lethal management tools and enables humans and grizzly bears to coexist. Properly developed and implemented, the 10(J) rule will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Correspondence ID: 11886Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Vernon, AZ 85940
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 12:12:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do not support the proposal to reintroduce grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem for the following reasons:

1. There is little local support for the proposal from those who will have to live with the consequences first-hand. While there may be majority support for the proposal nation- or region-wide, I suspect it is primarily from those who don't live in the area, so there will be no direct impacts on their lifestyles. The local populace will face the brunt of adverse impacts from having an apex predator in their backyards. Unlike gray wolves, grizzly bears do attack and kill people. This will lead to more hostility towards grizzly bears, the Endangered Species Act, and federal agencies charged with administering and enforcing the ESA.
2. Grizzly bears will be persecuted by those opposed to the reintroduction proposal. There is no way to stop illegal killings of reintroduced bears. No amount of federal enforcement or rewards will impact this. I have great admiration and respect for these animals, and I surely want to see them recovered, but this proposal is going to unleash more hostility towards bears and ESA and more unfortunate killing of this grand species.
3. Moving this proposal forward will further harden the views of those skeptical of ESA species recovery efforts and will undoubtedly raise the ire of elected officials looking for further evidence of a hostile federal government not listening to local concerns.
4. It doesn't matter whether the federal government lists these bears as an experimental population. They are grizzly bears-an apex predator. They will undoubtedly have adverse run ins with people, pets, and livestock. Someone will get mauled or killed and the federal government will be blamed for not listening to the concerns of its citizens. It is inevitable. There is no way to sugarcoat this or sweeten the deal for locals through a designation. Grizzlies will do what grizzlies do. The bears will either be killed by locals or removed and killed by state or federal agents.
5. You are proposing to reintroduce bears into an ecosystem that hasn't had bears in decades. During their absence, the ecosystem has developed a visitation expectation as a safe place to hunt, fish, and recreate. As an avid outdoors person, I can tell you quite honestly, while I love the idea of grizzly bears, I hesitate to recreate in areas inhabited by them, for good reason. Where they are present, we are no longer at the top of the pyramid. We are vulnerable. It doesn't matter the low odds of having an adverse interaction. You are potentially opening up a Pandora's Box. For the sake of the bears, I urge you to reconsider.

Correspondence ID: 11887Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 12:12:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hello, I would like to voice my opposition to reintroducing grizzly bears in the North Cascades.

Here a a few reasons why I do not think grizzly bears should be reintroduced to the North Cascades:

- 1) They could pose a threat to human safety, with encounters potentially leading to conflicts and danger.

2) The reintroduction could lead to hunting restrictions or reduced opportunities, affecting the economic interests of hunters and related businesses.

3) With grizzlies roaming the North Cascades, recreational activities like hiking, camping, and fishing could face restrictions or deter tourists. Areas like the Methow Valley depend on tourism for everyone's economic well being and I don't want to jeopardize the tourism that feeds areas surrounding the North Cascades for the sake of a few bears.

I ask that you do not reintroduce grizzly bears into the North Cascades.

Thank you for considering my opinion.

Correspondence ID: 11889Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lynden, WA 98264
United States of America

Outside Organization: BCH Non-Governmental

Received: Nov,07 2023 12:16:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I don't agree with putting grizzly bears in the N Cascades, If they come there on their own or from Canada, we can't do much about it. But to endanger people and their livestock seems ridiculous and reckless, by putting bears ahead of people. As we have seen in Montana. We have enjoyed riding in the wilderness for over 40 years, with our horses and small children. This would put us all in danger, I wouldn't feel comfortable in taking kids there anymore, nor would I myself feel comfortable with this. I hope you use some common sense and let people continue to use this beautiful area without being in danger

Correspondence ID: 11890Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Melbourne, FL 32940
United States of America

Outside Organization: - Select - Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 12:23:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am greatly opposed to the proposed U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) [section 10j under the Endangered Species Act (ESA)] that want to make it easy to kill the grizzlies that the agency that proposes to relocate to the Northern Cascades.

The USFWS proposes that designated threatened grizzlies bears move to the North Cascades as a "NONESENTIAL EXPERIMENT POPULATION". I am highly offended of the use of the words Nonessential and Experiment. The Humans' "Superiority Complex" has already done immense damage to our Wilderness, our Country and the Earth.

This proposal is not only counterproductive and bizarre, but it is unethical and must not be allowed to happen.

Correspondence ID: 11892Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Chewelah, WA 99109
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 12:24:10

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I fully support reintroducing Grizzly Bears to the Cascade Mountains. Science shows that diversity is essential to environmental health in every aspect, and that includes predatory animals as they move nutrients deeper into

forests, enriching soil, and sending prey animals into natural migrations through the eco system, preventing over grazing and degradation. People need to learn to live with wildlife if we are to thrive.

Correspondence ID: 11893Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Maple Valley, WA 98038
United States of America
Outside Organization: BCHW Non-Governmental
Received: Nov,07 2023 12:25:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Contrary to some of my Backcountry Horsemen I support the re-establishment of the grizzly bear population in the North Cascades. Restoring the grizzly will enhance rather than detract from the recreation experience in this area.

We know the best practices for recreating in bear country. If we follow those practices I'm sure we can and will be able to co-exist with the grizzly.

Please proceed with your planning and release of the grizzly.

Kind regards,

██████████ - Maple Valley, WA

Correspondence ID: 11895Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Kent, WA 98032
United States of America
Outside Organization: Kent People for Climate Action Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 12:30:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Bring grizzly bears back into the landscape in Washington. They are much more important than cattle.

Correspondence ID: 11896Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98274
United States of America
Outside Organization: CCHW and Cowboy Campsite Business(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,07 2023 12:34:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: In addition to the concerns listed below by the BCHW group leadership, as a member and board member of Cowboy Campsite, I only see problems associated with this initiative. Our 90-acre campground is located in the North Cascades portion of the proposed area. We have 125 memberships who own campsites and over 200 members that potentially ride the nearby trails all year long in the Harry Osbourne State Forest including my family. Please pursue the "No Action" alternative indefinitely.

As a member of Back Country Horsemen of Washington, I am very concerned with the ability to continue to recreate in the North Cascades should a small population of heavily protected grizzly bears be mechanically moved into the region that we recreate in. The DEIS does not sufficiently analyze the impact to recreation or present any options for how trails can be maintained open in the presence of protections implemented to reduce human-grizzly interactions.

1. The Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail runs through the core habitat and has permitted distance hikers of around 10,000. When considering the other trail users in and along the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE) since this is one of the most populated areas around any bear ecosystem, the use likely exceeds a quarter million visits. However, the DEIS indicates that the use is insignificant. It is very significant and will likely result in many human-bear interactions.

2. The Pacific Northwest National Scenic Trail also runs through the NCE as well as other bear ecosystems to the east, including the Cabinet-Yaak (CYE). The CYE has a more established population of bears but still has resulted with challenges to the very existence of the trail due to the limited number of bears in the CYE (20-40). Opposition to the National Scenic Trail in the recovering bear population area as well as the connecting landscapes between ecosystems has also been expressed by USFWS staff, the same agency putting forth the NCE proposal through which the same trail will pass.

3. Without a more detailed analysis of how to retain the carrying capacity of the trails, trailheads, and campgrounds without resulting in long term or permanent closures, there is no way to effectively review this DEIS.

4. Furthermore, the NPS and USFWS have pointed out that the Canadian counterparts and First Nations are preparing to release grizzly bears in the northern part of the NCE. IF that was the only release point, it would move the core recovery/release area north and away from the more densely human populated areas of Washington State. It also would be in line with Washington State law as well since no bears would be translocated directly into Washington, and there also would be predictability on how many bears are being moved into the entire NCE which overlaps both countries. The BC government has noted that their Recovery Plan is being developed jointly with the USFWS even though this US EIS only addresses the Washington effort.

5. As a trail horse rider in the NCE, I ask that the No Action Alternative be selected. The areas we ride in includes the Mt Baker Snoqualmie National Forest, the Okanogan Wenatchee National Forest including the Pasayten Wilderness, and the North Cascades National Park. We have many horse camps along the boundary of the NCE. We cannot support either Action Alternative without more substantive analysis on impacts to recreation as well as knowing more on the joint planning with Canadian counterparts.

Correspondence ID: 11897Project:112008Document:132104

Address: OMAK, WA 98841
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 12:40:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am opposed to USFS bringing any more grizzlies into Okanogan County, Washington. They are here and have been over the past years. During the years 1979 and 1980,I was employed by Okanogan Co. Sheriffs Office as a Deputy Sheriff to patrol the Tonasket Ranger District of the Us Forest. During that time, I investigated two Hereford Cow kills. One north of Crawfish Lake, buried under a pile of brush. her estimate weight around two thousand pounds. The second one was with a yearling calf. Both were dead with the cows neck was broke and her left side was raked with large claw marks. The calf died with two large puncture wounds at the base of its neck. Neither had been eaten. They were located East of Crawfish Lake. Later I was contacted by a Rancher who lives on Coco Mtn. Road, north of Anenas valley road. He told me that He spotted A Sow Grizzley with twin cubs at gooseberry meadows north of his ranch in the last week. Mr. Brazile reported that he was cutting hay on his property next to Roy Nealey's Ranch east of Havilah when he spotted a lone Grizzley next to a small lake. Other Ranchers from the area have seen them over the years.

About 12 years ago, during the 4th of July , while riding our atv's on the West side of Arlington Ridge south of Conconully at the old townsite of Loop-Loop my wife and I and others in our party spotted a lone Grizzley about 200 yards crossing a meadow away from us.

In closing, I do not support The bears being brought in from Montana or elsewhere.

Correspondence ID: 11898Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Broadbent, OR 97414
United States of America

Outside Organization: retired RN Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 12:40:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears repopulating the Cascades? Not only no but Hell No!

I'm a retired nurse. I worked in the ICU at the Intermountain Medical Center, a Level 1 Regional Trauma Center. We got hikers mauled by grizzly bears flown in on the chopper. Two were DOA (dead on arrival) One died in ICU. One survived. This does not include the campers/hikers found dead in the field.

Reintroduction of grizzly bears is not a good idea. Thank you for reconsidering.

Correspondence ID: 11900Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Suquamish, WA 98392
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 12:41:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Option A is not an option. We can live with grizzly bears. Reintroduce them.

Correspondence ID: 11902Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Brinnon, WA 98320
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 12:47:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support reintroduction of grizzly bears to their former range in the North Cascades. However, this must be done in manner fully consistent with the Wilderness designation of areas involved and fully consistent with all the protections of the Endangered Species Act. Designation as a "nonessential experimental population," [the 10(j) rule] with the resulting loss of protections is inappropriate.

Correspondence ID: 11903Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 12:47:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzlies in the N. Cascades works for me.

Correspondence ID: 11904Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 12:47:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do not believe reintroducing grizzly bears is a good idea for two big reasons.

Reason one:

The bears that will be introduced are not native to the North Cascades. Yes, grizzly bears did once roam the North Cascades. However, the bears that would be introduced to the North Cascades are perfectly adapted to the environment they are being taken from, not here. Everything from their behavior, their diet and their temperament is dependent on their habitat. Animals do not adapt to change's overnight, it sometimes takes hundreds of years. Not to mention the native animals living in the North Cascades. There is no telling exactly how this will affect the deer, elk and mountain goat population. They are not adapted to a habitat that is shared with grizzly bears. There's no telling what this will do to the native wildlife population, but if we look at history, it most likely will impact native wildlife in a negative way.

Reason Two:

Interactions/encounters between grizzly bears and humans is something that no one wants to think about when they are enjoying the outdoors. Introducing grizzly bears to the region will increase human and bear interaction, which is bad for the human and the bear. The introduction of grizzlies will compromise the safety and assurance of both people and bear, especially in a region that is popular for hiking and camping. Sure, this will not be a problem at first, but give it time and it will eventually become a problem.

Thank you

Correspondence ID: 11905Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Laconner, WA 98257
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 12:47:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My great grandfather and grandmother moved to a remote location on Lake Chelan in 1907. My family and I still have a large portion of the ranch. They were sheep ranchers and tended orchards. While family history and birth records indicate he was native, his ancestry was not of any local tribes but from east.

My Aunt and Uncle currently live there three seasons and I will as well in the future. The property is surrounded by Okanogan Wenatchee National Forest on all borders. The property is boat access only and off grid. There are by far more wild animals than people there, which is part what makes it so special there. We regularly have bear interactions although generally just property destruction only.

While I understand the desire to correct or repair human destruction of species and habitats, I do not want to add Grizzlies to the list of animals we already encounter and share space with. This area of reintroduction is literally our back door.

Thank you for the opportunity to voice my concern.

Correspondence ID: 11906Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Oak Harbor, WA 98277
United States of America

Outside Organization: BCH Non-Governmental

Received: Nov,07 2023 12:50:08

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: It is my opinion that adding grizzly bears to the North Cascades environment is an extremely bad idea. Many of us like to venture into the forests. We are absolutely respectful of these wild places and would never do anything to jeopardize its natural existence. My BCH group goes to great care for maintaining the available trail. For example, I will pick up debris on the trails so that others do not have to have their pathway obstructed. I would like to be mindful of existing wild animals such as cougars or brown/black bears so that myself or others do not harm them or ourselves. I have been hiking and skiing in the Cascades for nearly 60 years. I consider it a precious national treasure and am thankful for those who have gone before us to preserve and protect these lands. PLEASE!!!!!!! DO NOT ALLOW THE INTRODUCTION OF THESE GRIZZLY BEARS!!!! I want my children and grandchildren to enjoy these spaces.

Correspondence ID: 11907Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lake Stevens, WA 98258
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 12:53:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Reintroducing grizzlies to the North Cascades will be a terrible mistake. The outcome will be inevitable: livestock killings, pet killings, human casualties. Make no mistake: grizzlies are predators. Humans are predators. There will be conflict between both before the apex predator is determined.

Do you feel comfortable with being directly responsible for a child being one of the casualties of this conflict? With an elderly person living near the forest being attacked? With a hiker on being pursued, killed, and eaten? How about with a Scout troop being assaulted as they sleep in their tents? You will bear the load of responsibility for every incident if you reintroduce grizzlies to the North Cascades.

I am from Canada. One of my very good friends suffered just such a fate. You can say it will never happen here. Or if it does, it's the fault of the humans.

You are wrong. Dead wrong.

Correspondence ID: 11908Project:112008Document:132104

Address: QClarkston, WA 99403
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 12:54:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As an historically native apex predator to the region, it's critical that the reintroduction of Grizzlies to their historical ranges be welcomed. Thriving numbers of apex predators are a sure indication of a healthy ecosystem. As demonstrated by ecosystems where they do thrive, there's also the additional economic benefits brought in by citizens who seek to view them in nature. We've done so much damage to our natural ecosystems. It's not too late to address the damages done and attempt to reestablish natural balances, more so for future generations to enjoy and cherish.

Correspondence ID: 11909Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spokane, WA 99217
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 12:59:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I oppose introducing more grizzlies to the North Cascades Ecosystem!! Dangerous people-grizzly bear encounters will increase. This year alone there have been at least nine grizzly attacks on people up and down the Rocky Mountain Corridor of Idaho-Montana. A man lost his jaw to a grizzly in Montana. A couple in Banff Park were killed. I completely disagree with reintroduction of a native species if that native species is a threat to human life and prosperity. Speculative estimates are made as to how many attacks will be made on livestock. Why doesn't the EIS estimate grizzly related attacks? Obvious! Those should be no less accurate than livestock interactions. I have more concern for the safety of people using the area proposed and the families that live in the surrounding area. Ecosystem scientists and people that will never recreate in the area care more about the the grizzly bear and the infinitesimal impact of reintroduction on the ecosystem over human safety.

Ecosystems have not been static through time, they are constantly adapting including through pre-historic time. Ecosystem scientists should stop trying to manage species back to some arbitrary point in history. What a waste of time and resources unless it is for human health and safety.

Correspondence ID: 11910Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Walla Walla, WA 99362
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 13:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Restoration of Grizzly Bears to the North cascades is long overdue. Apex predators are groups of mammals that require more attention since there is the constant struggle with us. We have done a great job in restoring the ungulates; let's make sure that we do the same with animals that bite! Incidentally, get the livestock grazers resituated to the mid-west, closer to their food supply!

Correspondence ID: 11911Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Portland, OR 97229-6375
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 13:01:48

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: North Cascades is a great summer hiking, camping, recreational area for the Pacific Northwest residents. Grizzly bears are easily the most dangerous wild animals in United States. Grizzly habitat means, right away, carry bear spray on even shortest hikes, no tent camping, constant focus on the surroundings instead of enjoying the great outdoors. Unlike black bears, grizzlies do not necessarily avoid humans - they may confront and attack humans. Think about Yellowstone, rangers recommendations about bear safety, cases of deaths of wounds inflicted by grizzly bears in the surrounding areas almost every year. Grizzlies are not endangered animals, there are parts of the country where they are thriving. Of all things, grizzlies is the last thing we need in the Pacific Northwest.

Sincerely yours,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 11912Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Selah, WA 98942
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 13:02:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am admittedly apposed to relocating Grizzly Bears into WA State. The complications this will cause with hikers, horseback riders, and other user groups is huge. And the impact to other wildlife will also be affected. I am a member of Back Country Horsemen of WA, as well as the local chapter. Our public lands are being cut by not having a budget for the Forest Service to maintain trails that currently exist and now we will have to deal with a population of bear that has a whole new set of concerns for safety. I ask this. Would you relocate them to the Olympic Peninsula? I didn't think so.

Correspondence ID: 11913Project:112008Document:132104

Address: arlington, WA 98223
United States of America

Outside Organization: none Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 13:05:12

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not support this project. The safety of human population using the North Cascades would be at risk. Yellow stone and other parks have proven my point. It is my understanding in early 1990's Washington department of Fish and Wild life did several studies in the North Cascades and the results did not support Grizzly habitat.

Correspondence ID: 11916Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Chelan, WA 98816
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 13:12:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I fear that there will be too many human-bear interactions that result in great or substantial bodily injury. I also fear that over time these bears will become food-habituated and actively seek out human food from hikers, backpackers, and climbers.

I can also see local communities will face the burden of living alongside these bears. I understand that there is a small population already. I also understand these bears need big territories to wander and live. However I believe a bigger population will lead to conflict. Poaching may become a problem. I'm not sure that these grizzlies will be able to live in peace and prosper as intended.

Correspondence ID: 11917Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Medford, OR 97501
United States of America
Outside Organization: Pacific Crest Trail Association Unaffiliated Individual(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,07 2023 13:12:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: November 7, 2023

Superintendent
North Cascades National Park Service Complex
810 State Route 20
Sedro Woolley, WA 98284

RE: The PCTA's Response to the 2023 North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Superintendent,

I am writing on behalf of the 14,700-member Pacific Crest Trail Association (PCTA). The PCTA is the primary private partner, with the federal, state and local land management agencies, in the management and maintenance of the Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail (PCT). The foundation for this private-public partnership in the operation of National Scenic Trails is rooted in the 1968 National Trails System Act. Section 11 of the Act, titled "Volunteer Trails Assistance" states, "... the head of any Federal agency administering Federal lands, are authorized to encourage volunteers and volunteer organizations to plan, develop, maintain, and manage, where appropriate, trails throughout the Nation." Sec. 11(b) continues, "Each Secretary or the head of any Federal land managing agency, may assist volunteers and volunteer organizations in planning, developing, maintaining, and managing trails."

The involvement of volunteer and private organizations in the operation of National Scenic Trails is re-emphasized in Executive Order 13195, "Trails for America in the 21st Century." The Order states, "Section 1. Federal Agency Duties. Federal agencies will, to the extent permitted by law and where practicable--and in cooperation with Tribes, States, local governments, and interested citizen groups--protect, connect, promote, and assist trails of all types throughout the United States. This will be accomplished by: (g) Fostering volunteer programs and opportunities to engage volunteers in all aspects of trail planning, development, maintenance, management, and education as outlined in 16 U.S.C. 1250." Based on this direction, and captured in our memorandum of understanding, it is the PCTA's role to work with the land management agencies to ensure the best possible management of the PCT and the year-round experiences it affords trail users.

The PCTA supports the purposes and needs presented in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) documents and the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE). Grizzly bears are a historically natural part of the NCE, and we support efforts to recover the species and promote an environment that maintains its natural conditions, processes, and species composition. Grizzly reintroduction is consistent with direction in the PCT's designating statute, the 1968 National Trails System Act, to conserve the natural qualities of the areas through which national scenic trails may pass. The Act states:

"National scenic trails... will be extended trails so located as to provide for maximum outdoor recreation potential and for the conservation and enjoyment of the nationally significant scenic, historic, natural, or cultural qualities of the areas through which such trails may pass [emphasis added]."

As planning for grizzly bear reintroduction proceeds, we ask that management of the PCT and requirements from the National Trails System Act are adequately considered and incorporated throughout the planning process. Restoration of a self-sustaining grizzly bear population in the NCE is consistent with the "nature and purposes" for which the PCT was designated as a national scenic trail. The PCT's nature and purposes statement, along with the trail's significance and fundamental resources and values can be found in the PCT Foundation Document.

While PCTA supports the intent behind the reintroduction of grizzly bears into the NCE, we ask that area and trail closures only be utilized when absolutely necessary. That said, we appreciate the agency speaking to the issue on page 122 of the DEIS as stated below.

"Initially, closure of park or forest facilities and main roads is not expected to occur nor would access to visitors be limited because of grizzly bear restoration. For example, the agencies do not anticipate the need to institute trail closures along the Pacific Crest Trail or other high use trails."

Throughout the grizzly bear reintroduction planning process, it will be important to recognize that the PCT is a highly valued recreational resource that sees use from thru-hikers (people attempting to hike the entire trail in one season), other backpackers and horseback riders, and day-hikers. Additionally, there are countless other backcountry travelers who use the PCT as part of a broader backcountry or wilderness trip. Altogether, the PCT sees thousands of people per year. The PCTA would like to avoid a situation where access to the PCT is unduly restricted due to concern of bear and human conflicts.

The PCTA is incredibly supportive of additional backcountry bear-resistant food containers (i.e., bear canisters) requirements for overnight users to reduce the potential for human and bear conflicts. Additionally, we support opportunities to increase public education around how PCT hikers, horseback riders, and other backcountry travelers can recreate more responsibly. We believe that proper food storage requirements and effective public education should negate the need to unduly restrict backcountry and wilderness recreation opportunities.

As the exact effects that reintroduced grizzly bears will have on outdoor recreationists in the NCE is unknown, as well as the impact non-motorized recreationists will have on bear populations, we support the initial reintroduced population being designated as a 10(j) population within the meaning of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) as described in Alternative C of the DEIS.

We appreciate your time and consideration of the PCTA's comments regarding management of the Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail in relation to the 2023 North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan Draft Environmental Impact Statement. As the primary private partner in the management and maintenance of the PCT, we are eager to work with the federal agencies to ensure the purpose and need of reintroducing grizzly bears to the NCE is successful, while still providing for the PCT's nature and purposes. Please do not hesitate to contact the PCTA with any questions or to discuss our comments.

Sincerely,

██████████
██
Pacific Crest Trail Association
██████████

Correspondence ID: 11918Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Everett, WA 98208
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 13:12:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please don't bring more Grizzly bears to the Cascades. What do you think will happen at the trails? There are already grizzly bears in the Cascades. I and a friend were on a hike back from Fisher Lake, off US 2 when we encountered one on August 18 this year.

Correspondence ID: 11919Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 13:13:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please bring the grizzlies to WA! I used to live in Idaho near the Tetons and had several peaceful and powerful interactions with these amazing creatures. We must do all we can to make this planet healthier and stronger and the Grizzly Bears can help us!

Correspondence ID: 11920Project:112008Document:132104

Address: University Place, WA 98467
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 13:13:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Bring back the grizzlies to THEIR territory! They are a valuable part of the North Cascades ecosystem that was removed violently by humans in the 1800's.

Correspondence ID: 11921Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tonasket, WA 98855
United States of America

Outside Organization: Individual Unaffiliated Individual(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,07 2023 13:14:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears should be returned to the cascades.

Correspondence ID: 11922Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spokane, WA 99202
United States of America

Outside Organization: Gonzaga University University/Professional Society

Received: Nov,07 2023 13:17:31

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The reintroduction of the grizzly bear to the NCE bear recovery zone is a necessary step in restoring historical biodiversity to the area and providing ecosystem resilience and strength to the NCE. The DEIS covers many important points but should be careful to include several other points.

While Alternative A is necessary when drafting and EIS, implementing Alternative A would only provide negative effects to the NCE. While it is the most cost effective and easily implementable strategy, there is no interest in re-introducing grizzlies in this plan. There is no indication that grizzlies will establish themselves naturally in the NCE anytime in the next 50 years as the NCE is fairly isolated from other grizzly habitats. As climate change continues to encroach, every year that grizzlies are not re-introduced is a detriment to the NCE, as the keystone species is not providing the various benefits and ecological resilience attributed to them.

When introducing grizzlies in both action plans, initiative should be taken to provide as much genetic diversity as possible. While it would be reasonable to translocate grizzlies from the same grizzly recovery region, efforts should be made to select grizzlies with high levels of genetic diversity both on an individual and population scale. This will provide the grizzly

population with the most resilience against disturbances and would only improve the population as generations progressed.

While Alternatives B and C are both acceptable options for the reintroduction, alternative B does not provide the flexibility to handle the innate complications that come with bear and human interactions. While Alt. B does allow for defense of life, the interactions between humans and bears are vastly more complicated. Alternative C allows the flexibility necessary to promote a safe and successful co-existence between humans and bears.

Correspondence ID: 11923Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Atlanta, GA 30339
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 13:17:49
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am very concerned about the plight of the grizzlies. I encourage our leaders to return them to where they belong.

Correspondence ID: 11924Project:112008Document:132104
Address: RICHLAND, WA, WA 99352
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 13:20:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I believe grizzlies should be reintroduced to the North Cascades. Apex predators are necessary for a healthy eco system.

Correspondence ID: 11926Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Vashon, WA 98070-4313
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 13:23:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am writing in SUPPORT of the proposal to reintroduce grizzly bears to the North Cascade Ecosystem in northwest and northcentral Washington.

I am an avid hiker and have safely hiked and camped in grizzly bear territories - including a safe, distant encounter with a grizzly bear while hiking in Alaska.

I respect the concerns of local citizens with regards to this reintroduction and ask that consideration be made to address their concerns - while continuing to move forward with this historic opportunity.

I am excited for a future of living and hiking in a Washington where grizzly bears have been thoughtfully re-established in their historic range.

Correspondence ID: 11927Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Deming, WA 98244
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 13:27:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am an avid backpacker and have been my whole life. I support efforts to protect and restore the environment on many fronts including in my own community living in the foothills of the Cascades. However, I find it rather odd that Grizzly reintroduction has become a priority and that the various agencies are spending millions of dollars pursuing

this agenda. I live around Black Bears and also often see them while hiking. They bring me great joy and I have never felt like they had any inclination to be aggressive. Grizzly Bears on the other hand are known to be much more aggressive. It is my understanding that Grizzly Bears also compete with Black Bears for food and territory. I would rather see a healthy population of Black Bears and let the Grizzly Bears return naturally if that were to happen. I would rather see the Federal agencies spend the energy protecting Mountain Lions and Wolves from ranchers who think it is their right to graze cows on Federal land at subsidized prices. If we really want to build up the large predator population then I would rather see an end to the killing of wolves, coyotes and Lions for the sake of raising cows for profit. I vote for the option to do nothing and not spend more energy reintroducing Grizzly Bears. Michael Savatgy

Correspondence ID: 11928Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98516
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 13:29:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Humans seem to be extremely ignorant and quite capable of displacing and eventually wiping out other species. There seems no regard for understanding what role other species play in our environment. Overall, humans no longer need to hunt for survival. In fact, they no longer need to hunt for any reason beyond the human thrill of stalking and killing.

The return of the Grizzly Bear is a great start in helping to bring back this magnificent animal from the brink of extinction. As a lifelong resident of Washington state, I am thrilled with the prospect of returning the Grizzly Bear to their natural habitat. Thanks so much for taking the time to seriously consider this issue. It's so important and I sincerely hope you will follow through.

Correspondence ID: 11929Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98102
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 13:29:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I write to support alternative C in the draft EIS. Both my father and I have worked in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem (GYE) over the course of the last 30 years, and we have both seen the positive impacts to the natural world and to the visitor experience to the park that having apex predators like grizzly bears bring to the area. We have also seen how beneficial it is to have a multi-agency apparatus in place for making difficult management decisions, and I believe that option C of the draft EIS best provides for the sort of nuanced, granular rulemaking that is vital to the success of reintroduction projects. As we have learned from the experiences of the wolf reintroduction in the GYE, there will be conflicts with other sorts of land use whenever an apex predator is reintroduced into an area. I believe that those tradeoffs are worth it for the sake of ecosystem integrity and restoration, but whatever you believe it is important to have a framework in place for responding agilely to stakeholder concerns, changing conditions in the field, and other unforeseen circumstances. Alternative C provides that framework, and should be adopted.

Correspondence ID: 11930Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Friday Harbor, WA 98250
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 13:30:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I would love to see grizzly bears living in the Cascade Mountains again. I would only like to see this, however, if the reintroduced bears receive protection at the federal level... Forever. It has been heart breaking to see wolves reintroduced into states that turn around and kill them on-mass. It is irresponsible and unethical for any animal, whether it is endangered or not, to be brought into areas where they will be at risk from state legislation granting the right to unrestricted

killing. Bring grizzly bears back, but make sure they have the protections they need to ensure their continued survival and quality of life into perpetuity. Anything less is a cruel and irresponsible joke.

Correspondence ID: 11932Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 13:32:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not reintroduce grizzlies to the north cascades. This area has wildlife in it that has adapted to life without this big game predator and reintroduction could harm other species in the area. Also, this area is popular for hiking and camping and I think most people would not want to encounter a grizzly for their sake and the bears.

Correspondence ID: 11936Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA, WA 98103
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 13:42:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Humans were responsible for removing grizzlies from the North Cascades and it's our responsibility to bring them back home. They are a critical component of a healthy ecosystem - let's take this opportunity and rewild the Cascades!

Correspondence ID: 11937Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bothell, WA 98021
United States of America

Outside Organization: Olympic Vulture Study Non-Governmental(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,07 2023 13:44:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I would very much like to see the introduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades as long as there is proper and humane management all around.

Correspondence ID: 11938Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sequim, WA 98382
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 13:45:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The restoration of native wildlife is an appropriate policy in certain areas that do not have heavy recreation use. There is no benefit for grizzly bears or humans (and livestock) to putting them in areas where they are likely to encounter each other. Grizzlies are not an endangered species that needs more places to roam freely. They do quite well in many places in Canada, Alaska, and the continental United States. First Nation people will not benefit by living in an area where their people and property may be endangered as well.

Correspondence ID: 11940Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Port Angeles, WA 98363
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 13:48:08

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I believe we owe the grizzlies a chance and monitoring and management will mitigate risk. After all people have been touring the wilds of Alaska on and off trail and river for generations with minimal risk. The population proposed is small and the area large. Let's cohabitate peacefully with them in the northwest and at least try.

Correspondence ID: 11941Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spokane, WA 99218
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 13:49:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support having grizzlies back, 100%. We are the reason they're gone and so we should be the reason they're back.

Correspondence ID: 11943Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Port Angeles, WA 98362
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 13:59:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly support the return of Grizzly Bears to their historic range.

Correspondence ID: 11944Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Stanwood, WA 98292
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 14:02:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please don't do this! Nobody is for this and is a bad idea from start. The Bears died off for a reason. Do not bring them back to the area. It will just cause trouble.

Correspondence ID: 11945Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Woodinville, WA 98072
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 14:03:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears play a vital role in maintaining ecosystem balance, cycling nutrients, dispersing seeds, and changing the behavior of species around them. Restoring them would benefit the park and the people who use it.

A restored population of grizzlies will benefits to local communities and support the park's mission to protect park resources in perpetuity.

Correspondence ID: 11946Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kent, WA 98031
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 14:03:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We fully support the Grizzly Bear restoration plan for the North Cascades!

Correspondence ID: 11947Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spokane, WA 99218
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 14:03:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am strongly in favor of reintroducing grizzlies and hope more efforts are made to restore wild parts of Washington. Including predators, and removing dams for salmon and other fish.

Correspondence ID: 11948Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tacoma, WA 98408
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 14:05:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Though I Love wildlife I don't think it is a good idea to put grizzly bears in the area that is so populated and used. I think you're asking for trouble for people and for bears. I think there is a lot of areas that are less populated with the bears, could go and have happy comfortable Lives.
As somebody who has spent time over the last 30 years traveling up to Mazama and Winthrop I really just don't think it's a good idea to put grizzly bears there. There are less populated areas that would be better suited. I would not feel safe. I know that there are already some grizzly bears there, I don't feel comfortable with when I'm hiking, snowshoeing, etc.

Correspondence ID: 11950Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bainbridge Island, WA 98110
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 14:06:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We adamantly support reintroducing grizzly bears back into the North Cascades ecosystem and setting strict penalties (if not already in place) for killing grizzlies in this place.

Correspondence ID: 11951Project:112008Document:132104

Address: bothell, WA 98012
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 14:08:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support reintroducing Grizzly Bears into the North Cascades, but have concerns about the target of 200 bears. The lowland habitat has far less access to salmon which is a key food source all coastal and near coastal Grizzly populations. Hoping that NPS has evaluated the current available biodiversity and food sources in the targeted habitat and that it is sufficient to support the population they're attempting to achieve. Otherwise it will be the same continual issues of Bear/Human conflicts. There are a few Grizzlies in the North Cascades right now - a friend showed me a picture of one that was clearly a Grizzly appx 10-15 miles south of the Pacific Coast Trailhead south of Marblemount. Yet there have been no reports of conflict with humans or livestock.

Correspondence ID: 11952Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Eatonville, WA 98328
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 14:12:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: It is a terrible idea to reintroduce grizzlies to the North Cascades. Especially under the excuse that "they once thrived there". The entire ecosystem has changed since those days, and human interaction in the area

has increased greatly. Our government needs to stop letting animal lovers make decisions that impact other species and man in negative ways.

Correspondence ID: 11953Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 14:14:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hello,

I moved from Montana to Seattle a couple years ago and have been surprised to learn about the extinction of grizzlies in the North Cascades. Grizzlies are intimidating animals, but they are part of what makes wilderness wild. People in Montana have coexisted with Grizzlies forever. I would love to see Grizzlies back on the landscape in the North Cascades. I also hope the voices of Indigenous people are being centered in this discussion. I support reintroducing grizzlies to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 11954Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 14:14:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a conservationist, I know grizzly bears provide important ecological services, like distributing seeds and aerating alpine meadows. Humans were responsible for removing grizzlies from the North Cascades and it's our responsibility to bring them back home. If we don't take action now, we risk losing grizzly bears from the North Cascades forever.

Correspondence ID: 11956Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 14:16:47
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Yes, please bring the bears back to cascade!

Correspondence ID: 11957Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98107
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 14:17:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am in favor of reintroducing grizzlies to the North Cascades

Correspondence ID: 11958Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Stehekin, WA 98852
United States of America
Outside Organization: Mountain Barge Services Business(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,07 2023 14:19:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To All who control this,
It has come to my attention that despite severe disapproval there has been proceeding on this grizzly bear project with no

regard or concern for human beings and businesses and families disrupted by this threat. In addition public employees funded by the very souls that are being ignored have made it their livelihood to to negatively impact or threaten to impact the futures of families and businesses who contribute as tax paying citizens. Most recently we face a document that is so large that unpaid citizens trying to read and comprehend this could take months if not years to evaluate and we have been given only 3 short months to consider it for comment. This is an unrealistic and irresponsible operation and borders on criminal in how it has the ability to disrupt so many people and their lives. At the very least I request an extension in time for proper evaluation of this document. Thank you for your consideration,

Correspondence ID: 11959Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 14:22:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: NO!!! Please do NOT reintroduce grizzlies into WA state parks! The people in this community do not want them here. Introducing grizzlies into the environment WILL lead to the deaths of people. It will also bring fear into a region that is so beautiful and peaceful now. When I visit grizzly country, I have to really be on guard, carrying bear spray and traveling in small groups. It impacts the way I experience an area. I always appreciate our parks here in WA state because I can enjoy them without that fear.

You keep saying that grizzlies are mostly peaceful. They aren't. They are huge carnivores that will aggressively defend their young or even on occasion prey on humans for food. I don't want them in my area. If you feel like you need to introduce an apex predator, try wolves!

You need to spend a little time caring about the HUMANS who live here instead of worrying so much about grizzly bears. Not everything has to go back to the way it was in the past. There are enough grizzlies in Alaska, Wyoming, and Montana. We DO NOT WANT THEM HERE. If you care at all about what the people in these communities actually feel, you will stop pushing this agenda on us. Haven't we already been through this? Didn't we make our feelings known in 2018?

I will vote ANYONE who supports this OUT. And while I would never wish harm on any animal, IF grizzlies were reintroduced here, I would applaud any poacher who tried to eliminate them himself. What you are doing is wrong - sick and wrong. STOP.

Correspondence ID: 11960Project:112008Document:132104

Address: seattle, WA 98103
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 14:27:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Do everything you can to support grizzlies in the North Cascades Ecosystem. It isn't complete or healthy without them!

Correspondence ID: 11961Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Everson, WA 98247
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 14:28:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is a BAD idea. There will be danger to livestock and people. There is no worthwhile good that can come from this.

Correspondence ID: 11962Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98199
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 14:29:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Our environment has been damaged enough by deforestation, habitat loss, and poaching, this seems like a positive step towards restoring some natural balance.

Correspondence ID: 11963Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America
Outside Organization: Woodland Park Zoo Conservation/Preservation
Received: Nov,07 2023 14:30:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzly bears 🐻 should be protected because they play a natural role in the North Cascades National Park by digging up the soil with their big paws and claws to look for insects they help loosen and turn the soil so new plants can grow. And when grizzly bears catch a salmon from the streams and rivers and waterfalls they eat it and when a grizzly bear is done eating the dead salmon, the nutrients from the dead salmon it fertilizes the earth bringing nutrients to plants and trees to help them grow healthy.

Correspondence ID: 11964Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Kenmore, WA 98028-1918
United States of America
Outside Organization: Boeing Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 14:31:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I would support returning grizzlies to the PNW.

Correspondence ID: 11965Project:112008Document:132104
Address: PROSSER, WA 99350
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 14:34:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I strongly oppose introduction of grizzly bears into my home state of Washington.

Despite the unanimous continuous rejection by the people who live in Washington state The subject of introduction of grizzly bears into the cascades has been continuously brought up by unelected bureaucrats in Washington, D.C.

Why do these unelected bureaucrats refuse to see the issue of predators in the West--grizzly bears and wolves--from the perspective of the people who have lived there for generations. These bureaucrats seem to have some delusional utopic vision. They just want to know grizzly bears are romping happily through the woods smelling the flowers and eating berries like in a Disney movie. This "utopic" vision puts the onus of tolerance on communities that are forced live in the midst of bears or wolves.

How much is it going to cost the taxpayers to "manage" a grizzly population? Lets look at wolves. The introduction of the unwanted wolves may have been a success numbers wise but it has been a nightmare for some sparsely populated counties in the state south of me. Nearly every week I read of wolves killing livestock in those areas. So many wolf depredations in fact, that game management have been allowed to permanently remove some members of the pack through designated elimination. There is a rigorous time consuming and costly process to determine a wolf kill. All this effort and money could have been better spent to better manage other wildlife. Our deer and elk are threatened by such diseases and

black tongue and chronic wasting disease. Moose are being decimated by ticks. The unwanted introduction of grizzly bear will divert even more desperately needed resources and money away from wildlife that truly need it.

The introduction of these apex predator grizzly bear to Washington state is a threat to the safety of our communities. I repeat, grizzly bears are apex predators. They are apex predators that are federal under protection and have no fear of humans, making them over 20 times more dangerous than their cousin black bears. Residents will be forced to be always vigilant of their surroundings. Be forced to live in fear. In nearby states with grizzly populations people are forced to put electric barriers around their gardens and livestock to keep the grizzly bears out. Residents will forced to live in a sort of federally induced prison.

Introducing grizzly's will have a profoundly negative impact on the communities and wildlife in Washington state.

Again, I strongly oppose introduction of grizzly bears into my home state of Washington.

Correspondence ID: 11966Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98273
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 14:38:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To whom it may concern,

I've been hiking and climbing in the North Cascades my entire life. I've run into Cougar, Black Bear, and Wolverine in the backcountry. It is my opinion that those animals are enough for outdoor enthusiasts to watch out for while recreating. Reintroducing a massive animal such as a Grizzly bear to an area where many people recreate is not a wise idea. Most of the people recreating are from the city and have enough problems with things as simple as backcountry navigation- let alone being comfortable and confident when coming face to face with a Grizzly Bear. Reintroduction of these animals is inviting serious trouble to an already tearcherous and rugged swath of land.

Thank you for your time,


Climber, flyfisherman, outdoor enthusiast

Correspondence ID: 11967Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Anacortes, WA 98221
United States of America
Outside Organization: United Healthcare Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 14:46:19
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: It's unconscionable to introduce Grizzlies into the North Cascades. The Pacific Crest Trail hosts thousands of hikers every year. They would be put in danger of being eaten. We have enough predators as it stands.

Correspondence ID: 11968Project:112008Document:132104
Address: PACKWOOD, WA 98361
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 14:48:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: There are absolutely no benefits to citizens of washington state to bring grizzly bears back. I don't see where anyone has asked this question. We are only setting ourselves up for human and pet encounters and it's not an if

question but a when question that there will be a deadly encounter, then what, we will then remove the problem bear. It will happen just like the wolves that have been introduced, now we find ourselves reducing packs..... What is the benefit to the citizens and visitors to Washington state. There are a lot more ways to spend our money than this.

Correspondence ID: 11969Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 14:49:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I prefer no action. The risk of reintroducing grizzlies in the North Cascades outweigh the benefits.

Correspondence ID: 11970Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Baker City, OR 97814
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 14:50:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Since most of you people have not lived with grizzlies in your back yard, you have no idea about them except what you have read. You have not as far as I can see to ask one of the foremost grizzlies expert in this matter about the introduction. Mr. Jonkel of Montana fw&p. He told me that natural introduction is the only solution. From my own experience bears will go where there is good food and habitat. This experiment is just to make more jobs for people that do NOT have the skills to actually make something and have to rely on government or schools to make a living. That includes the Forest service and park service.

Correspondence ID: 11971Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Anacortes, WA 98221
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 14:50:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am for reintroducing grizzly bears to the Cascades

Correspondence ID: 11972Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98112
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 14:51:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I vote for restoring grizzly bears to the North Cascades. I vote for Alternative C.

Correspondence ID: 11974Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 14:52:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As someone who has spent time in Grizzly territory, I feel they are valuable to our ecosystem. And if one takes all measures and precautions, you tend not to run into them. They are not a threat as much as people think. I believe option 3 is a good choice, as there may need to be adjustments to control Grizzlies' behavior around farms and homes.

Correspondence ID: 11975Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Kirkland, WA 98034
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 14:53:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I think that grizzly bears should be re-introduced into the north cascades before they migrate from Canada. Option C where we can create additional rules to support people living in the area and farmers, who want to protect life stock would be our best choice to support protection for people and bears.

Correspondence ID: 11976Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 14:55:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Yes to introducing Grizzlies and bring back more beavers and all the rest of them!!! WE are wiping out the eco system as it is...there is a balance in nature that we have interrupted unknowingly and many times uncaringly.. Do the right and moral thing...\$ nor fear should be the defining answer...there is room for all.....many people need to relearn how to respect nature, and her rules....

Correspondence ID: 11978Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 14:56:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzly bears have historically been a keystone species in the North Cascades. The impact their uniquely effective digging has on plant biodiversity, especially in areas scarred by megafires, offers exponentially positive outcomes for this strikingly beautiful part of our state that is repeatedly threatened by fire. As stewards of this land threatened by climate change, it is our mandate to reintroduce species like grizzly bears that offer a lifeline to the flowers, conifers, and grasses of the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 11979Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Deming, WA 98244
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 14:59:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Thanks for the thoughtful plans to reintroduce Grizzly bears into the North Cascades and know many recreation enthusiasts like myself are supportive of these efforts. Bears and humans can share these spaces just like is done in other regions and I think the benefits to the ecosystem far outweigh the negative impacts.

Correspondence ID: 11981Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Amboy, WA 98601
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 15:03:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: "As a resident of Washington State, I am excited at the prospect of grizzly bears returning to the North Cascades ecosystem. Wherever grizzlies thrive, so does wildness, clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife. That's why I support restoring grizzly bears to the North Cascades via Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation - provided that the accompanying 10(J) rule promotes the recovery of the population, ensures management is humane, prioritizes non-lethal management tools and enables humans and grizzly bears to coexist. Properly developed and implemented, the 10(J) rule will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape."

I have spent time hiking in Montana and in the Yellowstone Park area and have never had any encounters or issues with the Grizzlies that were seen. By being Bear Aware and carrying bear spray, myself and family members have enjoyed our outings.

Correspondence ID: 11982Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spokane, WA 99224
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 15:04:55

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is probably a bit odd because I financially support Conservation Northwest, BUT.....I'm not a real fan right now of re-introduction of grizzlies into the North Cascades for one very simple reason: I'd like to be able to backpack without having to worry about the unpredictability (at times) of grizzlies. I specifically do NOT backpack in Glacier NP, Yellowstone NP, or some of the other grizzly habitat areas in the Rockies simply because I really don't care to have an encounter with a grizzly. I do everything that most authorities would want me to do: bring a bear resistant food canister, pack bear spray, keep a clean camp, make a little conversational noise along my route to alert bears to my presence, etc. But I just don't relish the idea of an encounter with a grizzly. While attacks have been rare, they have happened, and sometimes with fatal results.

Correspondence ID: 11984Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Darrington, WA 98241
United States of America

Outside Organization: retired resident Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 15:06:15

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello

I am a Darrington resident and a small forest owner.

I am also an avid backpacker and mountain bike rider.

I SUPPORT the re introduction of Grizzly Bears in the North Cascades.

Please follow the intent of the Endangered Species Act.

I believe the science is correct and that we need these top predators in our ecosystem.

Sincerely,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 11985Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 15:07:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have lived in the Methow Valley all of my life. I was against this the last time it was tried and I am against it now. I have read you have to many in another state so now you are thinking of us again. You have tried so many different ways to inundate us with what you think is right. This is not right for us and I do not want grizzly bears in my surrounding area. If they wanted to be here they would be already.

Correspondence ID: 11987Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98121
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 15:08:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly Bears. Yes.

Correspondence ID: 11989Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kingston, WA 98346
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 15:15:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We already have grizzly bears in WA. If the our current ecosystem could handle more they would re-introduce themselves and repopulate these areas. Like the wolves, they are transient until there are enough food & land present to keep them here. They will expand when it is time. Unnatural reintroducing grizzly will put a strain on the ecosystem. It will lead to conflicts with people. The pronghorn that were reintroduced on the Yakama Res. wandered off Yakama lands. The same may happen when the bears run out of food and space in the North Cascades. The wolves wandered in from Canada and from the Yellowstone Wyoming transplants. And the McKenenzies brought into Yellowstone were not the right subspecies of wolf. Now the WDFW culls a pack or two everyonce in a while due to them running out of natural food which forces them to prey on livestock. Please do not introduce another species/ subspecies into our state to feel better. Help the ones that are here by keeping your hands off the species.

Correspondence ID: 11990Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham/Republic, WA 98225
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 15:17:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To planners and organizers of the Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan.

Be advised that I am against the reintroduction of Grizzly into the North Cascades. As a hunter/fisherman on both the Western and Eastern side of the state, I have seen a reduction of big game animals and a loss of livestock, due to the reintroduction of wolves. Adding another apex hunter to the eco system would only deplete the game even more. Plus the landscape from a century ago has changed dramatically as Western and Eastern Washington's population explodes. Overpopulation will inevitably lead to more human-bear conflicts which will result in deaths of humans and Grizzlies. I am sure that nature has already brought some grizzlies down from Canada. So government agencies should not be introducing more to the eco-system.

Correspondence ID: 11991Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Shoreline, WA 98177
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 15:18:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I heartily support the reintroduction of the grizzly bear into the North Cascades. The bears lived there for millennia before white European settlers came to the northwest and extirpated them. Please bring them back home so they can begin to resume their vital role in this ecosystem. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 11992Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bainbridge Island, WA 98110
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 15:18:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in favor of encouraging grizzly bears to repopulate the North Cascades under Alternative B, keeping existing endangered species rules.

Correspondence ID: 11994Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bremerton, WA 98337
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 15:20:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Docket No. FWS-R1-ES-2023-0074).

NO TO GRIZZLY RELEASE IN THE NCE

SPEND MONNEY ON REMOVING THE PINE BEETLE.

I have lived in Washington State my whole life. I'm 53 and have spent much of my life in the outdoors with my father (now 84) enjoying the nature that this state had to offer. I was taught at a young age to respect nature and to be a good steward of the land. I can't believe that the introduction of grizzly bears into the north cascade ecosystem (NCE) is a good idea. As with the wolf I would think we would figure out that animals do not stay where you put them. If the grizzly wanted to move in to an area, they would have moved. If the end goal is to keep people from using our public lands then just shut them all down. Introduction of big animals that have the potential to kill the current population of native animals (that I have seen in decline over my time in nature) I do not think is a good plan. To me it sounds like dropping a fox in to a hen house and tell it not to kill all of the hens. I have seen over my time in nature that between the state run lands and the federal lands that there is less and less access. There appears to be more and more fences that block off access to places to camp and use the lands. This forces people to use only state or federal run camp grounds (good for the budget but bad for us that don't want to stay in a place that is piled up with people like cord wood). In the draft grizzly bear restoration plan/ environmental impact statement. The grizzly bears have gradually expanded their occupied habitat by more than 100% (NPS 2023a). Grizzly bears have tripled the extent of their occupied range in the GYE since the early 1980s. The implementation of grizzly bear restoration activities could contribute to the spread of invasive species such as diffuse knapweed (*Centaurea diffusa*) or reed canary grass (*Phalaris arundinacea*) within the NCE. Restoration population goal of 200 bear's. Based on the report this would mean that we would have a new population of grizzly from Canada to Oregon. The bears are not concerned with roads, rivers or borders. Grizzly are very aggressive and can sprint 35mph to 40 mph, and will eat anything that it perceives as food.

In conclusion:

Promote Selkirk Mountains in Washington for grizzly bear encounters.

No new programs to release grizzly.

No more closing down public lands.

Spend more time on removing the pine beetle.

Correspondence ID: 11995Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tacoma, WA 98445
United States of America

Outside Organization: none Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 15:20:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not think grizzly bears should be brought back to the N Cascades. Time has marched on and so has the human population from when the bears were in the N Cascades. WA has had a big increase in population and more and more people are moving further into the forest for one reason or another. The N Cascades are also a visitors, campers, hunters, etc. destination. This is the present situation and what it will be like in a few more years will be worse, let alone in the 60 years you are talking about. I don't think you can predict how many people will be exposed to the bears in the future. Black bears are already becoming an expected sight in neighborhoods. My vote is no.

Correspondence ID: 11998Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98126
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 15:23:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I grew up in Northwest Washington, and spent much time hiking, camping, and canoeing in the North Cascade when I was a child.

I'm very excited to have grizzly bears returning to their native lands in Washington. I hope this plan goes through!

Correspondence ID: 12000Project:112008Document:132104

Address: MuKilteo, WA 98275
United States of America

Outside Organization: Myself Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 15:30:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Appreciate the stats on live stock kills in Montana.

My question is, " What is the projected kill number for PEOPLE?"

What, in your mind, is an acceptable number for people killed by the grizzly when re introduced to North Cascades?

Currently not aware of any in my life time in this area.(70 yrs)

Looking forward to your response.

██████████

Correspondence ID: 12001Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Vancouver, WA 98660
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 15:33:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a resident of Washington State, I support restoring grizzly bears to the North Cascades via Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation - provided that the accompanying 10(J) rule promotes the recovery of the population, ensures management is humane, prioritizes non-lethal management tools and enables humans and grizzly bears to coexist. Properly developed and implemented, the 10(J) rule will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Correspondence ID: 12002Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Redmond, WA 98053
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 15:34:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Do nothing to promote the presence of grizzlies. They sre a threat to the lives of those who love to spend time in the North Cascades, etc.

Correspondence ID: 12005Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ellensburg, WA 98926
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 15:39:55

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live in and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

Furthermore, the 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

The North Cascades Grizzly Bear Recovery Zone (NCGBRZ) is the second largest of six such designated areas at nearly 10,000 square miles. Combined with contiguous protected areas in British Columbia, including Manning Park, there are 14,000 square miles of productive, wild habitats, wilderness, and roadless areas.

People and grizzly bears can coexist and thrive. They do so in British Columbia, Montana, and Wyoming where grizzly populations and back and front country recreation continue to grow hand in hand, providing a vital economic boost to those areas' gateway communities.

Grizzly bears lived in Washington for thousands of years. We still have a small population in the NE WA Selkirk Mountains. However, currently, there are no grizzly populations in the United States or Canada that are large enough or close enough to serve as a source to naturally repopulate the North Cascades.

Having wiped out the grizzly bear over the past 150 years we now have the unique opportunity and the ethical obligation to restore them to their native home, where suitable habitats still exist.

Grizzly bears are ecologically and culturally significant and are vital to the overall health of the North Cascades ecosystem and its biodiversity. They are considered an indicator of ecosystem health.

Thank you for taking the time to keep our North Cascades wild!

Correspondence ID: 12007Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Auburn, WA 98001
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 15:43:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: It's past time that humans do the right and just thing for these bears. With proper education and prevention, bears and humans should be able to survive in the North Cascades. They did so for decades before humans

decided to pass judgement on these animals. Instead of setting limitations on bears, why not set limitations on humans who are supposed to have enough intelligence to obey and follow the law. The human race is systematically eradicating all animals and that is a sin!

Correspondence ID: 12008Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Brier, WA 98036
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 15:55:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Strongly against reintroducing grizzly bears. Where do we draw the line with manipulating nature? Mongoose was introduced to Hawaii to control rats, with disastrous consequences. Would we introduce more white sharks to Hawaii to restore white shark populations? How would the local populations feel about this? Have the local populations in the northern Cascades agreed to this idea? This is not a native plant or other innocuous species, this is a dangerous animal that has attacked and killed humans, even those armed with bear spray. This will negatively impact campers, anglers, farmers, and other Washingtonians. I will not take my family, including my small children, on hikes, camping, or fishing, in areas that have grizzly bears - we will travel to Oregon or other states that do not have grizzlies. This will result in camping and gaming fee revenue loss. I have not seen any reports of ecosystem issues due to a lack of grizzlies. Are deer and elk populations out-of-control? Is the claimed reduced seed spreading by grizzlies causing vegetation issues? These are things that grizzlies CAN do, but no scientific evidence that missing grizzly bears is causing a negative impact. There are 60,000 grizzly bears in North America. We are not in danger of losing grizzly bears as a species. Do not reintroduce grizzly bears to the Northern Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 12010Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellevue, WA 98006
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 15:58:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: - North Cascades National Park and the surrounding ecosystem have more than enough open space to successfully recover grizzly bears.

- This would be a major step in restoring the species across its historic range.
- Grizzlies provide ecological benefits and will improve the ecosystem's health.
- We're giving grizzlies back their home -- and people want that.
- The public process includes new tools to reduce the potential for conflict with local landowners and communities.

Correspondence ID: 12011Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mill Creek, WA 98012
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 15:59:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I feel that Grizzly bears should not be re-introduced to the North Cascades.

How would it improve anyone's quality of life if they were re-introduced?

How about bringing rattle snakes back to the Hagerman valley region?

Please don't put people, other wild animals, live stock and pets in more danger.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 12014Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98105
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 16:03:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the re-introduction of Grizzly Bears to the North Cascades. I am an avid, hiker, backpacker and mountain biker. Almost all the comments I have read against introduction seem to be based on ignorance, hatred and fear and not facts. Like the wolf's introduction into Yellowstone, the grizzly will improve the North Cascades entire ecosystem. Its presence and the knowledge of its presence will enrich the wilderness experience and lives of many for generations.

Correspondence ID: 12015Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98101
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 16:03:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I like bears

Correspondence ID: 12017Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Denver, CO 80123
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 16:03:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Reintroducing the grizzlies to the North Cascades is a great idea for the both the grizzlies and for the Cascades. The impact they would have on the ecosystem would be a net positive and the population growth for the grizzlies would be astounding there. We must protect and nurture the grizzlies so they do not share the same tragic fate that many other species tragically have.

Correspondence ID: 12018Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Woodinville, WA 98072
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 16:03:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: With human population expanding further and further into animal habitats, humans are subjected to more and more encounters with wildlife. Black bears commonly wander into neighborhoods! It's no longer a surprising occurrence. They even wander into towns, but black bears don't pose as dangerous of a threat as do grizzly bears! There have been deadly encounters involving grizzlies that have pulled humans from camping tents and sleeping bags and killed them. I am opposed to reintroducing grizzlies into the North Cascades!

Correspondence ID: 12019Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 16:03:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am NOT in favor of restoring Grizzly bears in the North Cascade. Though I am a big fan of nature and bears, and have seen Grizzlies before in other parks, I am AGAINST the introduction of them into the North Cascades. My reason are the following:

Safety Concerns: I have seen the literature that says people + Grizzlies have co-existed (examples in Alaska, Montana etc) and in the majority of cases it is peaceful. But there are still cases of danger and close calls, and many more additional measures need to take place, for people visiting the park as well as surrounding communities that require a higher level of preparation and diligence, which still does not alleviate safety concerns to zero. I enjoy how the parks are today, and though there is a level of diligence and precautions taken today for the current habitat, adding Grizzlies into the park adds an additional safety concern for, in my opinion, not much upside.

Unintended Consequences: There have been previous human re-introductions of species that had unintended ecological effects. I am worried we are taking an unnecessary risk that may lead to unforeseen outcomes (whether it be for the animals, plants, local communities, etc)

Cost Benefit/Reward: The park and its ecosystem have existed well so far without Grizzly Bears. There are many other areas of investment (e.g. wildfire mitigations, greater access, etc) that would seem to benefit the National Park. From all the literature I have read, I do not see what the huge upside is, in the habitat, for introducing Grizzlies, with all the other animals and species we have today. This will definitely change the ecosystem, but at what benefit and cost.

Correspondence ID: 12020Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Saluda, SC 29138
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 16:04:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am not in support of the plan to reintroduce the bears in the northern cascades.

The department is clearly ignoring the wishes of land owners, citizens, and the current legislature of the states there included.

The department is failing to take into adequate consideration the public danger of reintroducing predator animals into human proximity habitats from which they were purposefully extirpated.

The department is also guising the reintroduction as helpful to ecosystems for seed dispersal and population control, which could as easily be achieved via other means such as hunting and private organizations. With out the reintroduction of a large predator .

One only needs to read the journals of early explorers and naturalist like Bartram , to grasp the danger of predator animals to the public especially young children and the agricultural industry, which is already overburdened - including wolves and bears.

I'm firmly against this measure .

Correspondence ID: 12022Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellevue, WA 98006
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 16:04:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The bears need a safe place to return. We have it here!

Correspondence ID: 12024Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Berkeley, CA 94702
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 16:05:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support bringing grizzlies back to the North Cascades National Park as it and the surrounding ecosystem have more than enough open space to successfully recover grizzly bears.

- This would be a major step in restoring the species across its historic range.
- Grizzlies provide ecological benefits and will improve the ecosystem's health.
- We're giving grizzlies back their home -- and people want that.

thank you

Correspondence ID: 12026Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98119
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 16:13:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: North Cascades National Park and the surrounding ecosystem have more than enough open space to successfully recover grizzly bears.

- This would be a major step in restoring the species across its historic range.

Correspondence ID: 12027Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Gig Harbor, WA 98332
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 16:19:41

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Humans were responsible for removing grizzlies from the North Cascades and it's our responsibility to bring them back home.

Correspondence ID: 12028Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98102
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 16:23:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support.

Correspondence ID: 12033Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Edmonds, WA 98020
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 16:24:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This plan is 30 years overdue! I have hiked and camped throughout the Cascades since the 1980s and there is nothing that would help us restore ecosystem-wide health like the efforts needed to restore a healthy grizzly population. As much as protecting the grizzlies, this is about protecting vast swaths of our wilderness. We should and must

do this. Simultaneously, we must keep the public well aware of progress and how to ensure dangerous conflicts don't happen. Thanks for the good work and please move fast: before 1/2025.

Correspondence ID: 12034Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Shoreline, WA 98177
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 16:25:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I'm all for reintroducing grizzlies into the N cascades. My biggest question is how do we protect them in our changing environment from forest fires, drought and lack of food, not to mention unsavory characters!? I hope these considerations are in your planning.

Correspondence ID: 12035Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Issaquah, WA 98027-8459
United States of America
Outside Organization: BCHW Tahoma Non-Governmental
Received: Nov,07 2023 16:26:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the: Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Environmental Impact Statement for the North Cascades Ecosystem

As a member of Back Country Horsemen of Washington, I am very concerned with the ability to continue to recreate in the North Cascades should a small population of heavily protected grizzly bears be mechanically moved into the region that we recreate in. The DEIS does not sufficiently analyze the impact to recreation or present any options for how trails can be maintained open in the presence of protections implemented to reduce human-grizzly interactions.

1. The Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail runs through the core habitat and has permitted distance hikers of around 10,000. When considering the other trail users in and along the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE) since this is one of the most populated areas around any bear ecosystem, the use likely exceeds a quarter million visits. However, the DEIS indicates that the use is insignificant. It is very significant and will likely result in many human-bear interactions.
2. The Pacific Northwest National Scenic Trail also runs through the NCE as well as other bear ecosystems to the east, including the Cabinet-Yaak (CYE). The CYE has a more established population of bears but still has resulted with challenges to the very existence of the trail due to the limited number of bears in the CYE (20-40). Opposition to the National Scenic Trail in the recovering bear population area as well as the connecting landscapes between ecosystems has also been expressed by USFWS staff, the same agency putting forth the NCE proposal through which the same trail will pass.
3. Without a more detailed analysis of how to retain the carrying capacity of the trails, trailheads, and campgrounds without resulting in long term or permanent closures, there is no way to effectively review this DEIS.
4. Furthermore, the NPS and USFWS have pointed out that the Canadian counterparts and First Nations are preparing to release grizzly bears in the northern part of the NCE. IF that was the only release point, it would move the core recovery/release area north and away from the more densely human populated areas of Washington State. It also would be in line with Washington State law as well since no bears would be translocated directly into Washington, and there also would be predictability on how many bears are being moved into the entire NCE which overlaps both countries. The BC government has noted that their Recovery Plan is being developed jointly with the USFWS even though this US EIS only addresses the Washington effort.
5. As a trail horse rider in the NCE, I ask that the No Action Alternative be selected. The areas we ride in includes the Mt Baker Snoqualmie National Forest, the Okanogan Wenatchee National Forest including the Pasayten Wilderness, and the North Cascades National Park. We have many horse camps along the boundary of the NCE. We cannot support either Action

Alternative without more substantive analysis on impacts to recreation as well as knowing more on the joint planning with Canadian counterparts.

Correspondence ID: 12038Project:112008Document:132104

Address: North Bend, WA 98045
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 16:30:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As an avid backpacker of the North Cascades I fully support the reintroduction of grizzly bears. While grizzly bears are potentially more aggressive than black bears, the potential danger to myself and other outdoor enthusiasts is minor in comparison to the benefits they provide the ecosystem. Gratitude to all who are pushing this initiative forward!

Correspondence ID: 12041Project:112008Document:132104

Address: PROSSER, WA 99350
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 16:47:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Despite the unanimous continuous rejection by the people who live in Washington state The subject of introduction of grizzly bears into the cascades has been continuously brought up by unelected bureaucrats in Washington, D.C.

Why do these unelected bureaucrats refuse to see the issue of predators in the West--grizzly bears and wolves--from the perspective of the people who have lived there for generations. These bureaucrats seem to have some delusional utopic vision. They just want to know grizzly bears are romping happily through the woods smelling the flowers and eating berries like in a Disney movie. This "utopic" vision puts the onus of tolerance on communities that are forced live in the midst of bears or wolves.

How much is it going to cost the taxpayers to "manage" a grizzly population? Le's look at wolves. The introduction of the unwanted wolves may have been a success numbers wise, but it has been a nightmare for some sparsely populated counties to the state south of me. Nearly every week I read of wolves killing livestock in those areas. So many wolf depredations in fact, that game management have been allowed to permanently remove some members of the pack through designated elimination. There is a rigorous time consuming and costly process to determine a wolf kill. All this effort and money could have been better spent to manage other wildlife. Our deer, elk, pronghorn, and mountain sheep are threatened by such illnesses as hemorrhagic disease and chronic wasting disease. Moose are being decimated by ticks. The unwanted introduction of grizzly bear will divert even more desperately needed resources and money away from wildlife that truly need and deserve it.

The introduction of these apex predator grizzly bear to Washington state is a threat to the safety of our communities. I repeat, grizzly bears are apex predators. They are apex predators that are under federal protection and have no fear of humans. Grizzly bears are exponentially more dangerous than their cousin black bears. Residents will be forced to be always vigilant of their surroundings. Residents will be forced to live in fear. In nearby states with grizzly populations people are forced to put electric barriers around their gardens and livestock to keep the grizzly bears out. Residents will be forced to live in a sort of prison induced by the federal government.

Introducing grizzlies will have a profoundly negative impact on the communities and wildlife in Washington state.

I strongly oppose introduction of grizzly bears into my home state of Washington.

Correspondence ID: 12042Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spokane, WA 99258
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 16:47:19
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To whom this may concern,

After reading the Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan Environmental Impact Statement, I have some input and concerns that should be considered.

I am in support of the preferred alternative C. An important part of getting support for this management is the social context of grizzly bears. Alternative C would have the most flexibility to reduce conflict between humans and grizzly bears, increasing the social tolerance of the bears. Unlike alternative B where grizzly bear management options are limited since grizzlies would be managed as threatened species under the Endangered Species Act, alternative C allows for preemptive relocation and authorized lethal action if necessary. The aspect of preventative mortality will make users feel safer when restoring grizzly bears.

The main downside I found of alternative C (which is also found in alternative B) was that recreation by users would be impacted. Just as helicopters can disturb wildlife dens and nests when used to release bears in the North Cascades, they can also interrupt users' contemplative recreation. Just as there are limits to helicopter use in consideration of wildlife, has user recreation been considered in deciding the limiting of time of year and frequency of helicopter use?

Looking at the map of the North Cascades ecosystem in the impact statement, I noticed the North Cascade Highway SR 20 goes through the North Cascades National Park Service Complex. Grizzly bears crossing the highway could complicate restoration of the bears if they get hit by a car or if the crossing creates human and bear conflict. Is there information available on how often wildlife in the North Cascades die due to vehicles on this highway? In alternatives B and C, is there a plan for road mitigation for the introduced grizzly bears? Would use of a wildlife crossing be considered?

Thank you for considering my comments.

Correspondence ID: 12044Project:112008Document:132104

Address: sequim, WA 98382
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 16:53:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Trump and his administration's decisions were not for the betterment of the country, only for theirs. It is time to make an effort to balance that which has been destroyed by the "haves" in our society. The population is made up of more than the 1% entitled; serve the majority and its wishes for a change.

Correspondence ID: 12046Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spokane, WA 99207
United States of America
Outside Organization: Gonzaga University Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 16:58:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: First, I would like to express my appreciation for the NPS's efforts to restore grizzlies to the North Cascades. Returning species to their native habitat and consequentially improving the wilderness character is incredibly important to the long-term well-being of the ecosystem. Though it may cause some distress to humans, I think that if it is deemed practical, likely to be successful, and accepted by the majority of the population, that this is an incredibly important initiative to continue to push forward.

One area of interest that I think would be valuable to further research is the potential for increased species resilience and genetic diversity that could result from the establishment of a new population of grizzlies. As grizzly bears continue to be heavily threatened, it is important for their long-term survival that there is sufficient diversity within populations and within

the species as a whole. Though the NCE population would be made up of individuals from existing populations, its likely isolation from other populations would allow the bears to adapt relatively independently over time. If there was ever a major genetic threat to an existing grizzly population, I would hypothesize that having a distinct population in the NCE could increase the chances for resilience and ultimately, species survival. I think this is something that is important to include when weighing the potential pros and cons of reintroducing grizzlies. Beyond just restoring the bears to their native habitat, I think it could also provide more long-term security and increase chances of species survival.

However, I think it is important to more fully assess the impact that a fully restored grizzly population may have on recreational activities in the NCE. You note on page (vii) that "as grizzly bear populations are restored and numbers increase, the likelihood for an encounter with a grizzly bear would also increase." This is certainly true, and I think it has the potential to significantly decrease comfortability with recreating in the NCE, especially for families with young children. Thus, I am curious how the NPS intends to manage potential grizzly bear interactions. I see in alternative C that lethal take would be permitted in some scenarios, but does that mean that the typical recreationist would be expected to carry a firearm in case of a grizzly encounter? This hardly seems like the best option for both the bears and the humans. Further, suggesting lethal take as the solution to human-bear interactions could cause unnecessary fear surrounding bears, discouraging people from using the wilderness. I think that the reintroduction of grizzlies in the NCE is incredibly important, but it must come with a thorough plan for public education about the bears, the dispersal of management-related information and guidance, and alternative plans for ensuring that human-bear interactions are as safe for both parties as possible. This is done generally well in Glacier National Park, and I would like to see the North Cascades investing more thorough solutions to recreational concerns.

Correspondence ID: 12047Project:112008Document:132104

Address: EAST WENATCHEE, WA 98802
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 16:59:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm just a citizen, camper, hiker here. This is the usual MO for the DC clan who just do what they want based on poor information, and don't listen to the citizens; making sure they sneak it through before most people notice or have a chance to respond. Why the sneaky manipulation? Because they know the people who live here probably would not want grizzlies living nearby. When are we all going to be sick of this administration circumventing the legal process and doing as they please? Why would anyone think it is a great idea to move a predator into this area? Is this an environmentalist's fantasy? Why WA not CO? This is not 1820. We have small towns, rural homes, resorts and ranches with hundreds of trails and dozens of campgrounds in this region. The bears don't know where the boundaries are, so this is a fatality waiting to happen. There was a near tragedy in 2018 (i believe near Okanogan) when a researcher was treed by a pack of federally protected wolves. The feds would not tell anyone where the wolves were located. The dispatcher's call for help was like a "who's on first?" routine. Every agency pointed to another to respond while she was hanging on for life. She was rescued by helicopter. This summer, a young woman was fatally attacked by a grizzly on a trail near West Yellowstone, a popular tourist town.

I hope enough people will respond in protest to this ill-conceived idea and it will be stopped.

Correspondence ID: 12048Project:112008Document:132104

Address: SHORELINE, WA 98155
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 17:03:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: More grizzly bears in the wild, please!

Correspondence ID: 12049Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Redwood City, CA 94065
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 17:04:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I fully support the Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan for the following reasons:

- North Cascades National Park and the surrounding ecosystem have more than enough open space to successfully recover grizzly bears.
- This would be a major step in restoring the species across its historic range.
- Grizzlies provide ecological benefits and will improve the ecosystem's health.
- We're giving grizzlies back their home -- and people want that.
- The public process includes new tools to reduce the potential for conflict with local landowners and communities.

Correspondence ID: 12051Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98105
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 17:08:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I plan to study wildlife ecology and conservation and grizzly bears need to be reintroduced to their ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 12053Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98273
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 17:15:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: No! Grizzlies should NOT be reintroduced into the North Cascades. If they come on their own, fine, but artificially bringing them here is a death sentence for them, humans, and domestic animals. Black bears are already coming into towns and housing areas in the foothills and causing problems. Then these black bears have to be "put down." Other animals that have been "introduced" have also caused problems for farms, ranches, family pets, and rural housing areas (even sometimes in towns and cities) and then these "introduced" animals are killed.

The argument that grizzlies lived here 1000's of years ago is irrelevant since the human populate now is considerably larger than even a hundred years ago. Washington's human population is growing and more animals and people will be encroaching on grizzly habitat. Grizzlies and human/domestic animals WILL NOT coexist peacefully! Grizzlies will kill and then humans will have to kill the grizzlies.

There have been several news reports of grizzlies killing people/animals just in the last few years. Even ONE human death is too many unnecessary deaths caused by an "introduced" grizzly. Are those in favor of introducing grizzlies willing to be held responsible for the human deaths (even one human death) caused by introducing a large predator into an area where it did not naturally migrate?

Correspondence ID: 12054Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 17:18:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: First, I am in support of grizzly bear reintroduction. Second, as a former heavy user of offtrail areas of the North Cascades I believe you must have data of stray bear already having been there or being there now. I saw a cub prior to 2010 but post 2004. The cub was golden and in a sloped area north of Hwy 20 in Mazama where I had chosen to pick berries

from a copious location.

Reintroduction poses concern for climbers especially perhaps as we are most likely to be traveling before sunup or returning late, but our recreation is not a reason to deny the survival or thriving of a species. Having encountered a curious juvenile black bear as a solo female hiker on the PCT and a small group of cubs together with a group of climbers on our way to Luna Peak, I appreciate that grizzly encounters, if population is increased, will occur. And yet, we can adapt, we should adapt to them because we can.

It concerns me that this is even a question, though I understand some of the circumstances that necessitate its existence.

I will say that the presence of grizzlies probably creates recreational interest in Washington State in as much as it may deter others. Please bring them back and let's co-exist. Let's think about the opportunities not yet known to benefit from their reintroduction.

Correspondence ID: 12056Project:112008Document:132104
Address: SEATTLE, WA 98125
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 17:21:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Humans are responsible for the mess we're in & loss of wild life,let's make it right by re-introducing the grizzly

Correspondence ID: 12057Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Maple Valley, WA 98038
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 17:22:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I prefer Alternate A: No action.

Correspondence ID: 12058Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellevue, WA 98005
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 17:22:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The more diverse an ecosystem, the healthier it is. The bears would help diversify plants and animals and restore the natural balance in the North Cascades. The remoteness of the area will keep humans and grizzlies from interacting and help maintain their natural range in areas that are away from big civilization. I would love to see grizzlies reintroduced to keep our state's ecosystem healthy and thriving! Please consider!

Correspondence ID: 12061Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Greenacres by, WA 99016
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 17:36:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Restore Griz to the North Cascades

Correspondence ID: 12062Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98274
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 17:36:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Noooooo!! Please don't reintroduce grizzlies to Washington State!! Leave them over in Montana! There's plenty of them over there! We don't need them here. I'm sure there must be some in Idaho too. I used to get so nervous when I was huckleberry picking in Montana for fear of running into a grizzly. We have black bears and cougars here, that's plenty of excitement.

Correspondence ID: 12064Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Entiat, WA 98822
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 17:47:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I vote the grizzly bears be restored to their original and natural habitat in the Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 12066Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 17:49:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I would like to voice support for this restoration plan.

Correspondence ID: 12067Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98136
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 17:49:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hello,

My name is [REDACTED], I am an avid hiker and biologist who had recently moved to Seattle from Canada. Early in my career I was fortunate enough to be a part of multiple studies related to grizzly bears in the Canadian Rockies. I spent months hiking in bear country with bear bait, with only one other person and had zero incidents. Most recently, I have been hiking throughout the cascades in Washington state where I would love to see the bears re introduced into their historic home range.

It possible for hikers and the bears to peacefully co-exist in their native habitat. It is our responsibility as hikers to be cautious and educate ourselves on how to conduct ourselves in bear country. People need to Cary bear spray and make their presence know while hiking. These bears are part of the ecosystem and we should not restrict their presence based on the worries of people who have no lived with these bears in the past. I have and I know it is possible.

Thank you,
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 12069Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Centralia, WA 98531-1522
United States of America
Outside Organization: Taichung Shibas Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 17:57:24

Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hello:

While I hear two sides to the reintroducing Grizzlies back to the Cascades, I feel the fact they were there as was the wolf BEFORE the Cattleman who use OUR land to graze their cattle. Isn't it time to put Wildlife back where it belongs and as what is done with anything else a foreign object is removed in this case the cattle! I buy beef and pay for the ability to do so. However, I do not want Cattle to roam all over the Forest, get killed and the Wolf blamed so you shoot them. even when the picture shown then was of a Mt Lion killing, that picture lead Washington State to kill a whole pack of Wolves. Sorry went off topic a bit. My point is you do not or are afraid to let the Natural Original Wildlife back so Cattleman can allow a non-native animal to roam. Please stop this practice.

Correspondence ID: 12070Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98501
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 17:58:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm writing in strong support of restoring grizzly bears to their historic range in the North Cascades. The mountains and lowlands offer plenty of space for the bears, who no longer exist in 95 percent of their historic habitat. It's been three decades since the US Fish and Wildlife Service declared almost 10,000 square miles of the North Cascades an "official recovery zone" for the bears, creating a tantalizing path for possible restoration. Grizzlies on the land will improve ecosystem health, a particularly critical benefit in the anthropocene era of global warming. Their presence is a tangible symbol of their cultural and historic importance to indigenous peoples in the region. As a historian, hiker, and the author of a book about the history of North Cascades National Park, I view the grizzly as a vital missing piece in the environment and culture of the region.

Since the earliest days of Euro-American settlement in North America, grizzlies have had a public relations problem. The bears' reputation for fearsomeness was recorded in writing as early as the mid-1600s, but the journals of Lewis and Clark introduced the great bear to a wider audience and in doing so, established its image as a bloodthirsty predator. In May 1805, William Clark and an expedition member shot a 600-pound male grizzly 10 times, then watched it swim away before it finally died on a sandbar. Clark wrote the bear was a "verry large and a turrible looking animal, which we found verry hard to kill." Weeks later, after a wounded grizzly chased one man for more than a half-mile, Lewis decided "these bear being so hard to die reather intimatedes us all; I must confess that I do not like the gentlemen." Lewis and Clark's depiction has been compounded and amplified by decades of misguided belief that the extermination of predators like grizzlies would benefit game populations and, therefore, hunters. Grizzlies have been viewed as something to eliminate and, in the tamed forms of tanned robes or stuffed and mounted specimens (inevitably in a menacing upright position), as evidence of American exceptionalism and dominant masculinity.

When in 1967 local guide Rocky Wilson shot the last grizzly known to be killed in the North Cascades in Fisher Creek basin, he knew it was unusual even then to see grizzlies. But I doubt he foresaw the historical significance of his act. The area closed to hunting the next year with the creation of North Cascades National Park, Ross Lake National Recreation Area, Lake Chelan National Recreation Area, and the Pasayten Wilderness. Four years later, the completion of the North Cascades Highway created a literal barrier for the bears, who don't like to cross roads and were now trapped between the new highway and the Fraser River Highway in British Columbia, but opened an easy-to-traverse route for human recreation. The new park complex and highway marked the end of a way of life in the North Cascades.

Just as the park complex's existence depends on humans, so does the grizzly's. Author David Knibb wrote that the bear's "ultimate value and purpose may be to test our willingness to share part of Earth with a wild and fearsome creature that remains as intolerant of us as we have been of it." The North Cascades ecosystem is a big area, certainly, but, based on the very few confirmed sightings in the last half-century, not big enough to support a healthy population of grizzlies without

human intervention. It's time for that to change. Many, myself included, feel grizzly restoration would be the finishing touch on the crown jewel wilderness of the North Cascades. Without the grizzly, the North Cascades are wild. But as one journalist pointed out, they are not humbling. I believe a little more humility in our relationship with nature would be a good thing. And I suspect Rocky Wilson would agree. Bring back the grizzly. They deserve the chance to thrive again in the Pacific Northwest.

Correspondence ID: 12072Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Camano Island, WA 98282
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 18:03:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I write in support of the proposed plan to re-release grizzly bears into the North Cascades Ecosystem. This plan will have the following benefits:

- 1) return the bears to a habitat in which they were previously established, thus mitigating some of the damage caused by their loss;
- 2) expand the territory for the bears, potentially allowing the species to be further protected and increase numbers
- 3) provide support for a more complete ecosystem with the bears returning to their original habitat.

The EIS makes clear, I believe, that the concern for human-bear interaction is unwarranted, at least in the very near future as the number of bears to be released is low in number and over an extended period of time. The other concern I've heard expressed in media is an impact on salmon fisheries but again, the EIS makes clear this would not occur and again, the numbers of bears to be released are small.

I hope the NPS proceeds with this project and that grizzlies will once again be part of the Washington state ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 12073Project:112008Document:132104

Address: ELECTRIC CITY, WA 99123
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 18:04:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I oppose reintroduction of Grizzly Bears into the North Cascades. I fish, hunt, and bird in Okanogan and Chelan Counties. The bears will inevitably roam outside the release area, putting property and human life at risk.

Correspondence ID: 12074Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 18:04:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am a hiker who enjoys being out in our beautiful PNW wildlands. I am also involved in the community science program to monitor urban carnivores. As such I have learned a lot about the role carnivores play in ecosystems and how to safely coexist with them.

Grizzly bears play a significant role in the high mountain meadow ecosystem. As omnivores, they disperse seeds and aerate the soil through their digging. They also hold an important cultural significance for the local tribes and are one of the animals most associated with wilderness for all people.

Restoring the grizzly bear to the North Cascades represents a major step in repairing the damage humans have done to the PNW ecosystems. As demonstrated by the excitement of visitors seeing the brown bear cubs at the Woodland Park Zoo to all the people voting in the annual fat bear contest, the Grizzly inspires wonder, a state that improves the emotional health of

people who live in an increasingly fraught world.

For these reasons and others, I am in favor of restoring the Grizzly bear to their ancestral range in the North Cascades.

Sincerely,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 12076Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Vancouver, WA 98666
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 18:07:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: PLEASE DO NOT HARM the grizzly bears in any way. We don't OWN these magnificent creatures. We OWE them!

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 12077Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Snoqualmie, WA 98065
United States of America
Outside Organization: None Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 18:08:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Alternative A remains the only rational course of action under the circumstances described in the new EIS.

Alternative C, with its 10(j) designation, does nothing to mitigate the opposition that I have expressed in the past to any attempt to artificially create a new population of grizzly bears in the NCE.

I have lived my entire life in close proximity to the NCE. I have roamed the North Cascades my entire life and intend to continue to do so as long as I am physically able. I am not a member of any advocacy organization with a merely abstract or academic interest in this issue. It is deeply personal for me. The proposed importation of grizzly bears has a direct impact on the quality of my life and my need for remote wilderness recreation in solitude, free from any measurable possibility of violent or fatal animal encounters (the black bears common to the Cascades being an entirely different animal from grizzly bears, and far less dangerous), which is the whole reason why I live here and have contributed to the local economy for so many years. I could never obtain the benefit from the NCE that I do by traveling in groups, wearing bells or banging pots and pans (which would destroy my chances of any benign wildlife encounters), or having to be constantly looking over my shoulder or listening for any rustling in the brush for fear that a surprise grizzly encounter would be next. I relish my close emotional connection with the NCE as it presently exists. I would never choose to live near Glacier or Yellowstone or any other grizzly bear territory or to go solo hiking there, nor would I choose to relocate to the area of the NCE if grizzly bears were to be imported.

Alternative C's representations about "flexibility" to take this or that management action under this or that scenario if it turns out more negatively than hoped are hardly reassuring. There is no guarantee of sufficient long-term funding or availability of staff resources to implement and enforce the measures that Alternative C claims will serve and protect the public. Furthermore, the assurances vest too much judgment solely in the responsible agencies, do not provide for any objective criteria requiring them to take specific remedial action under specific circumstances, and do not provide any avenue for efficient citizen rights of redress against the agencies for failure to protect human life and personal property that may be impacted by the presence of grizzly bears.

Another highly disturbing element of the EIS is its failure to articulate an exit strategy if the grizzly importation program turns out to have adverse consequences that cannot be anticipated based on best presently available science. It is simply

assumed that the program will be successful to some degree because grizzly bears roamed freely in the NCE in the bygone days of the "Wild West," when humans were few and hunting restrictions were nonexistent, and that any adverse consequences will have to be dealt with in some manner. But there is no analysis of what would need to be done if the entire program were to turn out to be a disaster due to changed conditions from the "Wild West" days that are undetected and/or not properly addressed in the EIS.

Nothing in the present iteration of the EIS has changed my views that attempted restoration of an NCE grizzly bear population is an ill-advised boondoggle that threatens to upset the appropriate balance between humans and wildlife in the NCE which has existed for decades and has worked so well, enabling so many people to enjoy a relatively intact environment in such a relatively carefree manner in comparison with the precautions that have to be taken in grizzly country. Insertion of new elements such as a restored grizzly bear population that has the potential to create management headaches and threaten public safety is playing with fire. This is particularly so in view of the agencies' admitted inability to predict or control whether and where imported grizzly bears, or their offspring, might migrate outside the zone of initial introduction.

I saw no evidence cited in the EIS that importation of grizzly bears into the NCE is essential for survival of the species. Conversely, I also saw no cited evidence that the relatively intact environmental quality of the NCE is suffering from lack of grizzly bears. Publications over the last several decades that are too numerous to cite have addressed the controversies surrounding the impacts of road building, timber harvesting, mineral extraction, commercialization, highway construction, dams, proposed tramways and the like. But I have never seen any analysis establishing that seed dispersal in the NCE is inadequate due to the absence of grizzly bears, that prey is overabundant and in need of control by grizzly bears, or that any other element of the ecosystem is not functioning due to lack of grizzly bears.

The degree of urbanization adjacent to the NCE - which is vastly greater than in any of the other U.S. areas I know of presently containing documented populations of grizzly bears - and the human demands on public lands associated with that urbanization, have only increased. And it is well known that the demand for the area's outdoor recreation opportunities has increased many times faster than the state's human population as a whole. Not only is this regularly reported in the news media, but it is plainly obvious from the ballooning number of REI and other outdoor equipment stores and trip reports on the Washington Trails Association website, and the overflowing parking lots at trailheads at peak times.

Emblematic of the EIS's failure to appropriately assess the impact of this increasing public pressure on the advisability of importing grizzly bears is the following statement on page 147: "Given the amount of recreation that occurs in other grizzly bear ecosystems associated with Glacier National Park and Yellowstone National Park, the presence of grizzly bears is not expected to limit overall visitor use and experience of the NCE." I saw no scientific support cited in the EIS for this statement. Furthermore, the comparison is inapposite. Unlike North Cascades, Glacier and Yellowstone are not urban proximate parks. They are completely different scenarios, Glacier and Yellowstone being nowhere near major metropolitan areas with heavy local demand for wilderness recreation on the part of a largely and increasingly urban-suburban clientele. North Cascades is not a far-flung, out-of-the-way hinterland where few people would be impacted by sweeping wildlife management actions involving apex predators.

The vast majority of visitors to Glacier and Yellowstone are not from the local areas, they deliberately travel to these parks knowing in advance that they are grizzly territory, and they have the option of diverting their activities to other areas if they wish to be in an environment where they can be assured that they will not encounter grizzly bears. Residents of western and central Washington who are tied to their jobs and depend on the NCE to meet their demand for regular wilderness recreation as an essential element of the local quality of life but do not want to run the risk of a grizzly encounter will not have this option if grizzly bears are imported. They will be forced to divert their activities outside their cherished North Cascades. If Washington residents wish to experience grizzly country and have the time, they have many options where they can do so, including British Columbia, Alberta, northeastern Washington, Idaho, Montana and Wyoming. It is not necessary to import grizzly bears into the NCE to create this opportunity.

While it is undoubtedly true that many visitors to Glacier and Yellowstone actively desire to observe grizzly bears in their natural habitat, I know of no evidence that the many people who have chosen to live in Washington on account of its multitude of outdoor recreational opportunities have done so because of the possibility that they may at some point in the future observe grizzly bears.

I saw no analysis in the EIS of how people perceive that their visitor use patterns may change if grizzly bears were to be reintroduced. Due to the lack of a significant grizzly population in the Cascades since large scale outdoor recreation became established as a tradition in the area in the 20th century, the vast majority of local residents, including wilderness recreationists, have never had to take grizzly preparedness into account, have never had a close call with one of these animals, and have never been forced to deploy defensive measures against one. The claims of people who have not actively recreated in grizzly country that the presence of grizzlies would not deter them would be based to a large degree on speculation. What might sound like a nice idea on paper can be terrifying when one has to confront the actual on-the-ground reality of it. The agencies cannot possibly hope to gauge eventual public acceptance of grizzly bear importation by tallying present statements of support from people who have never had such an experience - or think it would never happen to them. I, for one, am not willing to accept this risk, and I doubt very much that I am alone.

Quite contrary to the statement on page 147 of the EIS, the importation of grizzly bears into the NCE has the potential for huge disruption of visitor use patterns. Are the agencies not aware of the monumental nightmares being faced by administrators of the Alpine Lakes Wilderness and Mt. Rainier National Park - areas outside the proposed initial reintroduction zone - because these areas are already bursting at the seams with visitor use, as evidenced by recent public comment processes on management plan updates? Can they not envision how these problems could be exacerbated by yet additional use on the part of local people who desire a quality wilderness recreation experience but are unwilling to accept the risk of a grizzly encounter in the NCE - or have recently had one somewhere else (or experienced the imminent threat of one) and do not want another one? This issue has not been adequately addressed.

Despite multiple EIS iterations over the past several years and the new preferred alternative of a 10(j) experimental grizzly population in the NCE, the agencies have not adequately analyzed the potential impacts, risks and consequences of such a plan and are not ready to implement it. I saw no discussion in the EIS of any previous program to import grizzly bears into an urban proximate ecosystem and whatever lessons may have been learned therefrom. Proposed importation of grizzly bears into the NCE is simply too far into "brave new world" territory under the current state of analysis.

Correspondence ID: 12079Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98121
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 18:18:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzly bears can be an important part of the ecosystem, pose little risk to the public, and there is plenty of room to create a thriving population.

Correspondence ID: 12080Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 18:20:47
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am concerned that the introduction of Brown (Grizzly) Bears into north Washington will bring about negative consequences for both humans and bears. Humans of the region have grown accustomed to not having the potential threat of Brown Bears in the local environment. This area borders a very densely populated region that contains a great number of outdoor enthusiasts. Many are not prepared to deal with the potential risks of large bears. People in the northwest generally don't carry bear spray, bear bells or many other deterrents. To add a species that has been substantially absent from a region for a generation is going to result in a conflict which will cost human and bears lives. Much of the ecological niche that brown bears occupy are now covered by the slightly less dangerous black bear. I am against the reintroduction of Brown Bears into the Northwest.

Correspondence ID: 12081Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98105
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 18:29:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the plan to bring the grizzlies back to the north cascades.

Correspondence ID: 12082Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Burlington, WA 98233
United States of America
Outside Organization: Back Country Horsemen Non-Governmental
Received: Nov,07 2023 18:30:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Very concerned about possibility of introducing grizzlies this side of the mountains since horseback riding in the woods is dangerous enough as it is. We don't need grizzlies over here!

Correspondence ID: 12083Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 18:35:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am writing in support of the reintroduction of the grizzly in the North Cascades wilderness and National Park. These iconic bears are essential for the complete and balanced ecosystem that this beautiful and rugged area needs to be able to continue on for generations to come. This is the perfect habitat for these great bears and much can be done to mitigate any human or livestock interaction so that little harm would come from their reintroduction. It is long past time that these bears are finally allowed to live again in their historic range, and the North Cascades is the perfect place for this to take place.

Thank you very much for your consideration and actions on this important ecological issue.
Sincerely,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 12084Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Fairfax Station, VA 22039
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 18:37:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and the wilderness environment.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness. Montana doesn't have any "extra" Grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades.

A natural recovery option must be fully developed and analyzed, even if it takes longer. Prioritize the bears and the wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 12086Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Dupont, WA 98327
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 18:41:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing you to express my opposition to the reintroduction of Grizzly bears in Washington's North Cascades range. The north Cascades now are not what they were a century or two ago. There are now many of us who use the area for backpacking and camping. By simply reintroducing these apex predators into the area you will not be able to turn back the clock to the population density of the surrounding area and the recreational use of the Range by the surrounding populations that existed a century or two ago. There are now parents with families who would not and should not expose themselves to the elevated risk level that Grizzly bears would pose on a typical backpacking or camping trip. The arguments in favor of introduction such as "controlling deer and elk populations, spreading seeds and other nutrients", etc., do not justify tampering with the reality on the ground in the Washington Cascades at the present time. Similarly, attempting to justify this project as an effort to support "Tribal cultural and spiritual values related to the grizzly bear" would ignore the fact that in civilized society there are never-ending public safety decisions that must prioritize the safety of vulnerable segments of the population over personal views of sub-groups. The need to protect families is a spiritual value shared by a very large segment of the population, Tribal and otherwise. It's easy to say that attacks by Grizzlies are rare but the fact remains that backpacking or camping in an area with grizzlies poses a distinctly elevated recognized safety risk.

Thank you for all the great work you do in making this area accessible to us.

Regards,

Correspondence ID: 12091Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Edgewood, WA 98372
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 18:43:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not add grizzly bears to the mix in the north cascades. That has to be the most hiked area in the state. Not to mention hunters and other wildlife. Grizzlies are killers and will kill anything they come across it doesn't matter if it's a deer or person. If they come across the boarder from Canada we can't do anything about that but it will take alot longer for Grizzlies to show up here and cause problems. If your going to release them in the cascades you might as well release them in down town Seattle so people can know what they're dealing with when they go hiking. This makes no sense we pushed them out for a reason.

Correspondence ID: 12093Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 18:49:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To Whom It May Concern;

As an avid hiker and lover of wildlife and wild spaces, please bring grizzlies back to the Cascades using "Alternative C." Allowing for more state government control while giving grizzlies federal protection is the best for people and bears. As someone who grew up in Montana around grizzlies, I would love to see their beauty and positive environment impacts restored in the Cascades for future generations.

Thank you for your consideration,

Correspondence ID: 12094Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 91106
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 18:51:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please save the grizzlies!!

Correspondence ID: 12095Project:112008Document:132104

Address: LYNNWOOD, WA 98036
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 18:51:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I m a frequent hiker in Cascades. I don't feel safe with the idea of introduction of Grizzly bears.

Correspondence ID: 12098Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Fairview, OR 97024
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 18:52:21

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Definitely reintroduce grizzlies to both Washington and Oregon.

Correspondence ID: 12100Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America

Outside Organization: Selg Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 18:53:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Having reviewed the EIS, I favor Alternative B. Alternative C is marginally batter than Alternative A. The idea that the reintroduction is a nonessential experiment is just gutless.

Correspondence ID: 12102Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spokane, WA 99202
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 18:55:48

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think Alternative C for the Grizzly Bear Recovery Plan in the North Cascades Ecosystem is better than Alternative B because the bears would be seen as an experimental population, rather than being protected as a threatened species. This would determine whether or not the recovery of the species in NCE is vital to the survival of the species as a whole is an important part of this situation. But with that being said, I think one part of this plan that could be better is looking into whether or not the recovery of grizzly bears in the NCE is vital to the survival of the species before the recovery effort actually starts. With more grizzlies in the NCE, this is going to change the overall structure of the ecosystem, whether for better or worse, but I think that if the recovery of the bears in NCE isn't essential to the survival of the species as a whole, it's probably not worth the effort behind the recovery process. Although there are benefits to recovering the species in NCE, there are also negative aspects of it as well, such as the effects this will have on recreational usage along with economic costs

of the plan. First off, the NCE is pretty separated from the other grizzly bear populations in the US, mainly being Yellowstone and the Northern Continental Divide areas. Because the NCE is so far away from these other populations, the recovery of grizzlies in the NCE probably isn't essential to the survival of the species as a whole because this would just create separate populations, instead of a metapopulation. I think that the USFWS could predict these outcomes instead of using many more resources on actually engaging in a recovery plan to determine whether the population in NCE is essential or not. Given this, the recovery plan could negatively affect recreational usage in NCE because of the threat of grizzlies to humans. This could lead to a decline in recreational usage within the NCE because of this recovery process, which may not even be essential. Along with this, there is also the obvious economic costs to following through with the plan, ranging from transportation costs of the bears to tranquilizer costs that would be used on the bears. Overall, I think that there could be more research done before this plan gets put into place to determine whether or not grizzlies are essential to the NCE, without going through the process then determining, which could have various negative impacts on recreational usage and the ecosystem in general.

Correspondence ID: 12105Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 18:58:01

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think it would be a great idea to re-introduce Grizzly Bears to the North Cascades area. I am a hiker and backpacker and I think that as much as we can we should right the wrongs of how humans have impacted our natural and wild areas. These bears used to be there and I think they would be a beneficial part of the ecosystem again. The north cascades in particular are so rugged, remote and wild the seem like the perfect spot for growing a Grizzly population as there would be a minimum of the kinds of human interactions that have come up as grizzly populations grow again in other areas of the US.

Correspondence ID: 12107Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Anonymous, ND 58503
United States of America

Outside Organization: Anonymous Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 19:03:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No reintroduced grizzlies in WA or OR please. There are plenty of ways to improve the ecosystem in WA that don't involve purposefully introducing people eaters.

Grizzlies are incompatible with outdoor recreation. Solo activities (i.e. hiking, trail running races, etc.) in areas of ID, WY, and MT are already not advised due to grizzlies, and WA is one of the few areas in the US with a somewhat intact wilderness where one can enjoy a hike without worrying too much about being eaten, and perhaps one of the only grizzly-free mountainous areas in the US with an oceanic climate. Like the bears, people need natural habitats and refuge too and in WA they find it.

Introducing grizzlies will put the public at risk and there are no effective mitigations. Spray is no panacea, as the tragic mauling of the backpackers and their dog in Banff National Park illustrates. Recent maulings by grizzly bears in Montana have left members of the public with grievous injuries, even when spray was properly deployed.

Grizzlies are at little risk of extinction. Existing populations of grizzlies in the US and Canada are sufficient to protect the species.

The ecosystem of the North Cascades is fundamentally intact already. There are already apex predators in WA and OR, such as wolves, black bears, wolverines, and mountain lions, to keep prey species in check.

Introducing grizzlies to WA, while cruel to outdoor recreationalists, is also cruel to the potential bears, which will inevitably be tempted to venture into semirural areas along Puget Sound to snack on fruit, etc. These bears will continually be

ethanized.

There are over 300 million people in the US--the frontier has been lost and it's not coming back by adding a couple hundred grizzlies in WA. Please drop the effort.

Note: Name, email, etc. associated with this submission were marked anonymous (e.g., name, email, etc.) due to privacy concerns.

Correspondence ID: 12108Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spokane, WA 99258
United States of America

Outside Organization: Gonzaga University Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 19:03:56

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: After reading the North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Environmental Impact Statement, I had a few questions arise. Looking specifically at Alternative B: Restoration with Existing Endangered Species Act Protections, one area I had a few concerns around was managing the bear populations. Like with all wild animals, you can't ensure that they're going to stay in the protected area their entire lives. They're bound to leave the protected areas at some point, which may subject them to human interference or mortality due to humans (i.e. getting hit by a car). Alternative B discusses bear mortalities, specifically human-caused mortalities and recreation activities, but believes that only 2% of the grizzly population would be lost due to this. How does the plan account for the bear mortalities? Where did this number come from? If this 2% is generated by looking at previous data regarding the number of bears killed per year due to human caused activities, has it taken into account that there is now going to be an increase in bear populations which may cause more frequent bear and human interactions. Also with the increase in bear populations, there is a subsequent increase in human populations, which may mean more cars on the road. Since only 7 grizzly bears are being released yearly, how will the restoration plan account for the bear mortalities if mortality exceeds the projected 2%? Will more bears be released the next year or will they release more bears in the current calendar year? These situations are likely to arise with the restoration of bears into the North Cascades. If the mortality rate exceeds the projected amount, how will it affect the population goal? Will it push it past the projected 60 to 100 years? As bear populations restore, it becomes more likely that humans will encounter bears, which may result in an increased mortality rate. If bear populations are being restored near roads, we may also see an increase in bear and car collisions.

Correspondence ID: 12109Project:112008Document:132104

Address: BAin bridge Island, WA 98110
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 19:07:41

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I want to see the grizzly bears back in Washington State mountains. as a lifetime hiker through the wilderness, I have seen and respect the company of many bears. as a former forest service employee who worked through the mountains again I came in to contact with many black bears. Please use or select plan b to support the reintroduction of the Grizzly bear.

Correspondence ID: 12110Project:112008Document:132104

Address: North Bend, WA 98045
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 19:10:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not reintroduce grizzly bears to the North Cascades. As an enthusiast of the outdoors I've spent great amounts of time in the North cascades and enjoy taking my family throughout the Cascades multiple times per year. It is not as remote as it once was, there are more people, which is why there are no longer grizzly bears. It would only introduce

the opportunity for endangering the safety of both bears and people if the bears were to be reintroduced. They are dangerous predators and human engagement would be negative. Please vote NO on this proposal!

Correspondence ID: 12114Project:112008Document:132104

Address: East Wenatchee, WA 98802
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 19:20:31

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Washington state has a ban on hunting cougars and black bears with dogs so their populations have skyrocketed. Now they're intruding on public areas and there have been numerous attacks on people hikers and livestock. Now you want to introduce the Apex predator back into the Cascades. Deer populations have plummeted due to the increase in blackbear and cougar populations then there's another predator. The wolf which is also feeding on deer and other animals as well as presentation on livestock. With the decrease in deer and elk populations, and also the government trying to increase the salmon populations, now is not the time to introduce an Apex predator like the grizzly to the north Cascades. You were just asking for problems when the grizzlies don't have enough fish to feed on or enough other animals to feed on they'll come looking for it and livestock.

Correspondence ID: 12115Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Denver, CO 80218
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 19:24:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This plan seems well thought out, structured, and reasonable. We all want these bears back in their natural habitat, and the ecological benefits that will follow. I strongly support this resolution!

- North Cascades National Park and the surrounding ecosystem have more than enough open space to successfully recover grizzly bears.
- This would be a major step in restoring the species across its historic range.
- Grizzlies provide ecological benefits and will improve the ecosystem's health.
- We're giving grizzlies back their home -- and people want that.
- The public process includes new tools to reduce the potential for conflict with local landowners and communities.

Correspondence ID: 12118Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Vancouver, WA 98686
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 19:36:24

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a Washington resident I strongly support the National Park Services preferred Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation.

I understand it is a challenge to restore large carnivores, however, this plan will give people the tools they need to thrive in and around grizzly bear country. Grizzlies belong in the North Cascades, as they enhance the park's ecological integrity and contribute to its wildness.

Please consider the positive ecological and economic benefits and support Alternative C.

We have lost and continue to lose so many species. We have an opportunity to benefit the ecology of the northern Cascades Range, provide economic benefits and restore grizzly bears for our future generations.

Thank you for your dedication to our national parks.

Correspondence ID: 12119Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Broadview Heights, OH 44147
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 19:36:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a frequent backcountry user in the North Cascades, I strongly support either Alternative B or C for restoring the grizzly bear population to the North Cascades Ecosystem. The North Cascades, while very scenic, is definitely missing the wild character that includes the opportunity to feel that awe and hair standing on your neck feeling from knowing a grizzly bear could be near by. Having spent a lot of time in barren ground grizzlies and coastal brown bear habitat, I feel that restoring these North Cascade grizzlies to their historic range is an important component of restoring balance to this ecosystem.

I strongly support Alternatives B & C of the Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan.

Correspondence ID: 12125Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Renton, WA 98058
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 20:00:45

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm a parent who cares about wildlife, and I want my children to experience grizzly bears as an important part of our regional culture. Humans were responsible for removing grizzlies from the North Cascades and it's our responsibility to bring them back home.

If we don't take action now, we risk losing grizzly bears from the North Cascades forever.

Correspondence ID: 12126Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ravensdale, WA 98051
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 20:01:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Bring back the Grizzlies.
Our world is better with its biodiversity intact and thriving.

Correspondence ID: 12128Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Concrete, WA 98237
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 20:02:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not agree with the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the north cascades. This is a bad idea and I oppose! Do not do it! Please

Correspondence ID: 12129Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Darrington, WA 98241
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 20:03:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I oppose the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the north cascades. My vote is NO.

Correspondence ID: 12130Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia., WA 98513
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 20:05:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I believe that the Grizzly Bear should be reinstated in the North Cascades National Park. I always imagined it in a way of what the Lions mean to Africa. I think it would generate a lot of interest among wildlife enthusiasts to be able to once again see an iconic symbol of North American wildlife roaming the landscape of the North Cascades. I think it is time to correct the damage that we have done in the past and create an environment where future generations will be able to see this magnificent animal. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 12133Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spokane, WA 99207
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 20:19:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears are an essential component of North American woodland ecosystems. As the perpetrators of decimation, people should restore Grizzlies to Washington's North Cascades and Olympic mountains. Millions of acres of intact, well connected habitat has been vacant of these creatures since the 1860's and it's honestly quite sad. I work in habitat restoration and I often find myself planting trees that will inevitably be mowed down by herbivores within a year or less. Large predator species like Grizzlies have been shown to help plant ecosystem recovery rates by 89%. The work I do is funded by taxpayer's money. If we want to use that money more effectively, Grizzly bears and other predator reintroduction plans are a viable option to achieve that.

Correspondence ID: 12134Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kennewick, WA 99337
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 20:23:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not bring Grizzlies to the North Cascades

Correspondence ID: 12135Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Oak Harbor, WA 98277
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 20:24:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please let nature take its current course. Don't import grizzly bears into North Cascades. Let them wander in as they have already been doing. Eventually the numbers will increase.
Thanks

Correspondence ID: 12136Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tulalip, WA 98271
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 20:25:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do not proceed with the plans to reintroduce grizzlies into Washington State.
In 2018 I was fishing just south of Anchorage AK on Bird Creek. 24 hrs later a fellow fisherman was killed by a griz just 20 ft from what I had been fishing.
We do not need the grizzly as a human hunter in our area.

Thank you for your consideration.

██████████
Marysville, WA

Correspondence ID: 12137Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 20:31:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am against the reintroduction of Grizzly Bears in the North Cascades!! If this happens I will no longer recreate in the N.Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 12141Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Oak Harbor, WA 98277
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 20:50:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Federal law defines the grizzly bear as threatened, (2017) with the exception of within the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem (2018). Grizzly bears don't stay where you put them and the Federal Government though they possess authority over the National Parks land they do not possess authority over surrounding state land and communities.

Canada is moving forward with their relocation program (very irresponsible) when their deep northern territory is a much better fit for relocation, vice the other side of the boarder. Bears will migrate south, with this being said the below should still be addressed while standing down this initiative in the PNW region.

Safety/ Surrounding Populated Areas:

The number one reason for any EIS to stop dead in its tracks!
The region where this relocation program is planned on average is 50-100 people per square mile, though the major populous blossoms to 700-1100 people per square mile. This is terribly close to metropolitan communities with unlimited opportunity of future and very dangerous interactions/impacts. This in itself is a bell ringer for any EIS for 'environmental impacts to public safety'! Chelan, Okanogan, Skagit and Whatcom counties have a combined approximate population of a three quarter million+ people the neighboring communities west burst with a combined populous of millions of community members. This is as unsafe as it gets, mindset that bears will stay where bears are put in 'remote areas' is unscientific and against the laws of nature.

Washington State law conflicts with the proclaimed federal self-defense policy publicly narrative:

Federal policy wants to reintroduce an apex predator to the 'national forest' areas under their management. (Canada is doing the same.) With the disclosure that under threat of serious harm, self-defense is legal. Per RCW 77.08 and WAC 220-440-060 killing wildlife causing private property damage states federally listed threatened or endangered species will require federal permits or federal authority, in addition to a state permit. Nowhere in the RCW or WAC does the law state self-defense is legal or defensible in preventing public harm or injury. This requires correction for public safety.

Damage Burdens (livestock and property):

Agriculture 'limited Animal Mortality coverage' is a secondary insurance that the agriculture community would at their own

expense be required to obtain as a result of this federal program. This high probability adds additional financial burdens to an already stressed community. Additionally private residence structures are not designed to withstand the level of destruction grizzly bears can impose.

The federal government under this program nationally should implement a federal program to fully indemnify - reimbursement for associated damages of stock animal mortality and structure damage at 100%. This damage if it occurs would be a direct result of a federal program and the negative outcomes/ effects of implementation nationally. The program should include manned hotlines for federal claims, across fiscal year for resolve and quick disbursement - no red tape. However funny and impossible this sounds the sovereign federal agency must make those it negatively impacts whole however big or small. (Exponential damage and loss has been witnessed from the Gray Wolf experiment - bad program too).

To complement the above damage burdens and self-defense laws a policy should be implemented for salvage permits as grizzly bears are on the threatened list and not the endangered. Waste not want not, when they are taken in defense. This should be a standing federal allowance in or out of federal lands with introduction new predators to the local landscape. Save tax payer dollars the associated disposal cost and including this language in an existing act or measure on the docket.

In summary -

I along with many in our region do not see the value in reintroducing an apex predator into to a thriving and growing community where children, families and communities flourish.... For the sake of "Aspiring future generations of bears for legacy purposes" makes minimal no sense - what does this really mean? Legacy purposes... what purpose do grizzly bears provide? This is smoke and mirror big words with no meaning. Our eco systems are balanced by land management practices and where this fails the tribes have first dibs on anything above the norm which is what they were promised in the first place. Bringing back the grizzly population at the proposed math rate of repopulation will forever change the landscape of the PNW. Stop the madness!

Correspondence ID: 12148Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bonney Lake, WA 98391
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 21:18:56

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Biologist,

I'm against reintroducing Grizzlies to Wa. State. I think many people will be killed or maimed by these predators.

Keep them outa Washington plenty will migrate here anyway what is the point?

My daughter and friends hike all over the state,I'll make sure she has a magnum

44 for protection when she hikes the Enchantments if this is allowed. I'm sure you'll see many shot and killed rather than being mauled to death by one of these predators. Washingtonians are all over the state 8 million live here now.

To many dangerous concerns for all who are in the woods camping, hunting or hiking or fishing.

Sincerely,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 12150Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98512-7404
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 21:23:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am not at all in favor of this plan. The year is 2023, not 1850, and the state is now populated by humans who enjoy recreating in the north cascades wilderness. Grizzly bears are an apex predator, and one of the few wild animals that see humans as a potential food source. There are many, many records of grizzly bear attacks on humans in areas that are populated by them. In most cases, the person is either mauled or killed. Take for example the poor soldier who was recently killed on a wilderness training mission in Alaska. Or the hunter from Lewis County, WA. who was mauled several years back while hunting in Montana and barely escaped with his life. These animals are an absolute threat to human beings.

I do not believe grizzlies are necessary for a balanced ecosystem. This is an excuse that proponents use repeatedly and without sound merit. Humans have replaced the grizzly in terms of managing deer and elk populations, as well as other animals, and the Washington state department of fish and wildlife does a good job of overseeing this recreation to maintain balanced and healthy animal populations. And, if grizzlies are reintroduced the hunters will see far fewer opportunities to hunt because of the impact of grizzlies on wild game, and hikers and fishermen will see a decline out of fear of these predators.

If grizzlies are reintroduced they absolutely will find their way into populated areas, especially in times of scarce food and/or hard winters. One of the foremost fact-based arguments, historically speaking, for expanding Yellowstone national park is that game do not recognize human boundaries and, likewise, boundaries do not respect the natural migratory patterns of wild game. John Muir himself was one of many who promoted this fact.

If you reintroduce grizzlies, someone will eventually be mauled or killed and eaten by one of these animals, or their offspring. At some point, reintroduction will absolutely come at the price of human life, and it will be on those who just thought they new best for everyone and had to have their way.

Once again, it is not 1850 and the ecosystem, supported by sound human management, has done just fine without the grizzly bear. I implore you to not move forward with this proposal.

Correspondence ID: 12153Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 21:34:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We do not support the re-introduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 12155Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98116
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 21:40:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to express my opposition to the idea of planting grizzly bears in the North Cascades National Park (NCNP.) I am opposed to the idea of purposely planting grizzlies for the safety and financial reasons as described below.

The introduction of grizzly bears into the NCNP is a massive safety concern for tourists and residents alike. The NCNP and Lake Chelan National Recreation Area (LCNRA) are uniquely isolated areas that will be difficult for rangers in applicable agencies to patrol and manage due to the lack of roads, isolated trails and rugged terrain and I wonder how the public safety and the safety of the bears can be adequately managed. I have personally seen grizzly bears in Yellowstone and Glacier National Parks and with each experience armed NPS rangers were already present or arrived within minutes to monitor the involvement of humans and grizzlies both on the road and on the trail. I cannot see how this type of management will be possible in the NCNP and LCNRA for the reasons described above and I do not see how grizzlies and humans can stay safe without it.

Additionally, applicable agencies will need to spend more money to increase head count to provide the appropriate safety monitoring for both bears and people as previously mentioned. I am concerned that hikers and tourists will stop visiting out of fear of a negative bear encounter and the lack of agency personnel to provide adequate protection. This fear will lead to lack of tourism dollars entering the area which is often providing the livelihood of area residents. As a result, I predict that there will be a very negative financial impact from extra spending and lack of income. Visitors looking for the thrill of a

grizzly sighting are going to head to Montana where they can view bears safely from their cars in large parks with roads and abundant staffing.

I am aware that a grizzly bear entering the park is not outside the realm of possibility but the idea of purposely planting them seems dangerous and expensive to me and I hope that you decide not to proceed forward with the grizzly bear introduction plan for these reasons.

Thank you for your time.

Correspondence ID: 12156Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spokane, WA 99208
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 21:43:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: There are already a lot of black bears in the north Cascades. I wouldn't feel very safe knowing there were grizzly bears there as well. It would deter me from camping and hiking in that area.

Correspondence ID: 12158Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kirkland, WA 98034-4642
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 21:56:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: All of our wildlife is important (they all serve an important purpose in our livable world) and the grizzly bear is no exception. We need to do all we can to keep them safe, healthy and doing their part to make our world the best it can possibly be. Thanks, [REDACTED] :-)

Correspondence ID: 12159Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellevue, WA 98004
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 21:56:56

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: After reviewing the Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Environmental Impact Statement for the North Cascades Ecosystem, I would like to express my support for the planning of restoration efforts taking place for grizzlies in Washington. I do however have some questions and comments regarding a few aspects of the draft text.

The first point which I had some concerns about is regarding the 10-J designation option for the grizzlies in the North Cascades ecosystem and the implications of this designation. I'm curious what the protocol would be for any bears who wander out of the natural ecosystems in which they are released and into local towns bordering the North Cascades such as Twisp, Mazama, or other more rural areas. Lethal removal of these bears in such a case under the 10-J designation could undermine the restoration mission at hand by removing individuals from an already vulnerable and threatened population. Are there any alternative approaches to the lethal removal of these bears in an instance like this? What sort of public education efforts are in place for locals in these towns regarding grizzly safety both for themselves and the bears?

Secondly, the ecological interactions mentioned in the report emphasize the role grizzlies play in shaping habitat, stating that "restoring grizzly bears in the NCE would contribute to restoring missing ecological interactions that help to shape fish and wildlife habitat through seed dispersal, increasing nutrient availability, and controlling prey populations." To what extent is the recovery of these interactions needed within the ecosystem today, especially in comparison to when grizzlies last inhabited the area? Are the prey populations currently at levels where they need to be controlled by grizzlies? A more in-

depth assessment of the existing habitat structure and prey population status could help insure that grizzly reintroduction is rooted in ecological science.

Lastly, I have some questions regarding the impact on the wilderness areas designated for grizzly bear release. What are the direct impacts on these primitive areas that grizzlies will be released into? What are the exact "impacts on the qualities of wilderness character" that will occur during releases in order to restore these grizzlies to their natural habitats? Though I can see the ecological value of adding grizzlies to these wilderness areas, I think it is important that the NPS, USFS, and USFWS attempt to preserve the wilderness character and values established within the Wilderness Act.

Correspondence ID: 12162Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Everett, WA 98208
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 22:11:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly Bears were an apex predator in the North Cascades before settlers came. They kept balance in their ecosystem along with wolves and cougars. When you take an apex predator out of an ecosystem, it is no longer a healthy ecosystem. Grizzlies need to be reintroduce in order to bring back balance. Deer and elk populations will be in better check which will make our forests healthier. They will eat salmon, but not enough to put a dent in our salmon stocks. Grizzlies are an icon of our country and the deserve to be reintroduced into their native range.

Correspondence ID: 12164Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sedro Woolley, WA 98284
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 22:12:12

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: There were grizzly bears in the North Cascades a century ago when one took my grandparents collie in Diablo around 1920. They owned the town site and had established a hotel there. Today there are still remnant bears around awe almost hit one that plunged I front of my car near Cascade pass 3 Yeats ago. It was not fully grown, but was a cinnamon coat , leggy and with a bug hump on its back. . It raced across the road and into the headwaters of the cascade river. It was no black bear! Entirely wrong shape. I had known others who have had grizzly encounters , all of whom always said do not let any hunters know, they will just kill them

Correspondence ID: 12166Project:112008Document:132104

Address: McCleary, WA 98557
United States of America

Outside Organization: Back country horseman of Washington Non-Governmental

Received: Nov,07 2023 22:21:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I would like to see a vote for no change I am an equestrian trail rider

Correspondence ID: 12167Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 22:23:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly support the reintroduction of Grizzly Bears into the North Cascades. They are an important component of the ecology of the that region and the entire state of Wahsington.

Correspondence ID: 12172Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spokane, WA 99207
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 22:37:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The DEIS for the Grizzly Bear Recovery Plan proposes three potential plans. The first option, Alternative A is no action. This means that nothing will be done differently than it currently is for grizzly bear recovery. The second option, Alternative B, is managing grizzlies as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act. This would provide the grizzly bears extensive protections and severely limit how humans interact with bears. The third option, Option C, is managing grizzly bears under Section 10j of the Endangered Species Act. Under this option, the grizzly population being introduced in the North Cascades would be a non-essential, experimental population. While listing grizzlies on the Endangered Species List would provide the most protection and opportunity for population recovery and would help restore native ecosystems, it does have some very crucial limitations. For one, when species are listed on the Endangered Species List, populations can only be restored in native ecosystems in their historical range of variance. This means that even if areas in their historical range of variance are no longer suitable for grizzlies, they have to be restored there regardless of whether that location would be the most beneficial. Additionally, due to the restrictions and regulations outlined in the Endangered Species Act, there are significantly fewer allowed management practices. This can be problematic if there is conflict between a bear and a human or if a bear moves out of the park and is eating livestock as the bear cannot be killed and tranquilizing and transporting a bear is not always an option. Given these notable limitations, Alternative C (management of introduced bears as non-essential, experimental populations) is the best option. While listing grizzlies as a 10j population does not provide quite the same level of protection a full threatened species listing does, the numerous benefits of this option outweigh the potential consequences of less protections. Primarily, an experimental population can be introduced in non-native areas. This means that the grizzlies can be introduced to whichever ecosystem is most conducive to population recovery as opposed to just in locations where they historically existed. Additionally, as humans are the largest cause of grizzly bear mortality, a 10j listing allows for more management strategies that can help reduce human caused bear mortality. The other major benefit of a 10j listing is that the increase in management options can result in humans being more comfortable with the reintroduction of an experimental population, likely more comfortable than they would be with an essential population. This was very successful with wolf reintroduction in Yellowstone and provides hope for the success of grizzly restoration. In deciding which alternative the grizzly restoration will pursue, it is essential that all impacts of each alternative are considered, not just prioritizing the management strategy that provides the bears the most protection.

Correspondence ID: 12173Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Everett, WA 98201-4165
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,07 2023 22:38:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a resident of Washington State, I am excited at the prospect of grizzly bears returning to the North Cascades ecosystem. Wherever grizzlies thrive, so does wildness, clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife. That's why I support restoring grizzly bears to the bears North Cascades via Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation - provided that the accompanying 10(J) rule promotes the recovery of the population, ensures management is humane, prioritizes non-lethal management tools and enables humans and grizzly bears to coexist. Properly developed and implemented, the 10(J) rule will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

What fun it would be for me to be hiking and camping in the North Cascades and see wildlife like nature intended with grizzly bears and wolves balancing the ecosystem. Once the grizzly bears have returned, perhaps there can be some pamphlets at the Ranger Stations about grizzly bears so people understand them better and enjoy them from a distance and not intrude upon their privacy or habitat.

Correspondence ID: 12178Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 23:16:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support reintroducing grizzlies into the north cascades

Correspondence ID: 12181Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Walla Walla, WA 99362
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 23:19:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I've lived much of my life near grizzlies and I've found them to be good neighbors. Most prefer to steer clear of people and stick to wild country. Restoring an ecosystem's apex predator is always good and grizzlies bring a lot of other benefits, too.

Correspondence ID: 12188Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Snohomish, WA 98290
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 23:38:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Unintended consequences always follow when we try and manipulate outcomes for one species. This will be true of the grizzly bear in Washington state. When a forest fire ravages an area we leave it mostly to mother nature to take it's own course for recovery. Some species flourish that didn't before and some that were doing well struggle. Over time a balance is reached.

We should take a 'natural' approach to the grizzly bear in Washington and let them migrate into new areas of the state on their own terms and speed. A gradual approach determined by the grizzlies themselves will optimize their ability to choose territory and thrive. A gradual approach will also help them be accepted by a concerned population.

Please do not mess with mother nature by trying to have man play mother nature.

Correspondence ID: 12189Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tacoma, WA 98406
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 23:42:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: It is right to try. I support the 10j proposal. Bring the bears back and protect them.

Correspondence ID: 12190Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98107
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 23:49:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzlies are beautiful animals that we should protect here in the Cascades, and throughout the state of Washington. While they are predators, that's one of the reasons they are so important to our ecosystems. We should do what we can to protect them and make sure that they continue to fill that role, as well as the many other roles they serve as a keystone member of our local ecosystems. Humans and grizzlies can exist together peacefully and it is our duty to make sure

that we protect and strengthen populations here in Washington. We should do what we can to bring them back to ensure the health of our local ecosystems so that they can be enjoyed for generations to come.

Correspondence ID: 12192Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Burien, WA 98146
United States of America
Outside Organization: self employed Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 23:53:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We need Grizzly bears, Moose and Wolverines in the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 12193Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98104
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 23:53:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzly bears are beautiful animals that can and have coexisting alongside humans. They help the ecosystem and North Cascades is a perfect place to relocate them with little risk and high benefit. These animals deserve to live and thrive where they once roamed.

Correspondence ID: 12195Project:112008Document:132104
Address: San Diego, CA 92103
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,07 2023 23:55:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I strongly support the National Park Services preferred Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation.

This plan will both effectively restore grizzly bears in North Cascades National Park and give people the tools they need to thrive in and around grizzly bear country. Grizzlies belong in the North Cascades, as they enhance the park's ecological integrity and contribute to its wildness.

I personally spend my tourism dollars to see wildlife. While I loved the North Cascades during an extended camping trip this summer, I was disappointed to not see many animals a pika was ther highlight! Whereas, my visits to Alaska and Yellowstone have yielded many sightings, including grizzlies. Bring back grizzlies to their historic range ASAP.

Alternative C, with the 10(j) rule, provides managers flexibility to address community concerns while protecting the grizzly population. It ensures coexistence between humans and bears.

Please consider the positive ecological and economic benefits and support Alternative C. Restoring grizzly bears will secure the park's natural heritage and conserve an iconic species for current and future generations.

Thank you for your dedication to our national parks.

Correspondence ID: 12199Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Tacoma, WA 98422
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please don't do it

Correspondence ID: 12201Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Marysville, WA 98271
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Thank you for creating this report and for requesting public comment.

As someone who lives near, and frequently recreates in the NCE, I feel opposed to the addition of grizzly bears. The first reason is human/bear interactions. In the last two years in western Washington, we have had at least two black bears become habituated to humans, resulting in the death of one bear. The North Cascades National Park, being in proximity to highly populated western Washington, receives thousands of visitors a year, a portion of which have limited experience in the wilderness. I would be concerned that visitors to these areas, unlike residents of rugged places where the other four zones of rehabilitation are located (Wyoming, Montana, and Idaho), would be unprepared to avoid a bear encounter, leading to increased risk for bears and humans alike.

Second, though the report states historically in the 19th century there were 50,000 grizzly bears, I wasn't clear on what the goal of rehabilitation was for today. Of course, I understand the goal of introducing 200 bears over the course of 60-100 years, but my question is, though I read that the NCE is prime territory for grizzly bears, is it actually necessary to re-introduce them to the area? It seems that the four (of six) zones are successful in maintaining their grizzly populations.

Finally, as I mentioned before that I recreated frequently in the area, the addition of grizzly bears would certainly give me pause when planning camping trips, backpacking trips, and hikes. I practice proper food storage with a bear canister and always carry bear spray, but the knowledge that grizzly bears are in the area would make me nervous.

Thank you again for you time.

Correspondence ID: 12202Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98133`
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hello. I hike in the Cascades all the time, so this may not be in my best interests..! However I appreciate, nay REQUIRE, connection with nature. I love to see our wildlands in as natural a state as possible, and that includes grizzlies. Plus, grizzlies would probably help regulate the deer population, which I hear may be growing too rapidly. So yes, I would like to see grizzly bears returned to the North Cascades. I'll just keep an eye out for 'em!

Correspondence ID: 12203Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Snohomish, WA 99207
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As said in the DEIS "Comments included requests for further analysis and review of existing information related to human safety, coexistence with livestock," This is one of the most important points to consider surround the reintroduction of grizzlies in the North Cascades. If there is a non-experimental reintroduction of Grizzlies how will USFW deal with human grizzly conflict, and livestock grizzly conflict? Will the resources needed to manage bears be solidly in place and how will problem beats be handled if they have greater protection than an experimental population. I know this is being considered but its importance is much greater than any previous large predator reintroduction due to its

proximity to a huge metropolitan area. Multiple highways cut straight through the grizzly recovery zone and very few of them have adequate wildlife crossings. Due to bear reproduction being so slow and every member of the population it should be pertinent that everything possible is done to prevent grizzly vehicle collisions. In their current state it does not seem that any of the highways intersecting the recovery zone, what is being done to mitigate this? There is finite number of bears to reintroduce to the north cascades and the loss of a single bear could slow recovery very much. Is the department of transportation working on any projects currently to deal with this? Additionally have any studies been done to look at how highways may affect the spread of grizzlies and how it may fragment their habitat? My final comment is how will grizzly related livestock mortalities be dealt with? It seems there is nothing that can sour a reintroduction quicker than farmers who feel ignored or when their livestock gets killed by a wolf or grizzly. They are the ones who bare a lot of the downsides of reintroductions and there should be a huge focus on ensuring they are happy and effective ways of balancing the needs of farmers and bears are met. What resources does WDFW and USFW have in place to make sure this happens, have effective strategies been employed in places in Idaho and Montana and could they be applicable to the North Cascades?

Correspondence ID: 12204Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: It has been far too long that reindroduction has been under consideration and study. I support bringing this important species back to the North Cascades, and I hope the population will thrive. As we have seen with wolves, the ecosystem will benefit.

Correspondence ID: 12205Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98121
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The grizzlies have always called this home. It's time we welcome them back. They have always been part of a thriving ecosystem and it's time to right the wrongs we've done before

Correspondence ID: 12206Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lynnwood, WA 98087
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The re introduction of Grizzly bears to washington state is definitely not a good idea. It would be extremely unsafe with The amount of people that go into the wilderness here. Places like Alaska and Montana. People are prepared for grizzlys. People there know how to deal with them and have grown up around them. And alot of the people that go hiking here are from the city that have probably never seen a bear much less a Grizzly. The trails in the summer are so crowded everywhere here in Washington. Throw some grizzlys and you have a bad situation.

And then there's the salmon. Wich will become a food source for the bears. They are in such critical rebound right now. They are having a hard time and don't need any other obstacles. The southern residents need these fish to survive. Let's focus on the species that are here currently.

I get where people are coming for the reintroduction of Grizzlys, but there is to many cons
There's way better things that we could be putting resources into. We'll that's my two cents.

Correspondence ID: 12207Project:112008Document:132104

Address: OLGA, WA 98279
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Bring grizzlies back. And salmon for them to eat!

Correspondence ID: 12211Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98116
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am in support of returning grizzlies to the North Cascades. I believe it important to consider their value to the ecosystem and the a degree that bear populations have been threatened in North America. Cattle ranchers and hikers in Montana can coexist with bear interactions, I think we can too. I support the thoughtful approach of the Draft Restoration Plan, and am glad that it this long process is proceeding.

Correspondence ID: 12215Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Maple Valley, WA 98038
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Bring back the grizzlies! They belong in the North Cascades!

Correspondence ID: 12216Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I fully support Alternative C. I wholeheartedly agree that reintroduction of grizzlies to their native habitat, including the North Cascades area, is a benefit to humankind. .

Correspondence ID: 12219Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Ellensburg, WA 98926
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: It is not a good idea to introduce more Grizzly bears to the Cascades in WA. I grew up in Gardiner, MT (North entrance to Yellowstone). We had Grizzly Bears. When I was a child hearing of bear attacks was rare. It happened but was rare. As an adult things have changed. There are now Grizzly bear attacks every year, especially during the hunting season. I have family friends that have been mauled while out hiking. Montana is a large state at 147,040 square miles with 1.1 million people living in it. Washington on the other hand is 71,300 square miles with 7.7 million people living in it. Introducing Grizzly bears to WA makes no sense. You will have encounters between Grizzlies and livestock, pets, and people. Once they are introduced there's no going back. The Grizzlies are already in WA and they will make their way to the Cascades in larger numbers in due time. Let it happen naturally if it's going to happen. You aren't talking about introducing an herbivore to our area, this is a huge, dangerous carnivore. I love Grizzly bears. I loved getting to see them while growing up in MT but introducing them to the Cascades in WA is a foolish idea and clearly the long term effects of such a decision

haven't been thought through. Will it be worth it when a child is mauled and a human life is lost? Because it will only be a matter of time before it happens.

Correspondence ID: 12220Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Rochester, WA 98579
United States of America
Outside Organization: Backcountry horsemen of WA Non-Governmental
Received: Nov,08 2023 01:04:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: It's just too populated to bring back grizzlies. It doesn't make sense to do so.

Correspondence ID: 12221Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Spokane, WA 99207
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023 01:19:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: After looking over the restoration plan and EIS to reintroduce Grizzlies to the North Cascades, I believe that the clear best course of action is to undertake Alternative C and make the reintroduced individuals a 10(j) experimental population. To start, these kinds of populations have proven success when it comes to reintroducing megafauna to national parks. The most popular example is with the Yellowstone wolves, who upon reintroduction, were managed as a 10(j) designated population. That population is now extremely stable and successful and a good example of the success that the special designation can bring. It simply allows the management agencies to be flexible in their practices and do what is best for the population. Additionally, it keeps the balance of power in the hands of humans. A significant number of people live in or very close to the recovery zone and they have a right to be wary of grizzly bears. They can be disruptive species, especially if they get comfortable around humans and other more urban elements. Under the 10(j) designation, more can be done to prevent these types of interactions. If they do still occur though, a person can do what needs to be done to protect themselves without the repercussions if the grizzly was classified as a regular endangered species. Although this may not change the minds of some people that oppose reintroduction, this at least ensures some security and flexibility for those people should the reintroduced plan be implemented. Lastly, this is a very unique situation, so if some management practice isn't effective, the 10(j) designation allows for agencies to try other methods. This flexibility is ultimately what will make the plan successful. With all this being said though, Alternative B is still a good option, should Alternative C not work out. Grizzlies lived in the area historically and have major significance to both the ecosystem and the indigenous people of the area. Some grizzlies are better than no grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 12223Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98125
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023 01:30:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Yes bring back grizzly bears 🐻🐻 , people need 2 get fact that Animals were here b4 people . That is there 🏠 not urs

Correspondence ID: 12225Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023 01:44:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Does the experimental nonessential (10J) option for recovery come with estimates or projections as to how many grizzlies will be lost through nonprotected human contact? If so is there concern that commitment to a

reintroduction effort will result in too many lost bears from the total population, or is the population the bears are moved from large enough for the loss to not matter? While obviously the point of an experimental population is its flexibility, if bear deaths do grow too high, is there any threshold of bear deaths at which the reintroduction would be aborted or the population might be re-designated as essential?

If public comfort level rises to sufficient levels over the course of a 10J recovery, is there a plan to shift the population to being protected under the endangered species act, or is that not considered until the 25 bear population goal of the restoration plan has been completed?

Correspondence ID: 12227Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Glacier, WA 98244
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 01:44:55

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This plan sounds like a lot of trammeling on not only the wilderness but the bears themselves. Who wants to live with a GPS collar around their neck? Does that really count as a wild bear? Do they really behave as they would without a collar? What about the trauma of relocation? We know that sort of trauma is lifelong for humans. Due to the small population, I don't think mortalities from this sort of experiment are worth it. It sounds like a desire to experiment with the environment for curiosities sake, with the benefits being near impossible to achieve considering what is required to artificially move the bears and then monitor them. Perhaps they have not moved further into the NCE for reasons we cannot measure. Perhaps they do not want to be found. This sort of tampering with ecosystems seems equal to that which caused the current state of affairs. There are always unintended consequences.

They were extirpated for reasons. Those reasons will be even more pronounced I imagine due to the higher density of the human population, and the expected increase in population.

It seems irresponsible to move individuals from their home to a place whose future habitability due to climate change is unknown.

Ultimately, as an inholder habiting a permanent residence surrounded by USFS on all sides with two small children relatively close to a proposed relocation zone, I favor action plan A.

Thank you for your stewardship of our national treasures, and for your diligent work on this EIS process.

Correspondence ID: 12229Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spokane, WA 99207
United States of America

Outside Organization: Gonzaga University Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 01:50:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: For the section titled "Consultation and Coordination," this plan discusses some very important factors that went into its design and ongoing plans for Grizzly Bear populations in the PNW. This section talks about its efforts to involve members of the community in voicing their values in what's done with grizzlies. This is very important since where grizzlies will live, especially if it's anywhere near human habitats, should involve the consent and knowledge of the community. In the Environmental Impact Statement, it mostly discusses having an open forum for people to come in, to which it appears that ~200 people showed up. I didn't see mention of any other work to report what's going on to the broader public, so if there's not much being done there then I would encourage some more notification so that it's not only people who are deeply invested in grizzlies to know what's going on.

This section also discusses the consultation of many nearby Tribes, which is also incredibly important. However, it mostly just talks about how some Tribes were contacted and few have responded, but not what any of the results of such consultation were.

Both for the work being done with the Tribes and the community members who left comments at the forums, I think making

more evident what their contributions were would be helpful for people to know, primarily so people can know why participating in such forums can be helpful and what kind of a difference they can make.

Correspondence ID: 12232Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Ferndale, WA 98248
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023 02:16:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: There is plenty of room in this stare for bears and humans, give this a project a chance, most conflicts are caused by man, so start fining those that don't follow the rules, don't kill the bear if the man is at fault.

Correspondence ID: 12241Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Airmont, NY 10901
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023 04:06:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do not support the National Park Services preferred Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation.

Wolves were reintroduced in Yellowstone and now they are being slaughtered again. There is a reason that wolves and grizzlies were eliminated from the parks. These reasons still exist so Unfortunately reintroducing them will only result in their death.

Alternative C, with the 10(j) rule, provides managers flexibility to address community concerns while protecting the grizzly population. It ensures coexistence between humans. This is a fallacy - as both the human and bear populations increase, there will be a definite conflict and the bears will be the losers!

Thank you for your dedication to our national parks.

Correspondence ID: 12253Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Carmel, IN 46032
United States of America
Outside Organization: NA Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023 05:57:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am not in favor of reintroducing the grizzly bear to N Cascades NP.
My experience living and working in Great Falls, MT leads me to believe it will endanger livestock and people.
With over 2,000 grizzly bears already in North West USA, why is there a need to expand their habitat territory?
From what I've read, local govt. entities and local citizens most impacted by this decision are not in favor of reintroduction. They should be listened to.
Outside NGO's who won't have to deal with the repercussions of reintroduction should not have influence on the decision. If for political reasons, the will of the local people is ignored and the grizzly is reintroduced to the area, money needs to be budgeted for educating locals and tourists to minimize the chance of encounters resulting in harmful outcomes (to people).
Thank you, [REDACTED]
11-8-23

Correspondence ID: 12259Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Five Corners, WA 98686
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 07:06:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a Washington State resident and longtime visitor to the North Cascades National Park I am fully in favor of the National Park Services preferred Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation.

Fifty to one hundred thousand grizzly bears ranged throughout the America's West in the early 19th century. I believe it is time to finally have a plan such as Alternative C to restore grizzly bears this small, but wild area of the North Cascades National Park in Washington State The plan also prepares people to coexist with these bears. Grizzlies were a thriving and important part of the western ecosystem for thousands of years coexisting with indigineous peoples. With the proper tools and education contemporary populations of people can also do the same. It will benefit the economy while bringing back a missing piece of the historical wildlife in the region.

I hope you consider the positive impact of Alternative C for people, nature, the region's economy and the magnificent grizzlies who belong in a wilderness like the North Cascades National Park!

Thank you!

Correspondence ID: 12260Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 10:19:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not let the fearmongering stop the reintroduction of a native animal to our mountains. For a healthy ecosystem, it is always best to have all the animals - including the apex predators. Please continue to work toward allowing the reintroduction of the grizzly bear to the North Cascades. Keep the Cascades wild! Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 12261Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Cle Elum, WA 98922
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 10:28:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello,

I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live in and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

Furthermore, the 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

The North Cascades Grizzly Bear Recovery Zone (NCGBRZ) is the second largest of six such designated areas at nearly 10,000 square miles. Combined with contiguous protected areas in British Columbia, including Manning Park, there are

14,000 square miles of productive, wild habitats, wilderness, and roadless areas.

People and grizzly bears can coexist and thrive. They do so in British Columbia, Montana, and Wyoming where grizzly populations and back and front country recreation continue to grow hand in hand, providing a vital economic boost to those areas' gateway communities. Grizzly bears lived in Washington for thousands of years. We still have a small population in the NE WA Selkirk Mountains. However, currently, there are no grizzly populations in the United States or Canada that are large enough or close enough to serve as a source to naturally repopulate the North Cascades. Having wiped out the grizzly bear over the past 150 years we now have the unique opportunity and the ethical obligation to restore them to their native home, where suitable habitats still exist.

Grizzly bears are ecologically and culturally significant and are vital to the overall health of the North Cascades ecosystem and its biodiversity. They are considered an indicator of ecosystem health.

Restoring grizzly bears as an "Experimental, non-essential" population under a well-crafted Section 10(j) rule of the Endangered Species Act makes sense. Such a designation will provide flexibility for wildlife managers to prevent and address human-bear conflict and a greater level of comfort for people who are concerned about the impacts of wildlife recovery on economic and recreation activities. Agencies have used the Section 10(j) Rule in the past to restore black-footed ferrets, California condors, wood bison, and many others.

Thank you and I hope to see Washington reintroduce more wildlife that has historically always been here and should still be thriving here. Washington is supposed to be wild, and let's keep it wild.

Correspondence ID: 12262Project:112008Document:132104

Address: North Bend, WA 98045
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 10:29:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not believe grizzly bears should be reintroduced to the North Cascades. It will reduce outdoor recreation opportunities for people who are afraid to be in the wilderness with these large animals. These mountains are one of the few truly wild glaciated areas in the region without grizzlies. It is important to remain inclusive and provide an area for hikers, climbers, and mountaineers to roam without having to worry about these animals. Implementing this proposal will likely reduce the diversity of people that are willing to go to these mountains.

Correspondence ID: 12264Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Everett, WA 98204
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 10:31:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Restore the bears. Ecosystems are critical. Humans have done enough damage already. Greedy humans.

Correspondence ID: 12265Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellevue, WA 98008
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 10:37:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please put plans to ensure the Salmons population does not get impacted by the introduction of grizzlies. If required, please reduce the hunting tags on Elks so that the population is kept in check by grizzlies naturally.

Correspondence ID: 12266Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Peshastin, WA 98847
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023 10:42:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: NO ACTION.

Grizzly bears should not be reintroduced into the NCE.
Danger to property owners, pets, livestock, hikers and
Kokanee spawn in the Stehekin River.

Thank you,
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 12267Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023 10:43:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Bring back the grizzlies!

Correspondence ID: 12268Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98273
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023 10:44:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I live in Skagit county and am always in the north cascades. I am all for reintroducing grizzlies to the north cascades. Should have been done decades ago.

Correspondence ID: 12270Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Darrington, WA 98241
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023 10:53:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am highly involved with recreation in the north cascades, including mountaineering and horse packing. Although it would have a negative impact on my recreation, I think that restoring grizzly bears to the ecosystem is a great idea, especially since climate change is reducing habitat, and we need to do as much as possible to let species and ecosystems have a chance at surviving the anthropogenic era. The north cascades is one of the best spots in the entire US and we shouldn't be thinking selfishly just about ourselves, individualistically, but also the biosphere and each ecosystem as a whole. Without grizzly bears here, it is like the body trying to function without one of its organs.

Correspondence ID: 12271Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Uniontown, WA 99179
United States of America
Outside Organization: [REDACTED] Farms Inc. Business(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,08 2023 10:57:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: While I value a diverse ecosystem, I do not support the reintroduction of another improperly or unmanaged large carnivore to the state of Washington. I realize that bears are technically omnivores, but I am not concerned

with the effects of bears eating plants. I am, however, very concerned that these efficient new predators eating meat will result in a further erosion to the prey base we all share. The leadership, planning and management of wolves is a pretty good indicator of how bears will be handled. This is unacceptable at all levels. The end result will be a declining prey base with more demand. Members of the WA Wildlife Commission are reportedly considering further reductions or the total elimination of predator hunting. This move will allow predator levels to rise to the point the natural prey base is decimated forcing predators to seek new food sources. This results in a huge swing of predators/prey populations, in a push of predators into new sources of prey and likely the future ban on all hunting in WA. If Grizzly Bears repatriate naturally, the ecosystem will adapt. Forced introduction will have the same results the introduction of wolves has had in many areas.

Correspondence ID: 12272Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 10:59:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am an avid outdoors person spending much of my free time recreating in the north cascades. I would like to advocate for not reintroducing grizzly bears too our mountains on the basis of safety for people who recreate in these areas and for apparent lack of need to reintroduce.

Correspondence ID: 12273Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Nampa, ID 83687
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 11:01:48

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is a very bad idea. Who in their right minds would think this isn't a bad idea?? Those bears will not stay in one area, they will be drawn to human settlements, where their is easy food, and trash and domestic animals, livestock and people will be on the menu eventually. The people who come up with these idiotic ideas should have a few bears released near where THEY live. They'd soon change their tune..... STUPID

Correspondence ID: 12275Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 11:07:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I live in Whatcom County and have hiked the North Cascades nearly everyday for the last 6 years. With my particular use case, I don't feel much danger from eventually running into a Grizzly Bear. I hike slowly. I have a dog who will alert me of potential predators. I have a can of bear spray that I take care of; I store it inside when not in use, so the propellant can't escape with extreme temperature and I replace it every year. I think about these encounters, so I know what to do in case they happen. My wife follows a Whatcom County Wildlife Photos group that reminds me how many Cougars are in our forest, which helps keep my guard up. I think I would be fine.

In my hikes these past 6 years, I have passed thousands of other hikers. My guess to the number of them who seemed prepared like me, I could count on two hands. The VAST majority of hikers don't think about these things. They are mothers with their kids who go there to enjoy nature. They are teenagers on their mountain bikes. They are joggers with earbuds in. Unless somebody has bear spray where I can see it, it would not do much good for them; and I have not seen nearly anyone with bear spray. The reality is that the people who use the North Cascades aren't thinking about these things. And whether or not you think they should, they don't.

I watched the movie The Revenant where Leonardo DiCaprio's character suffered a Grizzly Bear attack and I researched to determine whether that was an accurate characterization. My impression is it was. Unlike other predators who kill their prey

quickly, the Grizzly Bear does not. They hold you down with their massive weight and strength. They don't worry about putting you out of your misery, since there is no possible escape and they don't care about your suffering. So they just calmly snack on you while you are suffering immense agony. Do you think a family member wouldn't research this reality if one of their loved ones were killed by a Grizzly Bear?

Grizzly Bears eat meat. You don't know how well the North Cascades will support them. You say that in the past Grizzly Bears thrived here, but things have changed. With climate change, the mountains will likely be drier, forcing the bears closer to people. Salmon runs aren't what they used to be. Deforestation I imagine would have an affect on their food supply.

I am against reintroducing Grizzly Bears into the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 12278Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98107
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 11:24:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Reintroducing grizzlies back into the North Cascades is the best thing I've heard out of modern conservation efforts to date. There are countless studies and surveys that prove the positive ecological impact of having this species in its natural habitat, and anyone who hikes in the area should be practicing bear and animal safety ALREADY! Bringing back the grizzlies does not pose a substantial threat to the population, and should only improve the conditions we already enjoy up north.

Correspondence ID: 12279Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Newark, CA 94560
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 11:25:03

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please bring Grizzlies back to restore the ecosystem

Correspondence ID: 12280Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Edmonds, WA 98020
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 11:26:21

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I believe it's very important to reintroduce the Grizzlies to the N. Cascades. Even though they will be coming down from BC, increased efforts on their behalf is needed.

Correspondence ID: 12281Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Nine Mile Falls, WA 99026
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 11:26:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No to grizzly bear re-introduction in the North Cascades. I cannot fathom anything positive coming from grizzly, bear re-introduction. Only negative consequences. Absolutely, no!

Correspondence ID: 12284Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98199
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 11:35:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Alternative C, as written, appears to be the strongest option as it gives you additional tools to manage the population but doesn't place any additional mandates or restrictions.

My primary question is: While this plan is good for the species (Grizzly Bears), is it good for the rest of North Cascades ecosystem? If it's been 30 years since the last confirmed Grizzly bear, have we started to see problems (such as deer abundance which is one of the reasons for wolf introduction). From the Affected Environment; Mammals section, it reads like you're expecting this reintroduction will put stress on already struggling populations.

Correspondence ID: 12285Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sedro Woolley, WA 98284
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 11:39:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As someone who is very active in the outdoors, along with my family, I believe the reintroduction of grizzlies into the North Cascades is a bad idea. It unnecessarily increases risk for hikers, backpackers, campers, cyclists, horseback riders, and hunters alike who frequently recreate in the North Cascades. Whether it is warranted or not, it significantly increases worry for many who get out into the wilderness of the park, and may lead to many people largely avoiding the park. Decreased numbers of tourists and recreationalists will decrease income in the local economies, which rely on these people coming to visit and use the North Cascades.

In addition to the impact on human visitors, I believe that the environmental impact on the North Cascades ecosystem will be negative as well. The wildlife population in the North Cascades already has to deal with predators such as wolves and cougars, along with the dangers created by forest fires every summer, and does not need one more challenge to survival.

I strongly encourage you to pause and reconsider next steps with this plan and the negative impacts it may have, which I believe outweigh the potential benefits to the grizzly population.

Correspondence ID: 12286Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98133
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 11:51:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm in favor of bringing large brown bears back to the North Cascades. More bears would be good and benefit the ecosystem. Thank you!

Correspondence ID: 12287Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Prosser, WA 99350
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 11:51:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support returning grizzly bears to the North Cascades. I think the bears should be protected over the interests of any industrial purpose (including ranching, livestock, etc). This part of Washington is not a major producer of beef. (in fact Washington ranks very low in overall US beef production, 31st out of 50). Settlers and homesteaders have had

to protect their interests against natural threats since they started using the land, the introduction of grizzly bears would be no different. There should be a ban on hunting the bears until they have established a healthy population. I'm not allowed to shoot hawks or eagles that fly over my property, It should be the same with bears - unless a human life is at risk.

Correspondence ID: 12288Project:112008Document:132104
Address: TACOMA, WA 98418
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023 11:58:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hello,

I am writing in support of the plan to reintroduce grizzlies to the North Cascades under Alternative C.

Grizzly bears have historically been a part of this ecosystem, linked with the area's other species through millennia of co-evolution. The North Cascades are a big and diverse region, with enough space to support grizzlies and black bears, elk and deer, and human visitors as well.

With decades of experience and lessons learned from management of the Yellowstone ecosystem's grizzly population, wildlife management professionals should have the tools and expertise to successfully manage a grizzly population back to healthy levels in the North Cascades.

I trust the scientists at US Fish & Wildlife, the National Park Service, and the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife to find the right balance between wildlife, agriculture and human safety in the North Cascades. This ecosystem will be healthier as a whole with all of its historic residents in place, including grizzly bears.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 12289Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023
Correspondence Type: Park Form
Correspondence: Grizzly should be protected as a endangered species if it would be alright to bring in a few bears where practical. I have seen grizzly and black bears. I have had encounter with black bears none with grizzlys. I believe strongly that endangered species act should apply to grizzly.

Correspondence ID: 12290Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Elma, WA 98541
United States of America
Outside Organization: BCHW Non-Governmental
Received: Nov,08 2023 12:10:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am a horse owner/rider and part of Back Country Horsemen of Washington. I support Alternative A...NO ACTION. The draft seems to lack any substantive effort to address recreation planning and future management of recreation.

Please take in account what this plan will do for horseback riders and hikers.

Thank you,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 12291Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America
Outside Organization: Cascades Wolverine Project Non-Governmental(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,08 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Dear NPS and USFWS staff,

As a resident, mountain guide, and field biologists living in a community bordering the North Cascades Ecosystem, I wish to express my willingness to coexist with grizzly bears and my full support of Alternative C of the draft EIS.

Grizzly bears have been in the North Cascades ecosystem for over 20,000 years, and their current dwindling numbers mean they need our help. We have space here for bears and the capacity to alter our behavior so that coexistence is possible.

Thank you for your consideration,

██████████
██████████, Cascades Wolverine Project
Twisp, Washington

Correspondence ID: 12292Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America
Outside Organization: ██████████ Business(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,08 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: I have lived in the Methow Valley for 20 years, worked as a teacher and a farmer and am raising my family in the Methow Valley, adjacent to some of the wilderness where bears should be reintroduced. I wish to express my willingness to coexist with native wildlife, and that includes grizzly bears. I fully support Alternative C of the draft EIS, to reintroduce grizzly bears with a 10(j) rule.

Grizzly bears have been in this ecosystem for over 20,000 years, and their current dwindling numbers mean they need our help. While there are documented grizzlies to the north in BC, there are currently significant gaps in wildlife corridors that make it difficult for grizzlies to freely move north and south. Because of this geographic isolation, natural recovery is not possible, and unless we supplement the local population, we risk losing these bears in the North Cascades Ecosystem forever.

Science shows that the North Cascades are excellent habitat for grizzly bears: 75-85% of their diets are vegetation-based, and of the 124 plant species that grizzlies have been shown to consume, the North Cascades are home to 100. Spanning nearly 10,000 square miles, the North Cascades Ecosystem is one of the only wild places left in the lower 48 where grizzly bear reintroduction could be viable.

Concerns around how humans can live with grizzlies are valid and important to consider, and states like Montana and Alaska have proven that with straightforward 'Bear Aware' precautions, recreationalists, hunters, and ranchers can coexist with grizzlies, just as we do with other native wildlife. Option C of the DEIS strikes the right balance between the needs of grizzly bears and the needs and values of local communities.

Throughout the 6 year period of public comment, nearly 80% of the comments received have been supportive of grizzly recovery, and these have included many individuals from both sides of the Cascades, those living in communities closest to the proposed area of reintroduction like myself. I wish to make room for bears.

Sincerely,
██████████

██████████
██████████, Twisp

Correspondence ID: 12293Project:112008Document:132104
Address: N/A, UN N/A
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Dear NPS and USFWS staff,

So many issues are close to my heart - the state of an imminent water emergency we'll be facing certainly in the western United States, the loss of most of our Old Growth forests, the loss of much biodiversity and habitat and lack of 'greenways' for those plants and animals that have managed to 'hang on' and somehow manage to find a way to exist (certainly not thrive); the horrific travesty befalling our wild mustangs at the hands of the BLM; the current struggle of wolves trying to reestablish some of their historical territory - as evidenced in the recent gratuitous slaughter of over 200 in Wisconsin; the ever present danger to the cougars and coyotes being killed for sport; the wolverine's loss of needed snow range unpopulated, wild habitat to reproduce and survive being threatened by outdoor enthusiasts as well as climate change; and the Grizzly Bears (to name a few!).

I am not an 'expert' in any of these issues, but am a concerned citizen who both loves the outdoors, and has chosen to live in the Methow Valley where the beauty of the outdoors and nature are abundant and accessible. But even here we face constant pressures from industry expanding land sales and building, extractive practices, increased use by hunters, logging, heliskiing, snowmobiling and the like.

I would love you to help in any/all of the areas you and your team can so that we may start to turn things around and support Mother Nature in doing what only she can do.

I would especially love you to help us to reintroduce the Grizzly back into its historical territory here in the Northwest and that is why I support Alternative C of the draft EIS. As I believe (much like what we witnessed when wolves were reintroduced back into the Yellowstone ecosystem) our ecosystems will more easily be able to find 'balance' when grizzlies are here.

I thank you for your service and your dedication.

██████████

Correspondence ID: 12294Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Carlton, WA 98814
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: I am against introducing grizzlys. They will not stay in park or wilderness. They are spreading in the Dillon Montana area out of the Madison area.
I am also afraid of the bear safe rules that will be put into affect by both the Park and Forest Service.

██████████

Correspondence ID: 12295Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bainbridge Island, WA 98110
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 12:26:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support Option B.

Correspondence ID: 12296Project:112008Document:132104
Address: White Bear Lake, MN 55110
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023 12:26:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please consider the following comments:

North Cascade grizzlies must have the same protection under the Endangered Species Act that all populations have. It is unacceptable for the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service to issue a special rule for "a nonessential experimental population."

The final Restoration Plan should account for the positive effects grizzly bear reintroduction will have on wildlife in the North Cascades, maximizing their beneficial role in improving the ecological diversity necessary for a thriving ecosystem.

The National Park Service should craft the final Restoration Plan to account for the role humans play in minimizing human-grizzly bear interactions. While people are encouraged to enjoy recreational activities in and around the vast, sparsely populated North Cascades, the final Restoration Plan should prohibit hunting and encourage people to use non-lethal means to respond to and to deescalate any human-bear interactions.

The National Park Service should prioritize protections for grizzly bears over livestock grazing. Provisions to accommodate "management" of grizzly bears for the benefit of the livestock industry are not necessary.

Thank you for considering these comments.

Correspondence ID: 12297Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America
Outside Organization: Friends of the North Cascades Grizzly Bear coalition Non-Governmental(Official Rep.)
Received: Oct,30 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Striker,

Grizzly Bears have been significantly and happily part of my long professional life as a smokejumper, ranger, naturalist, mountain guide, avalanche technician, and ski instructor. I'm a proud original member of Friends of the North Cascades Grizzly Bear coalition and resident in Mazama, Washington.

I fully endorse alternative C to reestablish a viable population of Grizzlies here in my back yard, the North Cascades. You can best judge when the time might be right to add bears, but please know that this retired ranger, living close by where Grizzlies have been planned to be augmented, is solidly in favor of this action.

585 Lost River Road, above Mazama is my wife's and my physical address, but our new mailing address was necessitated after our residential mailbox was vandalized and our Jay Inslee sign stolen. Such are the hazards of being a known wildlife advocate after the Trump era. My SKI TRAILS AND WILDLIFE: Toward Snow County Restoration - 2008 book, numerous magazine articles and letters to the editor of our local paper, have tagged me as a target.

Sincerely,

██████████
██████████ Winthrop WA 98862
██████████

Correspondence ID: 12298Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023
Correspondence Type: Other
Correspondence: Dear NPS and USFWS staff,

I am writing to express my full support for the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascade mountains of Washington State and Alternative C of the draft EIS. This wild area of our state historically supported a healthy population of grizzly bears, whose population was decimated by human activity, including over-harvesting and "predator removal" actions.

I have lived in the Methow Valley, in the foothills of the North Cascades, for almost 50 years. I have enjoyed hiking, backpacking, snowshoeing and skiing in these mountains throughout those years, with my family and now with friends or solo. I have also spent a good deal of time hiking and hunting in Alaska and Montana in grizzly habitats.

We who choose to reside on the edge of our country's remote areas, must accept that we are in the home of a myriad of wildlife species, including other predators such as cougar, lynx and wolf. We learn to be bear and cat observant and to easily modify our styles and activities to accommodate these native species. We accept the modicum of danger their presence may impart, as we do the danger of snowstorms and (unfortunately) wildfires, in return for the many benefits.

Others will and have expressed the scientific and biological importance of grizzlies to our wild areas, and I concur in those sentiments. I want to emphasize that as a long time resident and frequent outdoor recreationalist, I support the reintroduction of grizzlies to my "front yard" in the North Cascades.

Thank you!
Sincerely,

Correspondence ID: 12299Project:112008Document:132104
Address: new york, NY 10017
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023 12:34:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please help our grizzlies from extinction---they need our help! Grizzly bears roaming the wildest parts of the North Cascades in Washington State could once again create a thriving, balanced ecosystem. As a keystone species, they spread seeds, aerate the soil, recycle nutrients and keep other wildlife populations in balance.

Correspondence ID: 12300Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023 12:36:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I fully support the reintroduction of Grizzly Bears back to their native habitat the North Cascades. They should receive FULL Endangered Species Protection and not treated like an experiment. They should be reintroduced and left alone as much as possible, and protected from ignorant livestock owners and humans who would harm or kill them. They are a Keystone Species and a missing link to a balanced ecosystem. Please return them to their native home The North Cascades.
Thank you

Correspondence ID: 12301Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Friday Harbor, WA 98250
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023 12:38:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Thank you for soliciting public feedback in the Grizzly reintroduction effort.

I would like to express my support for Alternative A - No Action.

I am an avid hunter, backpacker, and [REDACTED] Tribal member. I enjoy all that nature has to offer. I do enjoy knowing that there are cougars, black bears and wolves in many of the areas that I frequent. The grizzly is a very different animal from a human conflict perspective. I think it was best described to me by an old Alaskan friend who said "1/20 Grizzly want to kill you, for reasons we'll never completely understand". I'm not afraid of cougars, wolves or black bears and the data we see supports that they are virtually zero risk to humans. Grizzly are different. We currently have incidents EVERY SINGLE YEAR with humans and grizzly bears. Usually with maulings that require significant reconstructive surgery in the least or death in the worst. This is with bear spray, handguns and bells. So commonly, in other political venues, we say "if only one life is saved it will have been worth it". I can tell you that by choosing to reintroduce the Grizzly to Western WA, AT LEAST one life will be impacted in a negative way. Is that worth it to your panel? I suspect that a great deal more than at least one will be impacted over time.

The population of Western WA has grown significantly. I have a strong suspicion that the majority of supporters have never spent a night in North Cascades National Park. I have a stronger suspicion that many have not considered the changes that may eventually be required in their backpacking setup to ensure a safe night sleep when visiting the park. Additionally, the bears do not know where the park boundaries are, they will travel down to the suburban areas that have spread rapidly in the last 20 years and are ill equipped to handle Grizzly interactions. There will be livestock depredations, human interactions, and changes to common north cascade visitation norms that I believe will surprise (and not delight) the visiting population.

My last support for Alternative A is to suggest that nothing prevents Grizzlies from migrating naturally across the border from BC today. If the environment was suitable and fertile, they'd already be there. Their lack of natural migration suggests that this is no longer preferred habitat. Maybe we should take a hint from nature, rather than ramming down the throats of a place that has lived without them for so long.

Thanks,
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 12302Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,02 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Dear Mr. Striker:

I am writing in favor of grizzly bear restoration in the North Cascades. As a hiker, hunter and angler I want to share the wilderness with bears, and enjoy a more intact ecosystem.

These magnificent bears were native to the area and were extirpated by hunters. The data show that natural migration of bears from Canada is unlikely to result in sustainable populations. Reintroduction is the only way to recover the species in the North Cascades.

I also believe that humans who use the backcountry need to adapt to the animals, not the reverse. This includes cattlemen who use public land for grazing.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 12303Project:112008Document:132104
Address: N/A, UN N/A
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023
Correspondence Type: Park Form
Correspondence: I am commenting in favor of either alternative B or C. I'd prefer the bears be afforded ESA protection but if rule 10(j) reassures some fearful citizens, I support this compromise.

Correspondence ID: 12304Project:112008Document:132104
Address: North Bend, WA 98045
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023 12:42:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: YES, yes, and yes. Let's make our state truly wild again. Grizzlies have a vital place in the ecosystem of Washington State.

Correspondence ID: 12306Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America
Outside Organization: ██████████ LLC Business(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,08 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Greetings Superintendent Striker,
I live at the end of the road above the Methow Valley in Okanogan County, in a small homestead I began some 22 years ago. I made my home here, founded a small production studio in Twisp and I have traveled widely. Yet, ultimately I'm aware that I came here and have stayed here because of the Bears.

Thus I write so you'll know that I, and many of my friends and neighbors, would prefer to see grizzly bears reintroduced to the North Cascades ecosystem - which is their rightful home.

Indeed this is more than a preference. At least for myself I consider this an expectation if we have any hope of developing a meaningful reconciliation between ourselves and this landscape - which modern people have harmed so thoroughly. The systematic harm done to this landscape is rarely seen more clearly than in our historic and ongoing persecution of grizzly bears.

Back in my 20's my life was transformed from a frail urban youth to an adventurer and outdoor educator who traveled widely throughout the intermountain West in search of bears.

My studies in anthropology and human ecology at the Evergreen State College helped me recognize that ancestral humans world-wide had a long standing relationship and appreciation of bears; being omnivores like ourselves and important animal teachers in the landscape. And yet, in the modern era we have invaded their homes and

challenged their very existence in limiting the vastness of their historic range. Traveling through, visiting with, and even living in landscapes with large wild animals requires people to pay more attention - to themselves, their surroundings, the very nature of living. People must cultivate an awareness that something "bigger" is out there and this informs our humility and humanity. Without such teachers on the land, we are left to our own hubris,

rumination and inflation.

There are many people who are going to write and tell you that grizzlies should be reintroduced to the North Cascades because it is their home; because it is economically savvy for tourism; because it is scientifically sound ecologically; because it is the right thing to do emotionally. I agree with them.

But, I write so you'll hear this too: reintroducing grizzlies to the North Cascades is a critical step as humans must acknowledge what we've done on the landscape as colonists, settlers, and ultimately, invaders. We must take this opportunity to show that we can learn and make reparations, and so that our young and old people alike will have someplace to walk where they're not the most powerful creature out there.

In so many ways we're at a crossroads. We can either continue to harm wildlife and wilderness, or we can change our trajectory and try to put some things right... both ecologically for other species and for ourselves.

I don't envy the agencies as you negotiate these types of challenges with the "stakeholders" or people with such varied interests, expectations and heartfelt opinions. Still, I do encourage you to think of future generations who can either have the opportunity to be humbled and inspired by their experience of large and formidable animals out on the landscape, or, never have such experiences at all.

We wouldn't be the complex capable creatures that we are if our ancestors had not lived with and learned from bears. We deserve the right for these enriching encounters as well, as do our children's children. Without them, it's everywhere just a walk through a pretty field with little to make us more than ourselves.

Thank you for your time and attention and best wishes with your challenging decisions ahead.

Correspondence ID: 12307Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98122
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023 12:55:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I strongly support the re introduction of Grizzly bears to the state of Washington. This is an excellent use of tax payer dollars. Bears improve the environment.

I would caution that views that oppose bear introduction are uninformed or have a special financial interest.

The best thing for Washington State and it's residents is bringing back the grizzly bears.

I would add that I strongly believe bringing back the bears will be good for Washington State and US as a whole.

This is the government working for the people.

Correspondence ID: 12308Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,30 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: I am writing to address several concerns the Back Country Horsemen of Washington (BCHW) have with the proposal to relocate Grizzly Bears to the N.C.E.

The mission of BCHW is specifically concerned with keeping trails and trailhead roads open and accessible. This includes trail maintenance work on Washington State trails.

Proposed alternatives B and C do not provide any protection for recreation. A meaningful impact study of those management options on recreation has not been included in the DEIS. Without better alternatives BCHW will accept only Alternative A: No Action. We would like to see more reasonable options and better planning for the protection of recreational activity in the planned Recovery Area.

An additional concern is the mention of the concept of Wilderness Permits in the backcountry and Pasayten Wilderness to control the number of people in an area for recreational activities. This includes stock users and packers. The DEIS planners also need to realize that both the Pacific Northwest Trail, a National Scenic Trail, and the north end of the Pacific Crest Trail cut across the NCE area.

It seems likely that, if the 10(j) rule is implemented, additional prohibitions and regulations may be established to enable agencies to deal with bears that travel into areas outside of core habitat and cause conflict. BCHW is concerned that the 10(j) rule could be used to restrict, regulate, and/or close access over a longer term if agencies perceive a threat to recovery of Grizzly Bears.

Washington State law RCW.77.12.35 specifically states: "Grizzly Bears shall not be transplanted or introduced into the State". This law has not been changed. This law also affects federal agencies, contrary to their opinion.

In addition, the following comments are my own opinion as a resident of the Methow Valley.

Proponents, in their rush to relocate Grizzly Bears in the NCE, neglect the seriousness of human/bear conflicts. Washington State's population is greater than the combined populations of Idaho, Wyoming and Montana, the states where grizzly bears are currently located in continental U.S. This larger population will lead to a greater likelihood of conflict: destruction of property, maulings and deaths of our citizens. There is a real safety risk to recreational activity and to residents in surrounding areas. It is a frequently repeated fallacy that resident bears exist now in the Pasayten Wilderness and are the most endangered population there.

The theory that habitat will increase in the NCE over the next 50 years due to climate change will be offset by increases in large fires. Fire and destruction of habitat will cause bears to wander to the edges of the NCE increasing the likelihood of human/bear conflict.

Correspondence ID: 12309Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Vancouver, WA 98662
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 13:03:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The plan to transplant these apex predators into the Northern Cascades is unwise and contrary to the North American Wildlife Conservation Model. Grizzlies haven't been hunted in several decades and there are grizzly bears to the north in BC. Why haven't they repopulated on their own with no hunting pressure? Because the habitat will no longer support them. Your proposal not only endangers the animals you seek to "protect", but prioritizes these predators over other wildlife AND human beings in the area. If there were a void, nature would fill it. Stop playing God and return to practicing sound scientific wildlife management. Do not transplant grizzlies into the Northern Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 12310Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Yakima, WA 98908-3420
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 13:04:58

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support Alternative A- No action. Competition with wolves and cougars for already limited and struggling food sources will quickly have these bears expanding their range into areas with too much human conflict.

Correspondence ID: 12311Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sedro Woolley, WA 98284
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 13:06:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am against the reintroduction of Grizzly Bears into the North Cascades of Washington. This area is remote and relatively unaffected by humans, these bears have ample access to this area from the north and have chosen not to inhabit it. I don't see that this is an effective use of tax dollars or funds that could go toward other interests.

Please manage bears, cougars, wolves, and all other species based on science and logic. Not with emotion.

Correspondence ID: 12312Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Vancouver, WA 98660
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 13:10:31

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear National Park Service Staff,

I am alarmed to hear of this plan to reintroduce grizzly bears into Washington. I understand some people have a desire to see grizzlies restored to an area that was once their habitat and that these people insist they will be able to manage these bears. It is unrealistic to think that anyone can completely control these bears and prevent tragedies from occurring. Grizzlies are wild animals and even with tracking devices, it is impossible to fully prevent every possible outcome from occurring between bears and people or livestock. My husband and I recently visited Montana and Wyoming where grizzlies are prevalent. The people there live with a high level of caution and always have to be aware of a potential bear encounter. Everyone carries bear spray or guns. They have to keep their trash cans and food in bear proof containers. The list of items I read to keep locked up was mind blowing to me because the average person would not think bears would be attracted to these things. A few items listed are: sunscreen, toothpaste and baby diapers. The pamphlets warned that these items will attract bears just as food will. Most people would be shocked to know this. This poses major problems for people who have never lived in "bear country." The entire public who lives in or near the Northern Cascades would have to be educated in these safety protocols. This could dramatically impact the way they live their everyday lives and put them on constant high alert, causing extreme amounts of stress and fear for some. Washington is also a state where so many people love to hike... there will be grizzly to human encounters and some of them will be fatal. It is impossible to control these bears... they have a mind of their own and can be unpredictable. Just this year, a woman who was on a hiking path in Yellowstone was mauled to death by a grizzly. In Canada, a couple and their dog were all mauled to death by a grizzly even though they had deployed an entire can of bear spray. If you reintroduce grizzlies into Washington, we will soon hear of these stories happening here... but perhaps happening to your neighbor, friend or family member. It's important to take care of animals, but not at the expense of human life. Please reconsider your decision to reintroduce grizzlies. If people want a bear encounter, they know which states to visit. The potential benefits are not worth the risks when you're dealing with people's lives. Thank you for reading and considering my comment and concerns. Sincerely, Brittney Jackson

Correspondence ID: 12313Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Port Townsend, WA 98368
United States of America

Outside Organization: BCHW Non-Governmental

Received: Nov,08 2023 13:17:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: In regard to the reintroduction of Grizzly bears alternative A is in my opinion the only option. No where in the EIS is there a discussion on how bear reintroduction will affect recreation. I spend at a minimum of three weeks in the mountains where the proposed reintroduction will occur. While I am not worried about a bear encounter I want to make sure that I can still ride my horse in the Cascades. At this point there is no way to know if I will be able to access the area.

Correspondence ID: 12314Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023

Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: No-action alternative A

It is critically important that the public understands that the two action plans of this EIS will result in a contract that federal agencies in WA D.C. will be required to enforce on public lands - whether federal, state, or county, but also on your private properties. Make no mistake in understanding the extent of the Agency's reach. The Park Service, the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service as well as WDFW are all promoting for the occupation of grizzly bears not just onto federal lands, but onto state public lands and into our communities.

Page 60 of the EIS, cites a report from Northern Continental Divide Ecosystem that states "Approximately 90% of the recovery zone is in federal, Tribal, or state ownership, with only 10% on private lands." The report goes on to say, "However, the majority of human-grizzly bear conflicts and bear mortality occur on private lands, especially as grizzly bears expand their ranges" Again, it is documented, "the majority of human-grizzly bear conflicts and bear mortality occur on private lands". So read the contract.

So, what kind of "human-grizzly bear conflicts" are the agencies not willing to disclose either in the EIS, or in your public meetings? I'll read just a small sampling of these conflicts, but first here is the National Park Service Management Policy language concerning their conduct and decision making -

National Park Service written policy states, "The safety and health of employees, contractors, volunteers, and the public are core Service values. In making decisions on matters concerning employee safety and health, NPS managers must exercise good judgment and discretion and, above all, keep in mind that the safeguarding of human life must not be compromised." Their policy goes on to say "The species does not, based on an effective management plan, pose a serious threat to the safety of people in parks, park resources, or persons or property within or outside park boundaries."

So here is a small sampling on conflicts, most of which have occurred in a 4-month period this year 2023 -

- WOMAN was camping IN CITY LIMITS, ripped from her tent, killed by a grizzly bear.
- Grizzly bear and cub euthanized after months of breaking into homes.
- Navy veteran had jaw torn off in horrifying grizzly attack (he was ambushed).
- Grizzly killed hiker, then it broke into a home.
- Grizzly charges fishermen in Montana before being killed.
- Grizzly bear mauls Montana hunter.
- Woman found dead in Montana following grizzly bear encounter.
- Grizzly attack on 2 boys
- 14 grizzlies euthanized, double the 10-year average, (that was in a single year, 2019)

And if you believe that bear spray will save you, know this - empty bear spray canisters have been found next to the dead bodies of those killed by grizzlies. Grizzly proponents will say the remedy is public education. Yet attacks resulting in death or injury also occur against individuals expertly trained in how to protect themselves against grizzlies.

So what are the consequences of these deaths & injuries, cleverly referred to by the government as simply "conflicts"? According to either of the "Action Plans" when human/grizzly conflicts occur in the Park or in our communities, history has shown that very little occurs other than renewed efforts by the Agencies to "educate the public" on the dangers of grizzlies. There is no "pause button" or intervention in either Action Plan. When a grizzly is found to have "substantially injured a human" or killed a hiker, a biker, a camper, or, become food conditioned, killed cattle, or starved to death, both action plans call for Immediate replacement of the offending grizzlies, on a one-for-one basis. But that loss of a human or livestock has to happen first, then a replacement grizzly is inserted right back into the recovery zone. In feet, County Commissioners from both Chelan and Okanogan asked the same question that I just posed - What happens when the Agency's system is shown to be broken and public safety is taking a back seat to continued grizzly attacks? The federal government declined to answer the

question from either of the Commissioners, because there is no Exit Plan. In fact, there are no caps or limits in either duration or the number of incidences of attacks or conflicts that would occur, either in our communities or in the Park. There is no offramp, no threshold point in this contract that would dictate a pause, an intervention, or reconsideration of continued insertions of grizzlies into the foothills bordering our communities. Once this starts, it does not end regardless of the threat to public safety. So read the contract.

If you think there is due process for affected states to request relief through an appeal that would delist the grizzly, and that process is honored by the federal agencies, you are mistaken. Three recent cases make this point - Montana, Wyoming, and Idaho have all filed formal petitions over the last 2 years for delisting the grizzly. And despite viable populations of grizzlies in all three of these states, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has ignored these requests, and they remain ignored today.

Even the previous Director of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services stated before Congress that the grizzly is biologically recovered. He said this based on the thousands of grizzlies in Montana, Wyoming, Idaho, and Canada. In fact there are so many grizzlies inside and outside recovery zones that the government is killing them due to the government's overreaching management policies.

Finally let me say "Intentional omission of relevant information in any Environmental Impact Statement is the same as lying to the public. As a result of their failed grizzly management programs the leadership within the federal government and state agencies understands full well the tragic human sacrifices are ongoing in communities located near other recovery zones. If these agencies prevail with these reckless grizzly management plans inside WA state, they would have done so by lying to the public and cheating the system.

Correspondence ID: 12315Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Fairbanks, AK 99712
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 13:17:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: It is about time to restore the Grizzlies to NC!

Correspondence ID: 12316Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, UN N/A
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023

Correspondence Type: Park Form

Correspondence: I have had an opportunity to read both documents. I find the opportunity to re-introduce a major/top predator to eth ecosystem to be valuable to both the plants + animals of the ecosystem. The NCE has adequate space and food resources for the introduced bears now and apparently, in the future despite climate change. Recreationalists, and people using public lands for grazing livestock will need to exercise additional precautions which will enhance the experience.

People in Montana, Wyoming, and Alaska have all learned to exercise the additional awareness which comes with living with large carnivores. The 10(j) rule may be useful and I support its inclusion if wildlife biologists recommend it.

I comprehend the risks of large carnivores in the ecosystem and I judge the benefits to the ecosystem outweigh the risk to possible prey, be they human on livestock. We have wolves on the landscape presently and have learned albeit with difficulty, to exercise caution and awareness when in shared territory.

I spend much time in the NCE observing the natural world and I am willing to exercise necessary precautions to co-exist.

Correspondence ID: 12317Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Pasco, WA 99301
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023 13:21:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The following comments are my own but also represents the opinion of the 285 members of the Richland Rodd and Gun Club.

If the North Cascades were a good grizzly bear habitat, the bears would already be there from Canada, Idaho, or western Montana. There is a serious overpopulation of grizzly bears in north central Montana, so a potential solution for the USDFW is to move a portion of that overpopulation to the state of Washington. That way they can claim they responded to two groups and solved two problems with no loss of total grizzly bear numbers. However, they fail to take into account that they are creating a new problem in Washington and really doing nothing to solve the problem with too many bears in north central Montana.

The North Cascades is slowly being populated with wolves as they move from north eastern Washington. They have destroyed the deer and elk populations in north eastern Washington, northern Idaho and parts of Montana and Wyoming. The addition of grizzly bears as another predator spells disaster for the wildlife and ranchers in the area as well as all residents who have domestic animals.

It appears to me that there are too many urban people who think wild animals are no different than domesticated animals and its okay to have them everywhere so they can go see and admire them. I use the problems with people in Yellowstone Park who have gotten to close to wild animals and have suffered serious injuries. They are not cognizant of the perils of interacting with wild animals.

Please be responsible and stop introducing grizzly bears into the North Cascades before it becomes a disaster.

Correspondence ID: 12318Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023 13:22:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I strongly support the reintroduction of grizzly bears into the North Cascades Ecosystem. We all know the myriad reasons. I support Alternative C. Please let's make this happen! Eliot Scull

Correspondence ID: 12320Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Granite Falls, WA 98252
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023 13:25:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hello,

I support the Grizzly Bear Restoration plan. I believe the bears are a natural part of the health of the ecosystem of the North Cascades and should be reintroduced for the long term good of everyone. People who want to live and recreate in and near mountain and forestland will be able to exist with bears side by side. If we keep the forest healthy the bears will have plenty of habitat to sustain them. It is natural that both bears and people have a good fear of one another to head off any encounters. It is not ethical or reasonable to exterminate all of the creatures people "fear" or find a nuisance just to satisfy a hiker or livestock owner. We all must coexist to survive on this planet over the long term. The goal should be to live in agreement with nature, not dominate it foolishly and to our own detriment.

Thank you,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 12321Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98107
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 13:26:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing in support of the restoration of a health population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem. As stated in the scoping newsletter, the low population size combined with low reproductive rate of NCE grizzly bears suggest that this population will be unlikely to recover without active restoration. I feel we have an imperative to ensure that this iconic species remains a part of the biodiversity of the North Cascades Ecosystem. As a large member of the carnivore family, grizzly bears play a key role in the functioning of these montane ecosystems. Personally, when I recreate in mountain ecosystems that grizzly bears still inhabit, I feel more aware of my surroundings and thus more connected with nature.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. I feel that Alternative C is the best choice for bears and for people who live in and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering with few problems and with the involvement of local communities. My sense is that the process as a whole might have better chance of being accepted by all stakeholders if the population were considered an experimental population. In addition, with possible grizzly bear recovery actions in the Canadian portion of the NCE coming soon, now is the time for the US to provide ourselves this flexibility in management as we recover this important species.

I have been involved in various efforts to foster coexistence between people and wildlife and have observed public values shifting towards a mutualist perspective on sharing our landscapes with wildlife. I believe (and hope) that with appropriate, proactive community outreach and education about the recovery effort and coexistence, there would be minimal chance for either recreationists or property/business owners/managers to find themselves in direct conflict with NCE grizzly bears. I know that I'm not alone in support this effort to restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture and natural heritage. There is broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among residents of the North Cascades area.

Thank you for taking the time for this meaningful process!

Correspondence ID: 12322Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Washington, DC 20013
United States of America

Outside Organization: The Coalition to Protect America's National Parks Non-Governmental(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,08 2023 13:28:21

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: November 8, 2023

Don Striker
Superintendent
North Cascades National Park Service Complex
810 State Route 20
Sedro Woolley, WA 98284

Subject: Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Bison Management Plan

Dear Superintendent Striker:

I write on behalf of more than 2,500 members of the Coalition to Protect America's National Parks (Coalition), who collectively represent some 45,000 years of national park management experience. The Coalition studies, educates, speaks, and acts for the preservation of America's National Park System. Among our members are former NPS directors, regional directors, superintendents, resource specialists, park rangers, maintenance and administrative staff, and a full array of other

former employees, volunteers, and supporters.

Our members and supporters appreciate the long history of grizzly bears in the Pacific Northwest and controversies over whether and how to return that species, listed as threatened under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), after its being functionally extirpated for decades. Many of our members have had previous experience in North Cascades, as well other parks where grizzly bears remain, such as Glacier, Grand Teton and, like you, Yellowstone National Parks. We are familiar with the considerable challenges associated with living in bear country and with the perpetual commitment that is needed to manage the animals and humans for the safety of both.

Yet we respect that National Park Service Management Policies outline the affirmative responsibility "to strive to recover all species native to national park system units that are listed under the Endangered Species Act...and both proactively conserve listed species and prevent detrimental effects on these species." The North Cascades Ecosystem grizzly bear recovery area, as noted in the draft plan, has sufficient habitat to support a viable reproducing population, although it has lacked verified sightings of the species for thirty years or more.

We support the plan's preferred alternative C, which would reintroduce a small number of grizzly bears over five to ten years under Section 10(j) of the ESA, which permits flexibility for managing a 'non-essential, experimental population' to address conflicts such as may occur over livestock grazing, timber harvest, and mining operations. The inclusion of maps showing where those activities occur near the proposed restoration area are especially helpful. Alternatives B and C both take care to address concerns for wilderness values, nesting birds, and other species that could be affected by aircraft noise or other disturbance needed to accomplish restoration and associated monitoring. The ongoing commitment to no net loss of grizzly bear habitat and steps already taken to enhance campers' safety, such as the placement of bear-resistant food storage boxes, will help ensure low levels of human-bear conflicts. Importantly, alternative C would permit proactive relocations of bears to prevent conflicts or habituation of the animals to human presence and activities and to address livestock depredations. Experience in other grizzly bear-occupied ecosystems demonstrates that this option can be vital in securing tolerance, if not support, for bear recovery in balance with maintaining other public and private values. We also appreciate that, after certain conditions are met, the plan calls for adaptive management, and that robust discussions with cooperators, park neighbors, the State of Washington, and Tribes have occurred and will continue.

We offer a few comments for you to consider in a final plan. Future success of the program may require consistent food storage orders across North Cascades National Park and the adjacent national forests; we encourage adaptive determination of dates for which such orders apply, even though a June 1-November 15 time period may be sufficient under current conditions. Based on experience on other parks, some of our members, suggest that the cost estimates for implementation listed in Table C-1 are conservative, especially with regard to annual costs for sanitation. The cost of bear-resistant food storage boxes, trash cans, and dumpsters have risen considerably in recent years, and it is unclear whether costs for shipping and installation are included. Also, even though costs are anticipated to be 'project-based,' such equipment requires cyclic maintenance and repair, which should be included, as should funds needed to ensure that concession and administrative facilities are bear-resistant through such means as fencing off trash or recycling areas and sewage lagoons, if they exist.

In several places, the plan references the 1986 Interagency Grizzly Bear Guidelines, which have provided a tested framework for managers in other grizzly bear-occupied ecosystems to determine management actions for nuisance bears and bear-human conflicts. We support the use of the Guidelines, but we suggest that managers and the public would benefit from clarity on how your proposed 'Management Zones 1-3,' defined on page 36, would relate to their application. The proposed Management Zones are clearly of larger scale, although there is some similarity in the definition of Management Zone 1 and the IGBC Guidelines' Management Situation 1, as both refer to areas where bear recovery is of primary concern. Since management options outlined in the Guidelines often depend on where a conflict or nuisance bear occurs in 'Management Situations 1-5,' we infer that areas within each Management Zone would be further divided into Management Situations (such as park developed areas, which would likely fall into Situation 3). If the proponents have had or anticipate discussions with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as to specifically how the Guidelines would apply to different locations within the North Cascades Recovery Area, we believe sharing this in the plan would reduce confusion over potential control actions that could occur within North Cascades National Park and surrounding lands.

The cited information on grizzly bear diets (page 73 of the plan) may minimize the potential influence recovered bears could have on non-vegetative food sources; while the animals are indeed omnivores, the higher energy content gained from bears

eating ungulates and fish is noted in more current publications such as Gunther, et al.'s Dietary Breadth of Grizzly Bears in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem (Ursus 25(1),2014,pp 61-73) and Fortin, et al.'s Dietary adjustability of grizzly bears and American black bears in Yellowstone NP. (Journal of Wildlife Management 77(2), 2013. pp170-181). We question whether it is your and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's intent to abide by item number 5 on page D-5 of the Appendix, taken from the 1986 Interagency Grizzly Bear Guidelines, specifying that, in the case of a grizzly bear death, mortality reports and all bear carcasses would be sent to the Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks lab in Bozeman, Montana, for examination and subsequent disposition, as opposed an appropriate facility in Washington.

Overall, we compliment you and your partners for completing a thoughtful analysis of a contentious issue. We know that grizzly bear restoration, should it occur, will continue to require considerable time and attention by the park as well as Tribes, individuals, and other state and federal agencies. Nevertheless, it is exciting to consider the potential for the return of this long-missing species to the park and surrounding ecosystem. With continued attention to public awareness, we believe that your preferred alternative action can contribute to the recovery of a threatened mammal, add to integrity of the North Cascades' natural and cultural resources, and provide enhanced visitor appreciation with minimal added risk to human safety and other values and interests of people in the area.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide comments on this plan.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Coalition to Protect America's National Parks

Email: Editor@protectnps.org

Mail: 2 Massachusetts Ave NE, Unit 77436, Washington, DC 20013

Web: www.protectnps.org

Phone: (202) 819-8622

Correspondence ID: 12323Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023

Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: My name is [REDACTED] and I live in Twisp. I live on a farm bordering public land where we raise livestock, I'm an avid hiker and backpacker, and I support alternative C, active grizzly bear reintroduction alongside a 10(j) designation.

Grizzly bears were an integral part of our ecosystem here for thousands of years until we humans hunted and trapped them to local extinction. The North Cascades is ideal grizzly bear habitat. We are fortunate to live so close to these amazing wilderness areas that comprise nearly 10,000 square miles of public lands, we have the space for bears.

While grizzlies are incredibly powerful animals, there has also been so much misinformation spread about this keystone species. Reintroduction is something to take seriously, but it is also totally doable. I have family in Western MT and have seen firsthand how rural communities there very similar to ours socially, economically and culturally are already living, recreating and thriving alongside grizzly bears, and we can too. Preventative coexistence tools like electric fencing, carcass composting programs, and bear-proof garbage containers have been proven to work.

This time around, we also have an incredible tool in the 10(j) designation. This will allow our local communities to have more management flexibility should any conflicts with bears arise, giving us more agency in the process.

Here in WA and around the globe we are facing a biodiversity crisis of immense proportion. Grizzly bears are an endangered

species that deserve to be here in the North Cascades, and we as a community have a chance to bring them back, making our ecosystem more resilient for future generations by doing so.

Correspondence ID: 12325Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 13:33:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live in and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

Furthermore, the 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Thank you for taking the time to keep our North Cascades wild!

Correspondence ID: 12326Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellevue, WA 98005
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 13:34:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am AGAINST introduction of grizzlies in the North Cascades, and Washington in general. People live and recreate in these areas and introducing Grizzlies will lead to human/bear conflict, not to mention the damage they'll do to already struggling prey species. NO TO GRIZZLIES IN WASHINGTON.

Correspondence ID: 12328Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, UN N/A
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023

Correspondence Type: Park Form

Correspondence: Throughout the history of the earth there has never been reintroduction or conservation of species. There are millions of species that have gone extinct. The fact that trying to continue the grizzly is actually going against nature's role extinction and evolution or creation of changing species on our planet is the normal. The grizzly will be the only one that pays the price.

Correspondence ID: 12329Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023 13:36:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I live in Bellingham a stone's throw from the North Cascades and I would be absolutely delighted to see grizzly bears reintroduced to this ecosystem -- I was actually surprised and appalled to learn that they weren't currently already part of it.

Correspondence ID: 12330Project:112008Document:132104
Address: N/A, UN N/A
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023
Correspondence Type: Park Form
Correspondence: I am adamantly opposed to reintroducing grizzly bears into the St. of Wash. (N. Cascades et al). My reasons; (1) people will die (2) people will be maimed.

Safety is always first. It is inevitable that interactions between people + bears will result in death + injuries.

That said, if you superintendent, and the employees pushing this matter are willing to step up + hold yourself personally liable, both criminally + civilly, I would be willing to entertain a revision of my opinion.

What I'm succinctly saying is that above all else government has a duty to not willfully put its citizens in danger. It is very foreseeable that establishing a grizzly bear population will lead to deaths + injuries. It is only a matter of when, and how many, not if.

Correspondence ID: 12331Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023 13:43:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live in and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

Furthermore, the 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Thank you for taking the time to keep our North Cascades wild!

Correspondence ID: 12332Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, UN N/A
United States of America
Outside Organization: Okanogan County Republican Party Civic Groups(Official Rep.)
Received: Oct,26 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Resolution in favor of the "No Action" option for Grizzly Bear Restoration in the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE)

WHEREAS the National Park Service and U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service have requested public input on a draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) evaluating options for restoring grizzly bears to the NCE;

WHEREAS the EIS had been terminated by the previous administration's Secretary of the Interior David Bernhart and no justification was provided to reinstate the EIS process;

WHEREAS the EIS fails to document mitigation costs for citizens within and adjacent to the NCE (loss of range, expensive fencing, depredation of domestic animals and livestock, etc.);

WHEREAS the EIS fails to establish liability or set reparations for damages caused by the grizzly bears to individuals or businesses;

WHEREAS the EIS has exceeded its scope, which is confined to the NCE, but now includes two new areas, Zone 2 and Zone 3, which impact more stakeholders than those associated with the NCE;

WHEREAS the law requires public lands to be managed for multiple use and the 10(j) rule as proposed seems to rely heavily on closures of roads and access;

WHEREAS the Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife is already prohibited from introducing grizzly bears from out of the area; and

WHEREAS the restoration project is a misuse of the Endangered Species Act because the grizzly bear (*Ursus arctos*) is not endangered or threatened as a species, due to existing healthy populations in significant parts of its traditional range; therefore be it

RESOLVED that the Okanogan County Republican Party endorses and recommends the "no action" alternative in the EIS; and be it further

RESOLVED that this resolution be transmitted as a comment to the EIS, presented at the public input meeting to be held in Okanogan, sent to Representative Newhouse and Senators Murray and Cantwell, and submitted to the local newspapers.

Adoption attested by [REDACTED] Chairperson
10.26.2023

Correspondence ID: 12333Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Hoquiam, WA 98550
United States of America
Outside Organization: Grays Harbor Back Country Horseman of Washington Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023 13:47:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do not agree with introducing Grizzly Bears restoration plan/Environmental Impact Statement, North Cascade Ecosystem. I believe mother nature should be allowed to take its on course The Grizzly disappeared on their own, they will come back on their own. The Grizzly ate already being seen in the northern most part of the state of Washington. We need to leave the Grizzly alone and let Nature take its course.

Correspondence ID: 12334Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Hoquiam, WA 98550
United States of America

Outside Organization: BCHA Non-Governmental

Received: Nov,08 2023 13:50:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think in this case it will be better served to let nature take care of this. The grizzly was there in the past and believe they will reintroduce themselves a little at a time, They are already being seen in the most Northern parts of the State. Reintroduce if the Grizzlies will have safety concerns for Recreational users. Mostly for Hikers and Equestrian users.

Correspondence ID: 12335Project:112008Document:132104

Address: SEATTLE, WA 98117
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 13:55:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly support the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades! Offering more tools for management and pathways for learning what works for different communities and then reinforcing those successful methods is a good approach.

Correspondence ID: 12336Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Renton, WA 98057
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 13:55:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello

I would like to voice that I have personally seen grizzly in the pasayten wilderness, I am a avail animal watcher and these are not black bears. I also have a friend who spent 100 days in the pasayten and can attest to also seeing the grizzly. Also with a huge outdoor recreation population I think human grizzly conflict will be very dangerous. So many guest will be backpackers, and hikers who have not dealt with grizzlies in there lifetime I think it's a recipe for disaster and knowing there would be grizzly in the north cascades would make me much more fearful to visit this place I love.

Correspondence ID: 12337Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, UN N/A
United States of America

Outside Organization: OC Ranches LLC Business(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,08 2023

Correspondence Type: Park Form

Correspondence: Provide an independent study of the food resources for the Grizzlies. Not a WDFW study. We need an unbiased study done on if we have the Food source for these APEX predators.

Correspondence ID: 12338Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Omak, WA 98841
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023

Correspondence Type: Park Form

Correspondence: I do not support the introduction of grizzly bears in the State of Washington! We don't need any more predators or dangerous animals.

Correspondence ID: 12339Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Oroville, WA 98844
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023
Correspondence Type: Park Form
Correspondence: No Action!!!

How many times do we have to tell you?
No is NO - not bring it up every couple of years.

Grizzlies are present NOW and will multiply as the habitat can feed + shelter them. No artificial grizzly numbers need to be promoted. Let mother take care of it!!!

How many paid gov employees are here at this meeting?? My trip is 100 miles round trip and that gas money comes out of my pocket!!! So basically as gov. employees I'm paying YOU to hold + attend this meeting so you can tell me what YOU want to do!! Sucks being me.

So NO!!! Hell NO!!! Over my dead body, No!!

Grizzlies added artificially to this area will end up interacting with locals - you know like the Colvill grizzly in the chicken coup who came for a snack.

Correspondence ID: 12340Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Castle rock, WA 98611
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023 14:09:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Who will be liable when human life is lost due to the introduction of these bears....this is a terrible idea and one that will cost people dearly.. your ruining a way of life for a "feel good" for those who will never experience the. Consequences of these actions

Correspondence ID: 12341Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Wilbur, WA 99185
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023 14:10:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support re introduction of grizzlies into their former range of Seattle and their suburbs. If it turns out we can co exist in these areas then maybe we can throw in some of their canine friends from the wolf family as well. After all you decided to live where these great creatures once roamed. If your not willing to live with them in these areas the we sure is heck shouldn't be putting them in areas like the north cascades.

Correspondence ID: 12343Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Okanogan, WA 98840
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023
Correspondence Type: Park Form
Correspondence: Please do not bring the grizzly bears into the Pasayten Wilderness area. They might come in on their own + that's fine. But do not artificially increase their numbers.

We do NOT need to contend with an APEX predator - there are enough problems raising cattle, horses, goats, etc. that cost is plenty in vet bills etc. How are the costs of livestock losses calculated fairly + how long does it take to get paid if a grizzly kills my cattle?

DO NOT BRING IN THE GRIZZLIES
NO ACTION!!!

Correspondence ID: 12344Project:112008Document:132104
Address: N/A, UN N/A
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023
Correspondence Type: Other
Correspondence: Please choose alternative A

There is not enough prey animals for food sources to support another apex predator.

The population that explores the woods today in Washington would be extremely unsafe with grizzly bears trying to share the woods

Correspondence ID: 12345Project:112008Document:132104
Address: N/A, UN N/A
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023
Correspondence Type: Park Form
Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of grizzly bears.

The proposed area + number of bears to be introduced is more than able to support bears.

It is important that the 10j rule prevent citizens from indiscriminately killing bears. Only a government agent should be charged with the extermination of a bear.

Correspondence ID: 12346Project:112008Document:132104
Address: N/A, UN N/A
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023
Correspondence Type: Park Form

Correspondence: I'm writing to encourage Alternative A. we do NOT need grizzlies! There are no benefits to any people. 15 years ago Canadians lost 18 people in 1 year in Banff and Jasper Nat. Parks. They will endanger hikers and hunters and campers. They will also kill game animals and livestock. There is a reason they were killed off years ago and our ecosystem has been fine.

I have been frequenting Darrington and the N. Cascades for 60 years and the game population has gone WAY down. Another predator is not needed. A friend who is a guide in Wyoming has grizzly problems every year. As soon as one of his hunters shoots an animal, the grizzly comes to take the kill and they must flee.

Correspondence ID: 12347Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Kennewick, WA 99338
United States of America
Outside Organization: WA Resident Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 14:25:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: 1) Describe what actions will be taken to ensure relocated grizzly bears remain in their respective management zone(s)?

2) Describe what non-lethal methods should be used by citizens (hikers, visitors, etc.)?

Correspondence ID: 12348Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, UN N/A
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023

Correspondence Type: Park Form

Correspondence: I do not support the reintroduction of grizzly bears. There are G.B.'s already in the mountains and we don't need more. Leave nature happen. We have a major wolf problem and don't need a G.B. problem also.

The last time you all tried this it was a major NO!!! So why ask again?

Correspondence ID: 12349Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, UN N/A
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023

Correspondence Type: Park Form

Correspondence: We have a choice for our nation on what we will allow to exist and what will be here for future generations.

In order to allow those future citizens the experience of the wild and its creatures we should do what we can to promote all of the species and conditions and the NCE is one of the few places that grizzly bears can have a chance of permanent + stable population to bolster the species.

We should move the ball towards preservation.

Correspondence ID: 12350Project:112008Document:132104

Address: North Bend, OR 97459
United States of America

Outside Organization: Community Psychology Research Business(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,08 2023 14:30:10

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please remember your responsibility to wild creatures who cannot speak for themselves. These bears are a vital part of the ecosystem as predators and their wellbeing affects the wellbeing of the entire ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 12351Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Elma, WA 98541
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 14:30:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As someone that travels frequently to ride in the Cascade mountains, I already have severe concerns of safety for me and my horse. I have a deep respect for wildlife. Washington state already has a problem with black bear and cougar frequenting neighborhoods. Reintroducing grizzlies will create even more dangerous encounters. Please, do not release grizzlies into Washington state. Please allow the black bear population to not have to compete for food sources. Otherwise, they could become more dangerous themselves.

Correspondence ID: 12352Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Arlington, WA 98223
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: To members of the public comments committee:

ABSTRACT

Existing populations of grizzlies in British Columbia, Idaho and Montana will eventually fill an existing void in the north cascades ecosystem without human intervention.

An EIS could be in order to consider use of beavers to help reduce the impact of global warming as the long term outlook for Homo sapiens begins to place it in line as a threatened species..

INTRODUCTION/DISCUSSION

Theodore Roosevelt witnessed the demise of the passenger pigeon. Insightful people like TR saw the imminent demise of animals like wolves and buffalo. Later on Rachel Carson raised the alarm about rampant use of DDT. John Craighead began serious studies of grizzly bears.. We have people like them to thank for stable, manageable, populations of those and other species as well as an awareness of their importance to the environment. Grizzly bears were once a part of the north cascades ecosystem. They should return and fill that void through natural integration from expansion of nearby populations instead of by capture and release. The north cascades ecosystem/environment has changed dramatically since the last grizzly in Washington State was shot in the nineteen sixties. Roads are everywhere, numbers of hikers/campers has increased exponentially. Most of all, Homo sapiens has a terrible reputation when it comes to injuries as a result of interacting with wild animals. Interaction never ends well for grizzlies. Without help from governmental agencies the return of grizzlies would incur no liability, hence no grounds for litigation arising from attacks whether provoked or not.

Meanwhile north cascades, glaciers that stored and slowly furnished a steady supply of water are disappearing rapidly as a result of global warming. There does not appear to be a "quick fix" to that dilemma. Fostering increased numbers of beavers would contribute to slowing runoff from spring rain and summer snow melt. Beaver dams and the resulting ponds behind them create biodiversity that would ultimately contribute to enhanced grizzly habitat. Presently researchers have expressed divergent views with respect to beavers effect on salmon habitat due to stream siltation. Interestingly recent articles supporting grizzly relocation contain reference to Hudsons Bay Company records of grizzly hides taken in the north cascades.. Those same records also contain accounts of brigades sent out to trap as many beavers as possible. In addition to the financial incentives a less well known, but stated, goal was to turn the northwest into a "beaver desert".. Conventional wisdom of the day was the belief that total absence of beavers would make American immigration to the northwest unattractive. One thing is certain, in the early history of the northwest, beavers and salmon and grizzlies coexisted as abundant members of the exosystem.

Sincerely,

Correspondence ID: 12353Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Chelan, WA 98816
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023 14:35:19
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears are not wanted in the northern Cascade Mountains. For the sake of all recreational users of our public lands do not move to reintroduce them.

The state wildlife agencies already struggle to manage the other predators (wolves, mountain lions) due to not having effective management tools available to them, adding another apex predator would only further the challenges.

Due to loss of habitat, climate changes and diseases the wildlife herds in Washington state are already suffering, adding another challenge to the mix isn't a good idea.

Other western states have sustainable grizzly population with significantly less people than what Washington state currently has and history has proven that it has been a challenge to keep the residents of those states safe when they recreate on public lands. The loss of even one person's life is not worth any potential benefits to reintroducing grizzly bears back into the ecosystem.

Although certain ideological thinking residents of Washington state, in areas of the state that will not be impacted by a decision to reintroduce grizzlies back into the state favor doing so, the majority of local residents who will live with the impacts of this decision every day oppose it. The personal safety of those local residents should be a top priority. The ability of those local residents to earn a living that is resource-based should be a top priority. How those local residents choose to enjoy the recreational activities in the impacted areas on their public lands should be a top priority. Strongly against reintroduction of grizzly bears into Washington state.

Correspondence ID: 12354Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98125
United States of America
Outside Organization: National Parks Conservation Association Non-Governmental
Received: Nov,08 2023
Correspondence Type: Other
Correspondence: I support the efforts of National Park Service and the US Fish and Wildlife Service to restore grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem. I want to protect this natural legacy for future generations.

Please keep me informed about plans to recover this important species. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 12355Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Chelan, WA 98816
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023 14:41:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a resident of the areas that will be impacted by a decision to reintroduce grizzly bears, I strongly oppose doing it.
I do not think that it is needed, nor is it a good idea.
I do not trust that the state wildlife agencies will be allowed to protect me or my children and I know for sure that Washington state politicians will value political motivations over my safety or that of my children.
I and my family are strongly opposed to reintroducing grizzly bears into Washington state.

Correspondence ID: 12358Project:112008Document:132104
Address: N/A, UN N/A
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023
Correspondence Type: Park Form
Correspondence: Grizzly bears are aggressive to humans
In oct 2022 two wrestlers were mauled by a grizzly near Cody, WY (I lived in Cody)
In June 2023 a man was killed in his campsite
As well just today in Montana a woman filmed a grizzly tearing down her shed. Then fell asleep right next to it. His weight was estimated at 800 lbs.
Aggressive - YES it will be very aggressive to defend its personal space, cubs and food source. If you scream or make sudden movement it may trigger an attack, never make bear sounds or high pitch squeal a grizzly may think it's the sound of prey and attack. If a grizzly sees you as a threat it will attack and will not stop until the threat is gone. A human will not be on the winning side. If you think you can outrun or swim a grizzly can run 38 miles an hour + that's at a sprint, unless you are in a car. You will not win. Don't try to outswim a grizzly he can swim 6 miles an hour. The fastest human swims 3 miles an hour even with this facts 6% of americans believe they can beat a grizzly Facts: a grizzly can stand tall @ 8ft. weigh up to 1700

lbs powerful bite to 1000 PSI and has larger claws 5' or more than a polar bear. A grizzly can split your body in half in seconds. They go after the neck and back of head. Then eat you from the chest down
In north America there are 60,000 wild grizzly 30,000 in Alaska 29,000 live in Canada. That leave 1,000 for the rest of the US - grizzly are not in Washington state. We need to keep it that way. We pride ourselves as Evergreen for hikers + campers. Grizzly do not belong here. NO to grizzlys.

Correspondence ID: 12359Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bird Island, MN 55310
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 14:53:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in support of restoring grizzly bears to the North Cascade ecosystem. I support giving these bears endangered species act protections. It is vital to build multiple populations of these majestic creatures. Humans were responsible for the population becoming locally extinct in the first place. It is our responsibility to restore the population now.

Correspondence ID: 12361Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tacoma, WA 98407
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 15:10:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Our primary home is in Tacoma, Washington. We also have a residence in Mazama, Washington and recently attended a public comment meeting in Winthrop on November 3, 2023. First, I would like to recognize the Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/Environmental Impact Statement Document. It's very comprehensive and appears to be very well researched. Likewise, the Winthrop public meeting was extremely well organized and conducted with respect for all participants and opinions. My one area of concern relates to the existing black bear population. There is some mention of the potential impact and resource competition between the two species, but it did not appear to me that there is any concentrated focus on monitoring the black bear population as the grizzly bear is reintroduced. For many reasons, this seems to me an important monitoring element. Finally, great work! I look forward to hearing updates as the reintroduction begins!

Correspondence ID: 12362Project:112008Document:132104

Address: hernando, FL 34442
United States of America

Outside Organization: - Select - Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 15:16:48

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Stop this madness

Correspondence ID: 12363Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 15:27:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Staff- I think it is un-necessary ecologically to introduce grizzly bears into the North Cascades ecosystem- there is a clear migration corridor from Canada for grizzly bears to migrate into the North Cascades from southern BC in Canada. This has been documented to be already occurring, My suspicion is that bears would migrate to suitable habitat in their range if habitat is available. Black bears currently provide virtually the same ecological services as Grizzlies, This project is not necessary ecologically. I am opposed to this plan. Thanks for letting me comment.

Correspondence ID: 12364Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 15:40:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm not for the bears in any way, We went through this a few years ago. you need to listen to the people that live close to where you want to dump them and the hunters that hunt for deer and elk. Its bad enough that you brought in the wolves that are eating what we are hunting for. In the Methow valley the deer population has declined to far already. Also the habitat that is lost from wild fires is already keeping the black bears down low in the valley, So I expect the grizzly's well do the same. The game department use to be for the hunters not any more!!!! Maybe all of us hunters should get on social media and get every hunter to stop buying a license? why hunt if all the game is going to the Bears and Wolves. So I'm just saying I'm for getting my friends to stop buying a license and get the word out. MAYBE DROP THEM OFF IN DOWN TOWN SEATTLE TO THE FOLKS THAT WANT THEM

Correspondence ID: 12365Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 15:44:52

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Staff- I am opposed to the plan to reintroduce grizzlies into the North Cascades, As a result of introduction of Grizzlies in this area there will be a substantial increase in recreational visitor encounters with Grizzlies as a result of this introduction plan. This would lead to maulings and possible fatalities from bear encounters. The North Cascades are a highly used recreational area. I think a thorough study needs to take place that accurately documents the risk of encounters with bears after say 10 or 15 years under the release plan as bears are established. The risk needs to be clearly and transparently studied and the results need to show whether encounters would be significant based on current and anticipated visitor usage. Significance needs to be clearly tied to bear /human encounters and expressed as a risk. Any encounter with a grizzly has a significant risk of attack, and a risk of serious harm. This plan has a fundamental flaw in analysis without this information. Thank you for considering this.

Correspondence ID: 12366Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98102
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 15:47:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in full support of this. I think the grizzlies should be given back more of their natural habitat.

I think people will complain and raise concerns due to fear of running into a bear while hiking or how they could interact with livestock. I dont think hikers who visit the area 1-2x per year should really be listened to. Similarly, other places in the US and Canada have grizzlies nearby and don't have major issues - people will have to learn to adapt.

People hate change, but change is good.

Correspondence ID: 12367Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98146
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 15:50:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We need to stop cow towing to the cattle industry and focus on recreating a more natural environmental balance by introducing Grizzlies to their native habitat.

Correspondence ID: 12368Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Kirkland, WA 98033
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023 15:54:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am an avid hiker and a backpacker.

I believe that the introduction of the grizzly into an environment where the overwhelming majority of hikers/backpackers are not familiar with proper grizzly bear safety practices is irresponsible. It will likely lead to people getting injured or killed. Either instance will also result in the death of the bear.

Please do not make this mistake. Decisions have to be made based currently available information and circumstances. And the drive to fix what happened long ago is not always wise.

Please listen to the majority of the people that would be required to share the environment with an apex predator - and not activists that have never stepped foot in the back country.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 12369Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023 15:56:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am an avid hiker and encounter black bears a few times a year. It is always a thrill to see one and sometimes a bit scary, but each encounter has been a beautiful experience. It breaks my heart when I see people hunting them. That said- I m 100% against the re-introduction of Grizzlies in the Cascades. Please see my sentiments below.

I am opposed to the plan to introduce grizzlies into the North Cascades, As a result of introduction of Grizzlies in this area there will be a substantial increase in recreational visitor encounters with Grizzlies as a result of this introduction plan. This would lead to maulings and possible fatalities from bear encounters. The North Cascades are a highly used recreational area. I think a thorough study needs to take place that accurately documents the risk of encounters with bears after say 10 or 15 years under the release plan as bears are established. The risk needs to be clearly and transparently studied and the results need to show whether encounters would be significant based on current and anticipated visitor usage. Significance needs to be clearly tied to bear /human encounters and expressed as a risk. Any encounter with a grizzly has a significant risk of attack, and a risk of serious harm. This plan has a fundamental flaw in analysis without this information. Thank you for considering this.

Correspondence ID: 12370Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Port Angeles, WA 98362
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023 16:05:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I oppose the re-introduction of Grizzly bears to the North Cascades. A lot of people enjoy hunting/fishing/hiking/backpacking this area and do so currently without the concern of having a bear attack. Adding grizzly bears to this area changes the risk factor and tranquility of being in the outdoors greatly. Is this "experimental"

plan worth someone being mauled or possibly killed? Are the benefits greater than the risks? I think not. Bringing things back just because they were once here does not always make sense. This is a case where it does not make sense. The people making these decisions are not the same people that spend time recreationally in the area. Please listen to the people that will be most affected by this decision.

Thank you,

Correspondence ID: 12371Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Selah, WA 98942
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 16:07:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The plan to transplant these apex predators into the Northern Cascades is unwise and contrary to the North American Wildlife Conservation Model. Grizzlies haven't been hunted in several decades and there are grizzly bears to the north in BC. Why haven't they repopulated on their own with no hunting pressure? Because the habitat will no longer support them. Your proposal not only endangers the animals you seek to "protect", but prioritizes these predators over other wildlife AND human beings in the area. If there were a void, nature would fill it. Stop playing God and return to practicing sound scientific wildlife management. Do not transplant grizzlies into the Northern Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 12372Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Riverside, CA 92506
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 16:18:10

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: North Cascade grizzlies must have the same protection under the Endangered Species Act that all populations have. It is unacceptable for the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service to issue a special rule for "a nonessential experimental population."

The final Restoration Plan should account for the positive effects grizzly bear reintroduction will have on wildlife in the North Cascades, maximizing their beneficial role in improving the ecological diversity necessary for a thriving ecosystem.

The National Park Service should craft the final Restoration Plan to account for the role humans play in minimizing human-grizzly bear interactions. While people are encouraged to enjoy recreational activities in and around the vast, sparsely populated North Cascades, the final Restoration Plan should prohibit hunting and encourage people to use non-lethal means to respond to and to deescalate any human-bear interactions.

The National Park Service should prioritize protections for grizzly bears over livestock grazing. Provisions to accommodate "management" of grizzly bears for the benefit of the livestock industry are not necessary.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 12373Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Auburn, WA 98001
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 16:20:10

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am against reintroduction of the grizzly. We have to many people living in the area. If it was less populated maybe.

Yellowstone has shown us someone will try to take a selfie with a grizzly, then the grizzly will have to be killed. The salmon runs are not strong enough to support more wild life. They will not have enough to eat, then they will find food closer to humans.

Some people might think the north cascades have no people, but humans are to overpopulated to have large predators in Washington state.

Correspondence ID: 12374Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Whatcom county, WA 98226

United States of America

Outside Organization: self Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 16:26:45

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am noticing some hysterical comments on next door sites and such. Please ignore them. This is an excellent idea and of use to the residents of the counties in the northern cascades.

Correspondence ID: 12375Project:112008Document:132104

Address: SPOKANE, WA 99224

United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 16:35:37

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As an equestrian that rides the back trails I support Alternative A. Further consideration should be given to the impact of this action on recreational activities.

Correspondence ID: 12377Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Maple Valley, WA 98038

United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 16:38:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears were here before we were. We continue to take the forests from wildlife and destroy their homes. I think we can coexist with all wildlife as long as we treat the forest and the animals with respect. Bring back the Grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 12378Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Vancouver, WA 98683

United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 16:38:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Against repopulating. Let's keep the status quo. There is a lot of recreating that would cause inevitable conflicts between humans and bears.

Correspondence ID: 12381Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Oakville, WA 98568

United States of America

Outside Organization: Back Country Horsemen Non-Governmental

Received: Nov,08 2023 16:52:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a equestrian/trail rider I support alternative A the no action alternative.

Correspondence ID: 12382Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Marysville, WA 98271
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 16:54:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Although there are a few already here, there is no way we should purposely put them in the North Cascades or anywhere in the state of Washington!

We are way to populated of a state to put these apex killers in our woods. Trailheads are busy year around with hikers and outdoor users and that spells disaster when you put people hiking and potentially startling a sow with cubs as this usually results in attack.

Please please please do not release these Grizzlies into our state of Washington!!!!!!

Correspondence ID: 12386Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Oakham, MA 01068
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 17:03:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have a PhD in Ecology from Cornell and have hunted and camped with grizzlies both in Idaho/Montana elk hunting and in Alaska float trips while salmon fishing. I am in favor of option C and the 10j plan. We need to restore the grizzly bear as much as we can. The north cascades are a good location to try and the 10j plan provides the options that should satisfy the local concerns. Almost all the bears I've encountered ambled away quickly. Yes, there may be a few rare incidents, but that is what you accept when dealing with nature. And that is exactly what we want and are required to preserve.

Correspondence ID: 12387Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Carbonado, WA 98323
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 17:03:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Import lots of them. Too many people in the park anyways.

Correspondence ID: 12388Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98274
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 17:06:31

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No grizzlies please. Just leave them alone.

Correspondence ID: 12389Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 17:07:15

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in favor of restoring the natural order of our wild places by restoring the grizzly bear to the North Cascades eco-system.

Correspondence ID: 12391Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Arlington, WA 98223
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 17:19:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not support the introduction of anymore predatory animals in Washington state especially grizzly bear! If they wanted to be here they would be! No matter how far back in the hills they're put they WILL wind up in our back yards. We like to fish,hunt,hike,camp and just wonder in the hills and definitely do not need the threat of an apex predator such as a grizzly that was put in place by humans troubling us just because someone got a warm fuzzy feeling that it would be a good idea. They're happy where they're currently why would anyone want to snatch them up and put them somewhere new, somewhere they don't know and somewhere with habitat that doesn't support their species.

Jessie korr

Correspondence ID: 12392Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Everett, WA 98208
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 17:36:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We have abundant evidence that reintroduction of keystone species and large apex predators to the environment they have been removed from improves the population of all animals in the ecosystem. In fact improves the ecosystem down to erosion and plant life. This applies to land and sea, such as wolves in Yellowstone to the fish populations that increase in shark sanctuaries.

Our scientific evidence alone supports reintroduction of grizzlies into the North Cascades. We are in a desperate fight to save our most iconic apex predator of the area, our resident orca population, with few options. We have an option to correct damage we've done to another apex predator and we should. The environment improves when we work with it and the apex predators rather than conquer it.

Correspondence ID: 12393Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Monroe, WA 98272
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 17:46:55

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the return of Ursus arctos to this small bit of their historical range.

Correspondence ID: 12394Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tacoma, WA 98448
United States of America

Outside Organization: Homemaker Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 17:52:08

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I would like to see the Grizzlies restored to the North Cascades, because for one thing they belong in the wild and are beautiful and We have to do all we can to help their numbers increase and to protect them from poaching and over hunting. They are an asset to

the ecosystem- a balance in nature. These animals deserve a chance but we have to go about slowly. I don't want them to go extinct. Once they are gone you can't bring them back. Yes, I support the Grizzly Bears to be reintroduced to the North Cascades.

Thank-you for taking the time to read my thoughts and comments.

Sincerely,

Correspondence ID: 12395Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Portland, OR 97213
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 17:55:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Restoring animals like grizzlies (and wolves) to our ecosystems boosts biodiversity and ecosystem health and resilience. What a gift to be able to do this. Please make this a reality. Boosting biodiversity helps mitigate the effects of climate change, habitat fragmentation and ecosystem degradation.

The window to effect the se changes is closing on us - fast. We have to act now.

Correspondence ID: 12396Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98199
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 18:19:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: If we are trying to save the bear population and increase biodiversity in the NCE I personally think option B is the best solution in this scenario. I think it is important that we take this issue very seriously, but I don't think we need to manage the bears as much as considering them an "endangered species." I think with some human guidance we can restore/ introduce grizzly bears to the NCE, and create more biodiversity to the ecosystem at the same time which is the main overall goal.

Correspondence ID: 12397Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 18:25:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades. We have had the privilege and great good fortune to have hiked and skied the North Cascades for 35 years. The wildness of the place is an irresistible draw. Grizzly bears roamed these wild places long before humans decided unilaterally to sanitize the land of any perceived threats to humans and trap, kill, or remove native species for our economic gain.

Native Americans learned how to co-exist with grizzly bears. People who venture into the woods need to respect grizzlies and understand the root cause of potentially bad interactions. These are often the result of poorly handled refuse, inappropriately stored food, getting between cubs and a mother bear, ignorance of bear signs, ignorance of safe hiking behaviors in bear country, and diminishing habitats that shrink the space between them and us. This is a matter of public education and taking responsibility as individuals to behave in compliance with basic backcountry standards.

As stated in their website, the National Park Service "preserves unimpaired the natural and cultural resources and values of the National Park System for the enjoyment, education, and inspiration of this and future generations. The National Park

Service cooperates with partners to extend the benefits of natural and cultural resource conservation and outdoor recreation throughout this country and the world." It doesn't say "eliminate all potential hazards to humans in the wilderness". There is no way to achieve that even without the presence of grizzlies. The grizzly bear is an integral part of the ecosystem of the wilderness and a magnificent apex predator that deserves our respect and reverence.

While we fear grizzlies, an apex predator, we would exponentially save more human lives and reduce human suffering through enhanced auto safety and actual regulation of industrial chemicals than we would by removing all grizzlies from the landscape.

Our attempts to eliminate any and all threats to human life have often resulted in unintended consequences, creating imbalances in the ecology of the land. Such action damages, sometimes irreparably, the natural world, precluding incredible experiences of nature for future generations. Reintroducing grizzlies to the North Cascades is one step to repair our past actions in reverence for that animal's magnificence and to respect our obligation to future generations who wish to roam the mountains as we have had the privilege to do.

Correspondence ID: 12398Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Quincy, WA 98848
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 18:32:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am apposed of the inserting Grizzly Bears to the Northwest. My husband and I are avid hikers and campers here in the beautiful northwest. The danger of grizzly bears in the area will limit us and others in the northwest to enjoy exploring the national parks that we as taxpayers pay for.

Grizzly bears are omnivorous although their digestive system is that of a carnivore. They consume a wide range of food items constituting both plants and animals. They prey on mammals such as bison, bighorn sheep, mule deer, white-tailed deer, caribou, elk, and sometimes black bears. The northwest also cattle farm business in the area that the bears would feed off of. Introducing them here will endanger the ecosystem that is already in place.

Correspondence ID: 12400Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98136
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 18:39:12

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears have been a part of the Western landscape, including Washington State, since before the arrival of European civilization. It was European Americans who largely extirpated them from this region through hunting and game shooting because they falsely believed that bears are dangerous predators which are incompatible with civilization (aka colonization). Indigenous peoples had coexisted with these bears since time immemorial, and many people all over the world coexist with brown bears just fine. It's only right to bring them back to the North Cascades to allow them to re-engineer the landscape and bring back a more balanced natural environment. I am strongly in favor of Grizzly bear reintroduction in Washington State.

Correspondence ID: 12401Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 18:45:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As someone who studied conservation biology, I understand how important grizzly bears are to our ecosystem. The North Cascades is their home and it's our responsibility to reintroduce them. Please, let's act now before we lose them forever!

Correspondence ID: 12402Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Lakewood, WA 98498
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023 18:45:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: No grizzly reintroduction in WA state. There's no need to do so apart from ideologically driven reasons.

Correspondence ID: 12403Project:112008Document:132104
Address: North Bend, WA 98045
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023 19:07:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As an individual that has grown up in the cascade forests, i have witnessed the changes brought about by the introduction and protection of aggressive predators. Since cougar hunting with dogs was banned, and wolf packs are being introduced, the black tail deer numbers in my area are declining. We have seen both cougar and a wolf on our property.east of North Bend on the south fork of the Snoqualmie river. The thought of seeing grizzly bears is not something I welcome. I feel there was a reason these bears have disappeared from our forests due to their aggressive nature toward both humans and livestock. I feel that if the bears migrate into our forests on their own the numbers can be controlled. I cannot favor these predators being reintroduced by man.

Thank you.

██████████

Correspondence ID: 12404Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Montesano, WA 98563
United States of America
Outside Organization: Back Country Horsemen Washington Non-Governmental
Received: Nov,08 2023 19:10:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am a member of the Back Country Horsemen of Washington. I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

Thank you

Correspondence ID: 12405Project:112008Document:132104
Address: lake stevens, WA 98258
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023 19:13:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am writing to express my strong opposition to reintroducing grizzlies into the North Cascades. We have had more than enough grizzly conflicts and deaths across the west in the last few years.

Correspondence ID: 12406Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98274-8717
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023 19:14:10

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly support grizzly recovery in the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE). From the current DEIS, I support Alternative C, which will recover grizzly bears as a 10j Non-Essential Population under the Endangered Species Act.

I have two concerns with the proposed 10j rule, however:

- Why are State-owned lands that would appear to have suitable grizzly bear habitat within the NCE designated as Management Zone 3 rather than Management Zone 2? There is only vague reference in the proposed rule about lands within MZ 3 being more vulnerable to conflicts and resultant bear mortality - which makes sense for private lands, but is much less clear about the excluded State lands. My recommendation is to make state-owned lands as Mgmt Zone 2 within the NCE if they have suitable grizzly bear habitat.
- I have serious concerns about allowing private citizens to lethally remove a grizzly bear under Management Zone 3. The proposed rule enables an authorized private land owner to “kill a bear presenting an ongoing threat to human safety, livestock, or other property (e.g. compost, chickens, beehives) if there is a demonstrable and ongoing threat and when it is not reasonably possible to eliminate the threat through nonlethal means.” My questions/comments are these:
 - o Whereas human safety is a legitimate concern that might warrant an authorized member of the public to kill a grizzly (as enabled in MZ 2), how do property like compost and chickens rise to that level? Keep in mind it was people with guns, traps, and poisons that led to the extirpation of grizzlies in the NCE. We are not that far removed from those times nor those attitudes, and to willingly enable a private citizen to legally kill a grizzly for those resources is troubling. Certainly, agency staff should be involved in trying to manage those conflicts, and the various tools available (electric fencing, for example) should be used. If a bear persists in causing conflict after agency personnel have attempted other means, and after non-lethal means of conflict resolution are attempted and presumably failed, then it should fall back on the agency staff to manage that bear - either trap and move, or as a last resort, euthanize the bear. But do NOT enable private citizens with that task.

I have read that the federal agencies are working to memorialize the “no-net-loss of core” approach for management of core lands within the NCE - this is an important, critical step to complete. Please proceed with that effort!

Similarly, as discussed in the proposed 10j regulation, make the exception to the incidental take rule on USFS lands be contingent - as proposed - on the USFS continuing to abide by the no-net-loss of core approach.

Within the body of the DEIS, I would suggest reviewing the following publications to update and inform the discussion on Wilderness Character for the North Cascades NPS Complex. Both are peer-reviewed, published by the NPS:

Riegel, B., and J. Oelfke. 2020. The Stephen Mather Wilderness: Wilderness character baseline assessment. Natural Resource Report NPS/NOCA/NRR - 2020/2164. National Park Service, Fort Collins, Colorado

Oelfke, J. 2022. Stephen Mather Wilderness: An update of the 2015 wilderness character baseline and completion of the 2020 wilderness character monitoring reporting summary. Natural Resource Report NPS/NOCA/NRR - 2022/2452. National Park Service, Fort Collins, Colorado. <https://doi.org/10.36967/2294337>

Thank you for the opportunity to comment

Correspondence ID: 12408Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellevue, WA 98006
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 19:16:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Return grizzly bears to the North Cascades. Grizzlies are important for a healthy ecosystem. Humans have been poaching them and destroying their habitat since the 1800's, resulting in a decline down to only two confirmed bears. I support your ecologists' recommendations.

<https://www.nps.gov/noca/learn/nature/grizzly-bears.htm#:~:text=There have always been grizzly,during the heyday of mining.>

Correspondence ID: 12409Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Snohomish, WA 98290
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 19:45:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I live in unincorporated Snohomish county and have seen black bear, bob cats, deer and other wildlife on my land. I enjoy the area and we spend plenty of time with our young children hiking, looking after our livestock etc.

Part of the appeal of this area is the fact that there are no grizzlies. I would worry for the safety of my children and my animals. It would make hiking and camping/ back packing much less enjoyable and stressful knowing the grizzly bears are out there. No thank you!

Correspondence ID: 12411Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98146
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 20:03:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We strongly support the improved diversity of wildlife in our northern Cascade range. A healthy balance of wildlife enhances robust ecosystems and fortifies food chains and species interaction. Please restore grizzlies, a Pacific Northwest keystone species, to our northern Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 12412Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Endicott, WA 99125
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 20:06:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not believe that introducing more grizzlies to the North Cascades is necessary since they will be coming across the border anyway. Stick with the present management strategy.

Correspondence ID: 12413Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98115-4323
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 20:13:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live in and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

Furthermore, the 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Thank you for taking the time to keep our North Cascades wild!

Correspondence ID: 12414Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023 20:16:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Re: the EIS regarding restoring and placing grizzlies in the North Cascade Park System

We live in a rural area west of the Town of Twisp along the Twisp River. There are 50 miles of forest behind our property that reaches into the Stehekin area and north into the Pasayten Wilderness. We have dogs and many friends with dogs and enjoy recreating with our dogs in the North Cascade system. We also live in a riparian area and have had close encounters with black bear and cougar since moving here in 2006.

We feel that this move to reestablish grizzly bears in the North Cascades Ecosystem is not well-informed or for the benefit of citizens that want to recreate in this beautiful unique part of our country. My husband drives a local public transit bus part time and meets many hikers that are coming from all over the country, as well as all over the world to hike in this wilderness. They are often headed for the Pacific Crest Trailheads in the North Cascades. These people are not ones who would carry weapons and, if they have bear spray, they are not anticipating meeting grizzlies. Black bear attacks are fairly rare, but they will follow dogs back to people. Generally they are pretty quickly dissuaded by bear spray or loud noise. These are different animals than grizzlies.

As early as the 70's, hiking in Montana, trailhead signs told us to not take dogs on the trail because of the risk of them attracting grizzlies. It was hot in the summer there so there weren't ways to leave the dog safely in a car. I see that being a huge obstacle for people wanting to hike in the North Cascades as people here often hike with their dogs.

A little over a month ago there was a horrible incident involving a couple and their dog who were camping in the Banff Provincial Park. They were experienced with bears. They stowed their food away from camp in a tree. They had bear spray with them. They were attacked inside their tent and were killed along with their dog. They had GPS connected and sent out messages and there was no help that could have saved them. Grizzlies have always been there as a part of the environment and people carry spray, electrical devices, but cannot carry guns. I don't think we can rely on carrying guns, or should rely on that, to be safe recreating in this great ecosystem.

There are other populations we've been trying to bring back in this area. We've seen huge swings in the number of mule deer in this area in the past 10 years. Black bears will eat fawns and there are diseases like blue tongue and mite infestations that the deer population has been trying to recover from. Adding another effective predator will likely upset the balance of the game here. Many people we know hunt to support their families and the resource brings a lot of tourist dollars to the local economy as well.

We have had nuisance black bears threatening our safety, our dogs' safety and our garden crops. We had a boar black bear last year that was brave enough to stand on his hind legs to threaten the dogs on the other side of a 6 ft fence and he did not back down when we went out to scare him off. When we called the local fish and wildlife agents about the bear problem they told us that they don't relocate bears or come shoot them. They recommended we get rid of anything that attracted them (like our cherry trees). If that didn't work they told us that we could shoot them with some rock salt or something to scare them away. Or, as a last alternative, kill them or have a hunter come take the bear so the meat wasn't wasted. They told us that if we called them to come get the bear they would drop the carcass in the forest somewhere.

So, maybe that helps you to understand our concern with this Grizzly Plan going forward. If we don't have the resources to manage black bears close to residential areas, hiking trails and other heavy recreation areas, we do not believe that this plan can be successful. There is a growing population on the east and south side of the North Cascades Park and more people recreating here all the time. We have the largest county in acreage in Washington State and we account for a large part of the border of the North Cascades area. But, we have a County with so much public land that isn't taxed that we rely on a skeleton Sheriff Department for emergencies. In the past 3 years a completely volunteer Search and Rescue has been reorganized with volunteer supervision in Okanogan County. I worked in local government and in this largest County in the State, often sheriff's department staffing on the weekends was a minimum of 3 deputies. No one is going to get to a site of a bear attack in time to have a better outcome.

Please do not launch this experiment in the North Cascades with the growing population and recreation level and lack of resources to manage the reintroduction. If local wildlife officials cannot deal with black bear incidents, how in the world can we anticipate that there won't be disasters like what happened in Banff happen here in our backyards. The federal government should not inflict this disaster-in-the-making on the State of Washington and local resources hoping that everyone will be on board when the first bear disaster happens. Stop, think, back this up!

Correspondence ID: 12415Project:112008Document:132104
Address: West linn, OR 97068
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023 20:34:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do not use our limited resources to bring back Grizzlies. Grizzlies are very different than Black-Brown bears we have now. Grizzlies hunt and eat people. Livestock will also suffer. Thanks.

Correspondence ID: 12416Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Camano Island, WA 98282
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023 20:41:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please no, just "no"! We have too many people crowding into the outdoors. We need more available access to the outdoors, not less. We need more Outdoor Places where we can relax and let our guard down. The potential for grizzly encounters will deter people from using the north Washington area. There will be more encounters and people will get mauled and killed. Grizzly restoration is an honorable, but romantic idea. The time is not now.

Correspondence ID: 12417Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Lake Forest Park, WA 98155
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023 20:45:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am an avid hiker. This is the third time in the past few years that I have commented on plans to reintroduce grizzly bears to the North Cascades. Do NOT do it. Wherever these bears have been reintroduced, they have mauled and killed humans. These deaths, although not large in number, are avoidable. Given the increasing use of remote areas by outdoor enthusiasts, the reintroduction of grizzlies to the North Cascades is ill considered.

Correspondence ID: 12418Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Scotia, NY 12302
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 20:51:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: North Cascade grizzlies must have the same protection under the Endangered Species Act that all populations have. It is unacceptable for the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service to issue a special rule for "a nonessential experimental population."

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 12419Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Moses Lake, WA 98837
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 20:52:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm delighted that our state has been chosen to reintroduce grizzlies. This is important due to the endangered species recovery. The arguments I'm hearing that are against the grizzlies are idiotic. A couple who had a grizzly come into their yard and kill a chicken said that they moved to that area knowing perfectly well that there were bears in the area. But then they said that doesn't mean that they have to tolerate the bears. OH YES IT ABSOLUTELY DOES!! If you move into their habitat, then you have to share that habitat. It's that same old argument of "not in my backyard". The species recovery should take precedent. I also hear arguments from farmers and ranchers about crop or livestock loss. That is just the price of doing business. My father was the biggest potato farmer in WA in the 1980's. He was very much anti-hunting. He prohibited any and all hunting on our land, which was 9,000 acres. This angered hunters who claimed they would be doing us a favor and getting rid of pest animals. But my father said that any crop loss was just the price of farming. He held true to his values, and we did just fine. The recorded number of livestock killed by bears is miniscule compared the number of total bears in those areas. We need to bring grizzlies back to WA state!!

Correspondence ID: 12420Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98513
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 21:08:52

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not do this

Correspondence ID: 12421Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 21:25:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support Alternative A.

From the Proposed Rule Threats section;

"The complex relationship between changes in climate, natural processes, and natural and anthropogenic features will ultimately determine the future quality of grizzly bear habitat across the ecosystem (Ransom et al. 2018, entire)."

The effects of climate change does not appear to be fully analyzed. The proposed rule which seems to cite one author in the threat section, Ransom 2018 and 2023, indicates fire will cause a disruption in the grizzly's territory which will result in bears seeking new areas for a period of time followed by an increase available food. With the increased occurrence of mega fires in the North Cascade Complex the interaction between grizzly and communities will increase similar to that as we have seen with the black bear. Washington State Fish and Wildlife are currently closing lands in the Methow Valley to the public due to

decreased Mule deer populations. It seems adding an additional keystone predator into the area will further reduce the numbers of this important species in our ecosystem. Has the two agencies communicated or are the taxpayers and community members going to endure the hardship of unfunded mandates and poor planning. The addition of grizzly bears in areas which currently are demonstrating changes in vegetative community and structure is a flawed plan. Please review the nps study on the changes to the park as a result of climate change

<https://www.nps.gov/noca/learn/nature/climate-change-resource-brief.htm>

This study by the park service provides the data that the habitat slated for these bears to reside is decreasing at alarming rates.

Alternative B and C are both extremely irresponsible.

Correspondence ID: 12422Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 21:39:55

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I recommend the fastest introduction of the most bears possible under any alternative. This method will minimize negative impacts to wilderness character from introduction activities and give the bears a viable population as soon as possible. I support the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the north Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 12426Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 22:05:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I would rather not have grizzly bears in the cascades. It seems unnecessary. We enjoy walking out there and adding another predator would make it feel more dangerous.

Correspondence ID: 12427Project:112008Document:132104

Address: North Bend, WA 98045
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 22:14:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello,

I am writing in complete opposition for the reintroduction of grizzly bear to the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE).

As someone who recreates throughout the NCE on an almost weekly basis, grizzly bears are not an animal I want to see on the landscape. Documented annually, there are human - grizzly bear conflicts throughout other grizzly bear recovery zones. In some cases those conflicts result in death or serious harm to the humans, and they often result in the lethal take of the bear. The NCE is facing an increased predator populations from mountain lions, black bears, and wolves. I do not advocate for another predator, an apex predator, to be introduced to the landscape.

Animals do not know boundaries, and will not stay within remote confines of the National Park complex or within wilderness areas. As documented in other grizzly bear recovery zones, there is conflict between ranchers and grizzly bears every year. Resulting in tens of thousands of tax payer dollars going to compensate the rancher, and/ or funding wildlife professionals to investigate and potentially lethally take the problem bear.

Additionally, ungulate species across the eastern slopes of the cascades are in a decline. The decline is a complicated issue surrounding climate change, wildfire, human encroachment into habitat and loss of winter range habitat. Introducing an apex

predator will only further the decline.

For these reasons listed, I am firmly against the reintroduction of grizzly bear to the NCE and ask the NPS, USFWS, WDFW, and other federal, state, tribal, and local agencies to select the "no action" reintroduction option.

Regards,

Correspondence ID: 12428Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America
Outside Organization: None Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023 22:34:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hi. I favor Alt C. It's good to have the flexibility with 10j. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 12429Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Redmond, WA 98053
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023 22:36:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I would wonder where the grizzlies are being relocated from. They must be doing okay there. This obviously presents danger to humans.

Correspondence ID: 12430Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Walla Walla, WA 99362
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023 22:39:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Alternative C, or the Incremental Restoration option, is the best choice. The grizzly bears were here before us and they deserve to be returned to land that they once freely roamed. Because they are a keystone species, they are much more valuable, and this positive quality by far outweighs the threat that they may pose to humans. They will help return the ecosystem to a more balanced and thriving state, which also is more important than livestock that could potentially be damaged. This earth is the only one we have - we have to focus on taking care of Mother Earth and give her the respect and love she deserves.

Correspondence ID: 12431Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Concrete, WA 98237
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023 22:47:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I think it needs to be made public just WHO stands to benefit from the reintroduction of Grizzly bears and just HOW they will benefit.
And - who exactly came up with this idea and the dollars that this all will cost the state and the feds.

Correspondence ID: 12432Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Shasta lake, CA 96019
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023 22:52:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am hoping that grizzlies will be reintroduced into their homelands of the cascades. Ensuring all of our large predators are here for all times to come is extremely important for specie diversity and our environment. Stopping open range grazing of livestock would aid in protecting our wildlife and creeks too. I hope to see this happen soon.

Correspondence ID: 12433Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Edmonds, WA 98026
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023 22:54:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the action plans to restore the grizzly bear to the North Cascades. They are part of our wild heritage in this state, and while we can't ignore the human impact by bringing them back, I think the goal of getting our ecosystem back to where it was before human interference is noble and just. I believe projects like this have been undertaken in other national parks successfully and with little human impact. I appreciate the effort to bring grizzly bears back to an environment where they belong.

Correspondence ID: 12434Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Tacoma, WA 98422
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023 22:55:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The species *Ursus arctos horribilis* is magnificent. But your proposals to reintroduce Grizzly bears are ill advised and prohibitively expensive if looked at as both a cost per bear both at the start of your B or C alternatives and with ongoing expenses of dealing with further reintroduction and with "problem" bears either by relocation or execution when an encounter goes wrong with a "touron" (think Yellowstone and Bison) or a rancher loses livestock, both of which will happen eventually if bears are there. With continued global warming and increased wildfire danger, beetle kill in Cascade forests, increased use of the backcountry by humans, and logging, your vast proposed habitat may not be quite as vast as you assume to support your proposed numbers of bears. Then, if you do succeed in reestablishing a large (relatively speaking), long term and healthy bear population even beyond your wildest dreams, you may simply be subsidizing trophy hunting and poaching. Political winds can and do shift and the hunting lobby is strong (think Wyoming, Idaho and Montana). A reminder to you of the proposed road to a mine through Gates of the Arctic National Park and prime Grizzly habitat should give you pause. I am in my 71st revolution around the sun and am not clairvoyant. I have though spent many, many days and weeks in the areas that are included in the NCE approaching then climbing many of the mountains there and I am glad Grizzly bear encounters were not included in the many dangers inherent in my chosen pursuit at the time. If you look at what happened to wolf reintroduction in Northeastern Washington where wildlife biologists went to great extremes and expense to reintroduce *Canis lupis*, then when those wolves found easy prey in sheep and cattle apparently surprising everyone, the State hired guns to eliminate the problem. In closing, I would remind you of the law of unintended sequences. No matter how detailed you plans, you don't have any idea of how things will actually work out. People and Grizzly bears do not mix well and it will be the bears that pay the price with their lives while the taxpayers pay with, well, their taxes.

Correspondence ID: 12436Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Lynnwood, WA 98036
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023 23:12:41

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a family that camps and hikes all throughout Washington state and the North Cascades, I am very concerned about the possible re-introduction of grizzlies into the area. The presence of grizzlies would give me pause in considering outdoor activities with my family. Safety is a top priority when considering where our family enjoys the outdoors. Children make it very hard to ensure bear safety, as they do not pay attention to cleanliness and food scents. This area also has been without grizzlies for a very long time and it would impact the current ecosystem and recreation activities.

Correspondence ID: 12437Project:112008Document:132104

Address: San Carlos, CA 94070
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,08 2023 23:46:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The grizzly bear is a cultural cornerstone of the former Wild West, America's last frontier. The American West is the ancestral home (historic range) of grizzly bears. Before our nation's westward expansion, bears travelled freely, unencumbered by human involvement and conflict. The Environmental Impact Statement for the North Cascades Ecosystem Restoration Plan offers three solutions- do nothing, the proposed recovery plan, or a modified recovery plan under section 10 (j) under the Endangered Species Act.

A potential area for concern under Alternatives B and C is the impact of helicopters upon visitors recreating in designated wilderness areas. Personally, when I hear a helicopter while I am recreating outside, curiosity and concern are the primary emotions that I experience. I imagine a potential search and rescue operation taking place nearby and recognize the importance of these efforts. The interruption caused by helicopters is typically brief, especially when compared to the amount of time that a typical visitor spends in the wilderness. Other individuals may be frustrated or upset by the noise pollution. A maximum of 144 flights, totaling 65 hours, would take place over wilderness areas in the North Cascades Ecosystem (pp. 40). Although these flights will primarily take place during times of high recreational value, the limited quantity and duration of flights means that the impact on visitors will be as minimal as possible. Posting disruption notices online and at trailheads would reduce curiosity and concern among visitors, which would work to mitigate the impact of helicopter flights on recreation. These notices should include bear awareness tips and information surrounding the exciting species restoration program. Even when considering intermittent area closures on a short-term basis (pp. 45), the recreational value of returning grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem outweighs the negative effects of the restoration program. The recreational impact of release efforts is described in the Environmental Impact Statement as follows:

"Area closures during operations at the staging areas would temporarily limit opportunities for solitude and unconfined recreation; however, closures are expected to last only a few hours. Closures are not expected to be needed at release sites because remote areas without people would be preferred. However, the duration of any necessary closure would be temporary and last until the bear has moved away from the release site."
(pp. 106)

Remote areas without humans are specifically targeted as ideal release locations in order to limit interactions between humans and bears. As an avid user of public lands, being asked to avoid an area due to an imminent grizzly bear reintroduction would not impact me negatively. The ecological and cultural value of reintroducing grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem far outweighs the temporary inconveniences of helicopter noise and area closures.

Overall, Alternative B or Alternative C should be initiated to return grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem, part of their historical range. Despite the limited potential interference with humans recreating in secluded wilderness areas, the positive impact of grizzly bears in the areas overshadows concerns about disruptions. This reintroduction plan is an

opportunity for the North Cascades Ecosystem to be a model public lands unit for further grizzly bear and ursus reintroduction programs in the future.

Correspondence ID: 12438Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Vancouver, WA 98665
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears were a vital component of the ecosystem of the North Cascades for thousands of years until humans hunted them out of existence in the area. Now that we have the opportunity to responsibly re-introduce this important species into the area and bring balance back to this wilderness, it's important to not let naysayers use scare tactics to stall or end this effort by claiming a few dozen grizzlies being re-introduced to an area the size of New Jersey over decades is going to cause loss of human life and doom local farms. These animals have as much of a right as humans to exist in these areas, and the proposed settlement sites would not pose any direct threat to humans or their livestock. The areas are very remote, far from any towns, and would only benefit from the presence of grizzly bears. I urge the NPS to push forward with the re-introduction plan and allow these animals the opportunity to live in the wild of the beautiful North Cascades. Humans shouldn't be able to dictate what native animal species are allowed to exist in what areas. Co-existence is the goal.

Correspondence ID: 12439Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Delta Junction, AK 99731
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have lived in "bear" country for many years. Including MT, WY, and now Alaska. It's beyond my ability to comprehend why anyone in their right mind would want to bring these beasts back after they were eradicated. They make an area with many hazards far more hazardous. They don't play and they do not improve anything, rather they kill valuable livestock and much wildlife that could be used as subsistence by people. Why would you even consider this? I am strongly opposed to this plan and I speak from personal experience. Nothing is more terrifying than making contact with one of these brutes and no one who has would want them around. Have you ever been hunted? I have and I don't like it. You won't either. This is a terrible idea. You are putting many people and valuable assets in jeopardy. If your wife, children or other livestock were attacked or killed you would never be in favor of this insane notion of reintroduction. You bet I feel strongly. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 12441Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lake Forest Park, WA 98155
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 01:19:08

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We need the grizzly bears back in the North cascades. They would be able to live there and it would bring in people who are excited to see them. It would not affect livestock negatively - not more than how snakes do.

Correspondence ID: 12443Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellevue, WA 98005
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 01:34:48

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am definitely against this. Wildlife population will get reduced If brown bears are introduced here. Also, hiking and hunting will be dangerous for people.

Correspondence ID: 12447Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spokane, WA 99207
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 03:01:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Plan A doesn't help achieve any of the goals laid out because it doesn't take any action. The grizzly bear population cannot come back on its own and if there is something we can do to help support their recovery, then we should take action instead of sitting back and ignoring the problem.

While both alternatives B and C offer similar reintroduction plans, alternative C is a better alternative because of the constraints for management options with alternative B. If your objective is to restore the grizzly bear population and allow visitors the opportunity to see bears in their native habitat then a plan that takes preventative action is better for the well-being of both bears and people. Under alternative B it states that bears can be removed for the defense of life, but we are visitors in their habitat they should not be removed from their habitat for defense due to human interference. alternative C addresses this concern by proposing deterrence as well as relocation, therefore, trying to create a space where humans and bears can coexist. This will help restore the bear population because of fewer disturbances and will help prevent human mortality.

Both alternatives B and C use helicopters to transport bears into the habitat. I like that these plans address concerns about the disturbance of helicopters on other wildlife populations such as northern spotted owls. It is good that they will be staggered throughout many years, but I would like to see a monitoring of the impact this many helicopter flights make. If it is impacting nesting birds, what would alternatives to transporting bears into the environment look like?

Overall, alternatives B and C seem very well thought out and both would have positive impacts for the grizzly bear population. I think that alternative C is better for management, prevention, and the coexistence of humans and bears.

Correspondence ID: 12450Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mazama, UN 98833
Portugal

Outside Organization: Robert Davis Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 03:16:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in strong favor of returning the Grizzlies to the North Cascades. I live in an area that borders the national park and recreate there year round. We need to return the Grizzly bear to it's rightful home. Furthermore, I am in favor of Alternative C and the proposed Section 10(j) Rule which is our best choice that meets both ecological and social needs in the area. The Grizzly has been successfully reintroduced in other areas and WE CAN meet the needs of all parties. I know that many of those of us in favor are also in favor of developing means and contributing to funds that will support farmers/ranchers among other parties. Please, let's right a long-term wrong!

Correspondence ID: 12452Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98146
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 06:35:55

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly support the National Park Services preferred Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation.

I am sure you are already familiar with the many reasons we should bring grizzlies back. I wanted to share a personal view point.

Ive lived in Seattle for 11 years and love visiting the North Cascades.

However, I know we live on stolen land. And I know the National Parks would not be necessary if indigenous people still lived there, because the space would be properly cared for and honored.

Bringing grizzlies back helps restore the balance in the ecosystem and takes away the focus of National Parks on human recreation. We are just visitors on this land.

Correspondence ID: 12454Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Rochester, MI 48306
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,09 2023 08:04:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please bring back the grizzly bears to the North cascades

Correspondence ID: 12456Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Silver Spring, MD 20906
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,09 2023 08:31:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the bear ecosystem, bear need to place to live . Bear are very important part of this land !!!

Correspondence ID: 12461Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Elma, WA 98541
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,09 2023 09:14:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a hiker and equestrian I feel that no action be taken. I do not want Grizzly Bears as a threat to me or my horse. However I do believe that they will gradually move down from Canada and will eventually repopulate the area. The fact that they were in the North Cascades in the past does not mean they need to be there now. There are several other predator animals there to keep things in balance. JoAnn Yost

Correspondence ID: 12462Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Shoreline, WA 98133
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,09 2023 09:30:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: If we're going to restore extirpated predators to our wild lands, why not reintroduce lions to Washington? No, not cougars, but pantherine lions, similar to their extant African cousins except 25% larger. They lived here for hundreds of thousands of years before Native Americans wiped them out. Let's release a few prides that have been observed to be cold-tolerant and see what happens.

How would you feel about hearing stories where a family hiking up to Cascade Pass found themselves surrounded by a pride of aggressive lions, and only their bones and shredded packs were found by S&R?

There is no need to do this with bears either. Grizzly bears have connected habitat from the Rocky Mountains through Canada to the Coast Range, which then leads south to the North Cascades. There's minimal civilization and minimal highway crossings. Let them find their way here again naturally if they are inclined to do so. If they don't, leave them be.

The NPS and USFWS seem determined to create a human safety problem where none now exists. This is a stupid idea that should not be enacted.

Correspondence ID: 12464Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Washington, DC 20005
United States of America
Outside Organization: National Wildlife Federation Action Fund Non-Governmental
Received: Nov,09 2023 09:52:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Director Williams and Director Sams,

Below are 989 of 8,415 comments submitted by advocates and supporters of the National Wildlife Federation Action Fund in regards to the Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/Environmental Impact Statement, North Cascades.

Thank you for releasing an environmental impact statement and draft plan that outlines a path forward to recover and restore grizzly bears in the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE).

Grizzly bears belong in the North Cascades. They roamed the region for thousands of years and their eventual decline was a loss to biodiversity and to the cultural traditions of First Nations and Indigenous communities throughout the Pacific Northwest and British Columbia. Restoring and managing grizzlies in the North Cascades is an important step in bringing the full ecosystem back together and it's a critical step to larger grizzly bear recovery efforts in the lower 48.

I'm grateful for your leadership on this issue and encourage you to continue the recovery process in coordination with Tribal governments, local partners, and other stakeholders. Doing so will ensure that grizzly bears maintain a path towards full recovery for the benefit of future generations.

Sincerely,

██████████, Braithwaite, LA 70040
██████████, Long Beach, New York 11561
██████████, San Diego, CA 92130
██████████, Whitefish, MT 59937
██████████, Port Saint Lucie, Fl 34952
██████████, San Antonio, TX 78232
██████████, Indianapolis, IN 462192607
██████████, Boston, MA 02215-0005
██████████, Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20772
██████████rs, West Lafayette, IN 47906
██████████, Redondo Beach, California 90277-3009
██████████, Bridgewater, bridgewater new jersey 88071339
██████████, St. Petersburg, FL 33710
██████████, Silver Spring, MD 209104662
██████████, Conroe, TX 773011849
██████████, Palm Harbor, Florida 34683-5133
██████████, San Leandro, CA 94577
██████████, Columbia, SC 29205-1110
██████████, Thousand Oaks, California 91361-1116
██████████ ██████████, El Paso, TX 799153805
██████████, East Barre, VT 56490203
██████████, Wesley Chapel, FL 33543-7885
██████████ Saint Helena Island, South Carolina 29920-3828
██████████, Langhorne, PA 19047
██████████, Davenport, IA 52804

██████████, Brookhaven, GA 303291621
██████████, Northbrook, IL 60062
██████████ Zionsville, In 46077
██████████, Congers, NY 10920
██████████, Kernersville, NC 27284
██████████, Chagrin Falls, Ohio 44022
██████████, Middleville, MI 49333
██████████, Ph.D., New York, New York 10128
██████████, Cotopaxi, Colorado 81223-8680
██████████, Old Fort, NC 287628666
██████████, Riverside, IL 60546
██████████ Gainesville, VA 20155-3401
██████████, Dayton, OH 45419
██████████, Joseph, OR 97846
██████████, Bhubaneswar, Odisha 751021
██████████, Bridgeton, New Jersey 08302-4242
██████████, Panorama City, CA 91402
██████████, Port Saint Lucie, FL 34987-6714
██████████, Chicago, il 606186235
██████████, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55422-3832
██████████, Braintree, Massachusetts 02184-1012
██████████, FOREST GROVE, OREGON 971160216
██████████, Atlanta, GA 30345
██████████, Manhattan Beach, Ca 90266-3451
██████████, Brooklyn, NY 11249
██████████, Santa Ynez, CA 934609106
██████████, Bellevue, WA 98007
██████████, Kalamazoo, MI 49008
██████████, Southampton, NJ 8088
██████████, San Antonio, Texas 78209-2447
██████████, Westwood, NJ 07675-3150
██████████, Smyrna, Georgia 30080
██████████, Los Angeles, CA 90068
██████████, Spring Hill, Florida 34608
██████████, Littleton, CO 80128
██████████, Saint Albans, WV 25177-1644
██████████, Traverse City, Michigan 49684
██████████, Cortland, Ohio 44410-1492
██████████, Longmont, CO 80504-9783
██████████, Albany, New York 12203-5309
██████████, Norman, OK 73071
██████████, Grand Ledge, MI 488371409
██████████, Teaneck, NJ 76665211
██████████, Stow, OH 44224
██████████, Indianapolis, IN 46217-4834
██████████, Shorewood, Ill 604048264
██████████, Folsom, CA 956302035
██████████, Kihei, hawaii 967537149
██████████, Highland, IL 62249
██████████, Madison, WI 537111454
██████████, San Bruno, CA 94066-2117
██████████, Schenectady, NY 12304-1819
██████████, Brooklyn, NY 11218
██████████, Ewing, New Jersey 08628-2916

[REDACTED], Albuquerque, NM 87113-2094
[REDACTED], Shamokin, Shamokin Pennsylvania 178725454
[REDACTED], New York, New York 10022
[REDACTED], Hingham, MA 20433904
[REDACTED], Seattle, WA 98106
[REDACTED], Palm Beach Gardens, Florida 33418-7327
[REDACTED], Ashland, OR 975209787
[REDACTED], Anderson, SC 296251117
[REDACTED], Oakland, CA 94618-1488
[REDACTED], Goshen, IN 46526
[REDACTED] Nome, AK 99762-0381
[REDACTED], Johnstown, Pa 159052416
[REDACTED] New York, New York 10011-8142
[REDACTED], WASHINGTON, DC 20002
[REDACTED], Cincinnati, OH 452311722
[REDACTED], Elkhart, in 46514-1858
[REDACTED], Sahuarita, AZ 85629
[REDACTED], Justin, TX 76247-4264
[REDACTED], Peru, Indiana 46970-7961
[REDACTED], Orlando, fl 328351087
[REDACTED] Hidden Valley Lake, Ca 95467
[REDACTED], Madera, CA 93636
[REDACTED], Orlando, Florida 32837-4014
[REDACTED], Sedona, AZ 86340-4238
[REDACTED] Tyler, St. Louis, MO 63122
[REDACTED], Olive Branch, Ms 386546121
[REDACTED], Blue Mounds, WI 53517-9512
[REDACTED], Chappaqua, NY 105141311
[REDACTED], Santa Monica, CA 904034066
[REDACTED], Cedar Falls, Iowa 506132335
[REDACTED], McHenry, IL 600503895
[REDACTED], Lyndonville, Vt 05851-9125
[REDACTED], Saint Louis, MO 63103-1652
[REDACTED], WACO, Texas 76705-2199
[REDACTED], Westcliffe, CO 81252
[REDACTED], New York, NY 10019
[REDACTED], Altamont, New York 12009
[REDACTED], Prospect, CT 6712
[REDACTED], Telluride, CO 81435-3627
[REDACTED], Eastampton, NJ 8060
[REDACTED], Morrison, IL 61270-9371
[REDACTED], Stafford, Texas 77497
[REDACTED], Round Rock, Texas 786647304
[REDACTED], Kenosha, WI 531422032
[REDACTED], Naples, Florida 34110
[REDACTED], New Rochelle, NY 10801-3840
[REDACTED], Olympia, WA 98502-3957
[REDACTED], Arvada, co 800022439
[REDACTED], Augusta, GA 30909
[REDACTED] Venice, ca 90291-3833
[REDACTED], Eugene, Or 97408-7389
[REDACTED], San Pedro, CALIFORNIA 90731
[REDACTED], Cordova, Tn 38016
[REDACTED] Encinitas, California 920244231

█████ New York, NY 10024
██████████████, Sylmar, CA 91342-2920
██████████████, Santa Clara, CA 95054-2243
██████████████, Kentfield, CA 94904
██████████████, Broomfield, CO 80020
██████████████, SANTA CRUZ, CA 95062
██████████████, East Lansing, Michigan 488231751
██████████████, Medina, Ohio 44256
██████████████, Wheat Ridge, Colorado 802156609
██████████████, Bethany, CT 6524
██████████████, Somerville, MA 02144-1842
██████████████, Boston, Massachusetts 20001
██████████████, Granada Hills, CA 913443614
██████████████, Grosse Pointe, Michigan 48236
██████████████, Harlingen, TX 78552
██████████████, Jupiter, Florida 33477
██████████████, Jacksonville, Arkansas 72076
██████████████, Brooklyn, NY 11209-5850
██████████████, Madison Heights, Michigan 48071
██████████████, Minneapolis, MN 554161976
██████████████, Chicago, IL 60614-5114
██████████████, Mansfield, TX 76063
██████████████, Golden, Colorado 80401
██████████████, Bellevue, NE 68005
██████████████, Riviera Beach, Florida 33404-2552
██████████████, Lafayette, CO 80026-2751
██████████████, San Clemente, CA 92672
█████ Chicago, Illinois 606181713
██████████████, Reisterstown, MD 21136-2428
██████████████, San Francisco, CA 94103
██████████████, Coventry, RI 2816
██████████████, Valley Center, CA 92082
██████████████, Flushing, NY 11354-2057
██████████████, Redding, CT 6896
██████████████, Morganton, North Carolina 28655
██████████████, Cedar Park, TX 78613
██████████████, Eagan, Mn. 551232535
██████████████, Kenosha, WI 531422032
██████████████, West Palm Beach, FL 33411-9130
██████████████, Fircrest, WA 984666640
██████████████, Fargo, North Dakota 58104
██████████████, Lyndhurst, OH 441243754
██████████████, Minneapolis, MN 55406
██████████████, Blackwood, NJ 80124904
██████████████, Coconut Creek, FL 33073
██████████████, Lyons, CO 80540
██████████████, Margate, Florida 33063
██████████████, Reston, VA 20191-1646
██████████████, Wichita, KS 67209-3517
██████████████, Peabody, massachusetts 01960-4553
██████████████, Eugene, OR 974016634
██████████████, Whitmore Lake, MI 481898280
██████████████, University Heights, Ohio 441231038
██████████████, Durango, CO 81301-5762

[REDACTED], Del Norte, CO 81132-8731
[REDACTED], Burlington, NJ 8016
[REDACTED], Damascus, Maryland 20872
[REDACTED], Birmingham, AL 35242
[REDACTED], Lexington, Ky 405155718
[REDACTED], Dayton, OH 454392710
[REDACTED], Hampton Bays, New York 119461109
[REDACTED], Winston Salem, NC 27106-4530
[REDACTED], Blaine, Washington 982309353
[REDACTED], Hudson, OH 44236-4449
[REDACTED], Drexel Hill, PA 190264506
[REDACTED], Hanover, NH 3755
[REDACTED] Manhattan Beach, CA 90266-7044
[REDACTED], Salem, Al. 36874
[REDACTED], Albuquerque, NM 87120
[REDACTED], Phoenix, Arizona 850085050
[REDACTED], Seattle, WA 981024625
[REDACTED], Pembroke Pines, Fl 33029
[REDACTED], Charlotte, NC 282178013
[REDACTED], Sheboygan, WI 53081
[REDACTED], Seattle, WA 98125-3705
[REDACTED], Chicago, IL 606604740
[REDACTED], Woodland, CA 95695-3698
[REDACTED], Palm Springs, FL 33461
[REDACTED], Bridgman, MI 49106
[REDACTED], Mineral Wells, Texas 76067-0826
[REDACTED] Mandeville, LA 70448
[REDACTED], WEST ALLIS, Wisconsin 53214-2003
[REDACTED], Garland, Texas 75046-0137
[REDACTED], Overland Park, Kansas 662232862
[REDACTED], Glenwood Springs, CO 81601
[REDACTED], Hallandale Beach, Fl 330097521
[REDACTED], Oxnard, California 930354606
[REDACTED], Needham, MA 02492-4216
[REDACTED], Brooklyn, NY 11218
[REDACTED] Philadelphia, PA 19012
[REDACTED], Jacksonville, FL 32216-1325
[REDACTED], Cliffside Pk, new jersey 70102008
[REDACTED], Wichita, Kansas 67211
[REDACTED], Seattle, WA 98118
[REDACTED], Rockaway Park, NY 11694-2685
[REDACTED], Weymouth, MA 2189
[REDACTED], Burien, Washington 98166
[REDACTED], Nashville, TN 372092306
[REDACTED] Tittle, Bronx, New. York 10462-2461
[REDACTED] Rochester, NY 14611-3605
[REDACTED], Shirrells Ford, NC 28673
[REDACTED], Brooklyn, NY 11219
[REDACTED], Watertown, Wisconsin 53098
[REDACTED], Santa Clarita, CA 91350-5887
[REDACTED], Orlando, Florida 32822
[REDACTED], Battle Ground, WA 98604
[REDACTED] Baldwinsville, NY 130271036
[REDACTED], Mckenna, WA 98558

[REDACTED], Williamsport, Pennsylvania 17702
[REDACTED], Pelican Rapids, Minnesota 56572
[REDACTED] Midvale, Utah 840472283
[REDACTED], Port Huron, MI 48060
[REDACTED], New Brighton, PA 150662888
[REDACTED], MOUNTAIN TOP, PA 18707
[REDACTED], Beverly Hills, CA 90210-3209
[REDACTED], Conway, SC 29526
[REDACTED], Snellville, GA 30078
[REDACTED], Palm Harbor, fl 346851403
[REDACTED], Dallas, TX 75252
[REDACTED], Northville, Mi 481672838
[REDACTED], Sterling Heights, MI 48313-5436
[REDACTED], BURBANK, California 91506
[REDACTED], Naples, FL 34113-8327
[REDACTED], Lewiston, ID 83501
[REDACTED], Chicago, IL 606604740
[REDACTED], Darrington, Washington 98241-9537
[REDACTED], Collinsville, Oklahoma 740216427
[REDACTED], Litchfield Park, AZ 85340-5555
[REDACTED], Overland Park, KS 66221
[REDACTED], Cheboygan, MI 49721
[REDACTED], Chesterfield, MO 63017-7285
[REDACTED], Chicago, IL 60660-4740
[REDACTED], Indian Trail, NC 28079-4175
[REDACTED], Birmingham, AL 35235
[REDACTED], Wakefield, ma 18804263
[REDACTED], Frisco, TX 750352115
[REDACTED], Verona, PA 151472721
[REDACTED], Columbus, IN 47201-4173
[REDACTED], Sacramento, Ca 958163901
[REDACTED], PALM HARBOR, FL 34684
[REDACTED], North Freedom, Wisconsin 53951
[REDACTED], Wake Forest, NC 275879224
[REDACTED], Sanford, fl 32773-6445
[REDACTED], Pleasantville, NY 10570-1405
[REDACTED], Lahaina, HI 96761-9300
[REDACTED], Fort Collins, CO 80524-1958
[REDACTED], Pennsauken, NJ 81091128
[REDACTED], NEW YORK, New York 100033680
[REDACTED], Great Falls, Montana 59403
[REDACTED], Portland, Oregon 97239
[REDACTED], New Mexico 871053942
[REDACTED], Port Huron, MI 48060
[REDACTED], Owatonna, minnesota 55060-5688
[REDACTED], Santa Rosa, CA 95404-2249
[REDACTED], Schertz, TX 78108
[REDACTED], New York, new york 10017
[REDACTED] Northbrook, IL 600627119
[REDACTED], Byron Center, MI 49315
[REDACTED], Baxter, MN 56425
[REDACTED], Minneapolis, MN 55408-2918
[REDACTED], Deshler, Ohio 43516
[REDACTED], New York, NY 10001

[REDACTED], Oakland, CA 94610-3365
[REDACTED] Fort Myers, FL 339081947
[REDACTED], Norwalk, CT 68552109
[REDACTED], Ballston Spa, New York 12020-2929
[REDACTED] Philadelphia, PA 191193116
[REDACTED], Jacksonville, NA - North America 32257
[REDACTED], Henderson, NV 89015-2442
[REDACTED], Buzzards Bay, MA 02532-4426
[REDACTED], Lyons, CO 805408107
[REDACTED], Chicago, Illinois 60625
[REDACTED], Cranston, RI 29101214
[REDACTED], Milford, CT 6460
[REDACTED], MELISSA, TX 75454
[REDACTED], Palatine, IL 60067
[REDACTED], Corrales, NM 87048-7433
[REDACTED], Wilmington, DE 19810
[REDACTED], Casselberry, FL 32707
[REDACTED], Brownstown Twp, MI 48183-5003
[REDACTED], Nyack, New York 10960-4913
[REDACTED], Seattle, WA 981072125
[REDACTED], Knoxville, TN 37922
[REDACTED], Saint Louis, MO 63130
[REDACTED], West Chester, PA 19382-4827
[REDACTED], Harrisburg, PA 17112
[REDACTED], Nyack, New York 109604913
[REDACTED], Media, PA 19063
[REDACTED], WHARTON, NJ 7885
[REDACTED], Bellingham, WA 98229-4428
[REDACTED], Weston, FL 333315041
[REDACTED], Acworth, GA 30101-7351
[REDACTED], Derry, NH 03038-0703
[REDACTED], Saint Louis, MO 63139
[REDACTED], Tucson, AZ 85757
[REDACTED], Franklinton, NC 275251501
[REDACTED], Huntington, New York 11743-1246
[REDACTED], Burnet, Texas 78611
[REDACTED] Somerville, MA 2145
[REDACTED], St Michaels, MD 216632107
[REDACTED], Norristown, PA 19403
[REDACTED], Walnut Creek, CA 945953727
[REDACTED], Boulder, Colorado 803039632
[REDACTED] Freehold, NJ 07728-8548
[REDACTED], Mansfield, IL 618546939
[REDACTED], Kent City, Michigan 49330
[REDACTED], Cedar Rapids, IA 52402-5223
[REDACTED], LAKE STEVENS, WA 98258
[REDACTED] New Hope, MN 554282816
[REDACTED], North Oaks, Minnesota 55127-6312
[REDACTED], Loveland, CO 80537
[REDACTED], Truth Or Consequences, New Mexico 87901
[REDACTED], Tacoma, WA 98444
[REDACTED], Seminole, FL 33772
[REDACTED], San Diego, CA 92115
[REDACTED], Quinalt, WA 98575

[REDACTED], Jupiter, FL 33477-6424
[REDACTED], Moss Beach, ca 940380203
[REDACTED], Tallahassee, FL 32304-2019
[REDACTED], West Simsbury, CT 6092
[REDACTED], Richmond, Virginia 232351603
[REDACTED] Ponchatoula, Louisiana 70454-6466
[REDACTED], Orlando, FLORIDA 32819
[REDACTED], San Mateo, CA 94402-4021
[REDACTED], Fort Wayne, In 468359120
[REDACTED], Escondido, CA 92026
[REDACTED], Ann Arbor, MI 48103-9612
[REDACTED], LOWELL, Oregon 97452
[REDACTED]z, Belleville, Il 622212532
[REDACTED], McDonald, Pennsylvania 150015003
[REDACTED], Kalkaska, MI 49646
[REDACTED], Easton, PA 18042-6600
[REDACTED], Depoe Bay, oregon 97341
[REDACTED] Morgan Hill, CA 950377893
[REDACTED], Austin, tx 787482425
[REDACTED] POST FALLS, ID 83854
[REDACTED], Durham, North Carolina 27703-9207
[REDACTED] Casper, Wyoming 82601-2832
[REDACTED], Hodgkins, Illinois 605254874
[REDACTED], Lexington, NC 27292-7180
[REDACTED] Strasburg, CO 80136
[REDACTED], Staunton, VA 24401
[REDACTED], Santa Barbara, CA 93101
[REDACTED], San Francisco, California 94109-6119
[REDACTED], Saint Francis, WI 53235-4313
[REDACTED], Phoenix, az 850071735
[REDACTED], Alexandria, MN 563084746
[REDACTED] Belding, MI 488091402
[REDACTED] Trenton, MI 481831711
[REDACTED] Sacramento, CA 95831
[REDACTED], Louisville, KY 40241
[REDACTED], Eureka, CA 95503-6751
[REDACTED], Tampa, FLORIDA 336298869
[REDACTED], Berkeley, CA 94707
[REDACTED], Oklahoma City, OK 73106
[REDACTED], Leland, MI 49654
[REDACTED], Temple Terrace, Florida 336171647
[REDACTED], Kenilworth, IL 60043-1260
[REDACTED], Los Angeles, Ca 90066-3202
[REDACTED], Durango, CO 81301-5891
[REDACTED] Thornton, Il 604761307
[REDACTED], ELMHURST, IL 60126-4050
[REDACTED], Auburn, GA 300112258
[REDACTED] Martinsburg, WV 25403-1661
[REDACTED], Sacramento, CA 95827
[REDACTED], Green Bay, Wisconsin 54302-4218
[REDACTED], Allegan, Michigan 49010
[REDACTED], Saint Paul, Minnesota 55116
[REDACTED], Scottsdale, Arizona 85251
[REDACTED], Salt Lake City, UT 841242158

[REDACTED], College Place, Washington 993241842
[REDACTED], St. Louis, Missouri 63116
[REDACTED], Columbus, OH 43206-2520
[REDACTED], Dalton, Georgia 30720
[REDACTED], Napa, CA 94558
[REDACTED], Raleigh, NC 27612
[REDACTED], Kettle Falls, WA 99141
[REDACTED], Russell, PA 163452805
[REDACTED], Chicago, IL 606266753
[REDACTED], Columbus, OH 43220-2827
[REDACTED], Tucson, AZ 85748-7610
[REDACTED], Helena, MT 59601-2618
[REDACTED], Long Beach, CA 908032303
[REDACTED], Kansas City, MO 64124
[REDACTED], Pace, FL 32571-1163
[REDACTED], San Jose, CA 95136-1804
[REDACTED], Herriman, Utah 840961235
[REDACTED], New York, New York 10001-4889
[REDACTED], Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19154
[REDACTED], McCordsville, IN 46055-9568
[REDACTED], Saint Louis, MO 63139
[REDACTED], Charlottesville, VA 22902
[REDACTED], Roscoe, IL 61073
[REDACTED], Allentown, PA 181022202
[REDACTED], Forestville, CA 95436
[REDACTED], Crandall, Texas 75114
[REDACTED], Holiday, Florida 34691-9729
[REDACTED], Spokane, WA 99207
[REDACTED], San Clemente, CA 926725474
[REDACTED], Ormond Beach, FL 337041702
[REDACTED], Macungie, PA 18062
[REDACTED], Lincoln, Lincoln Nebraska 68516-2309
[REDACTED], East Moline, Illinois 61244
[REDACTED], Big Pine Key, Florida 33043-6137
[REDACTED], Brooklyn, NY 112234933
[REDACTED], WARWICK, RI 02886-4838
[REDACTED], San Marcos, CA 92078
[REDACTED], Miami Beach, FL 33140-4320
[REDACTED], Alfred, NY 14802-0114
[REDACTED], Normandy, TN 37360
[REDACTED], Sacramento, California 95822
[REDACTED], Edmonds, Washington 980202964
[REDACTED], Providence, RI 2908
[REDACTED], Shoreview, MN 551263513
[REDACTED], Rock Hall, MD 216611662
[REDACTED], Bedford, MA 01730-1139
[REDACTED], DAYTON, ME 4005
[REDACTED], Wilbraham, MA 01095-9811
[REDACTED], Lakeland, FL 338101901
[REDACTED], North Carolina 27526
[REDACTED], Eureka Springs, AR 72631
[REDACTED], North Bethesda, Maryland 208522692
[REDACTED], Madison, WI 53704-3851
[REDACTED], Roseburg, OR 97471-9716

██████████, Fairbanks, Alaska 99701
██████████, Seattle, WA 98115
██████████, New York, NY 10010
██████████, Baltimore, Md 21214
██████████, Roseville, CA 95747-6651
██████████, Charlton, Massachusetts 15073311
██████████, Drexel Hill, PA 190265020
██████████, Grapevine, TX 76051
██████████, Brooklyn, NY 11228-2643
██████████, McFarland, Wisconsin 535588922
██████████, Salisbury, NC 28146
██████████, Atlantic Beach, FL 32233
██████████, VANCOUVER, WA 98661
██████████, Crestview, FL 32536
██████████ Little Rock, AR 72223
██████████, Tonawanda, NY 14150-3317
██████████, Bellevue, WA 98006
██████████, Austin, Tx 787386538
██████████, Leavenworth, KS 660487204
██████████, Fort Wayne, Indiana 46835-4221
██████████, Fort Lauderdale, Florida 333116231
██████████, Largo, FL 33778-4147
██████████, San Diego, CA 92102-1920
██████████, Pasadena, TX 77502
██████████, Pinckney, Michigan 481699562
██████████, Centereach, NY 11720-2874
██████████, Clermont, Florida 347112571
██████████, Newbury Park, CA 91320-4804
██████████, Dalton, GA 30721
██████████, Praha, OR 13000

Correspondence ID: 12465Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98274
United States of America

Outside Organization: Just checking to make sure I voted CON. Can't find my earlier submittal. Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 10:01:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I agree with the comments and concerns submitted by Val Mullen of Skagit Valley.

Correspondence ID: 12466Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wauconda, WA 98859
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 10:01:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We are completely against relocating Grissley Bears to North Cascades, this is iour back yard withing 50 miles, these bears will kill our livestock, amd at \$4500.00 per living cattle price it will help put us out of business. These bears are also a extreme danager to the public that hike and enjoy camping in North Cascades. I suggest relocating them to Down town Washington DC, OR Southern Border to help stop iillegal aliens coing into our country, WITHOUT tracking or vetting or Monitoring there location. DHD is gambling with future terrossim attack in our homeland. Stop the idea on relocating these bears. ANYWHERE.Except as noted or there current location.

Correspondence ID: 12467Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Packwood, WA 98361
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 10:10:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please don't add Grizzlies where they are not currently. Grizzlies and people have a poor interaction history. You are asking for problems. If people try and get close to an elk to take a picture with it imagine what happens when they do the same with a grizzly. They the bear will have to be destroyed. This is a bad idea. Please don't do this, for the people and the bears sake.

Correspondence ID: 12468Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Fall City, WA 98024
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 10:12:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support this initiative for the following reasons.

Some main points are;

They have been part of the ecosystem for 20,000 years and we don't have a complete eco system in the north cascades without them.

That it has been carefully researched and it will have minimal impact on people.

That grizzlies help to balance an eco system through spreading seeds in poop, fertilize soil, and keep other prey species in check.

Correspondence ID: 12469Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Gig Harbor, WA 98335
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 10:16:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Many years ago, grizzly bears roamed the North Cascades region of Washington. They carried a vital role in the ecosystem as a keystone species.

Tragically, these bears and many more predators were driven to the brink of extinction by humans. Today grizzlies are still functionally extinct in the North Cascades. It's time to bring them back!

The return of grizzly bears to their historic range is long overdue. We need to restore the North Cascades ecosystem, and to enable this iconic species to benefit the region and continue inspiring future generations.

As a resident of Washington State, I am excited at the prospect of grizzly bears returning to the North Cascades ecosystem. Wherever grizzlies thrive, so does wildness, clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife.

I support restoring grizzly bears to the North Cascades via Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation - provided that the accompanying 10(J) rule promotes the recovery of the population, ensures management is humane, prioritizes non-lethal management tools and enables humans and grizzly bears to coexist. Properly developed and implemented, the 10(J) rule will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

As a keystone species, grizzlies will have a vital role in the North Cascades ecosystem. It is crucial that we step forward NOW and protect these wild species and restore the natural ecosystems!

Correspondence ID: 12470Project:112008Document:132104

Address: La Conner, WA 98257-
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 10:17:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not bring grizzly bears back to the North Cascades. The prospect of reintroducing grizzlies to the North Cascades saddens me because my family will visit less and have less interest in the park. I've spent many days with my sons in the park, without fear of dangerous human predators, and that will all change with the presence of grizzlies. These impressive animals have roamed the area for roughly 200,000 years, and are a natural part of the environment but as they were pushed out, people moved in to enjoy the natural beauty of the environment. If grizzlies move back in, many, including me, will stay away. The project also creates new conflict that is not currently an issues. Ranchers, farmers, and other area residents don't need new problems to deal with. I don't think creating problems is the intent of the National Park Service but it will be the result for many, including our family. Please do not bring grizzly bears back to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 12471Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Washington, DC 20005
United States of America

Outside Organization: National Wildlife Federation Action Fund Non-Governmental

Received: Nov,09 2023 10:18:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Director Williams and Director Sams,

Below are 997 of 8,415 comments submitted by advocates and supporters of the National Wildlife Federation Action Fund in regards to the Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/Environmental Impact Statement, North Cascades.

Thank you for releasing an environmental impact statement and draft plan that outlines a path forward to recover and restore grizzly bears in the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE).

Grizzly bears belong in the North Cascades. They roamed the region for thousands of years and their eventual decline was a loss to biodiversity and to the cultural traditions of First Nations and Indigenous communities throughout the Pacific Northwest and British Columbia. Restoring and managing grizzlies in the North Cascades is an important step in bringing the full ecosystem back together and it's a critical step to larger grizzly bear recovery efforts in the lower 48.

I'm grateful for your leadership on this issue and encourage you to continue the recovery process in coordination with Tribal governments, local partners, and other stakeholders. Doing so will ensure that grizzly bears maintain a path towards full recovery for the benefit of future generations.

Sincerely,

██████████, Cold Spring, NY 105163921

██████████, New York, New York 100750561

██████████, Northglenn, CO 802331058

██████████, Chicago, Illinois 607073330

██████████, Chicago, IL 60631-1646

██████████, Tonasket, WA 98855-1051

██████████, Owasso, Oklahoma 74055-7102

██████████, Clinton, MD 207352341

██████████, Janesville, WI 53548

██████████, Arlington, MA 2474

[REDACTED], Woodbridge, VA 22193-3239
[REDACTED], Stanwood, WA 98292-6268
[REDACTED], nj 8210
[REDACTED], Seattle, Wa 981224104
[REDACTED], Palm Beach, Florida 334803069
[REDACTED], Albuquerque, NM 87120-2488
[REDACTED], Shell Lake, WI 54871-4402
[REDACTED], Columbia, SC 29229-7158
[REDACTED], Greensboro, Maryland 21639
[REDACTED], Rio Rancho, New Mexico 87144
[REDACTED], Castaic, California 91383
[REDACTED], San Francisco, CA 94109-7266
[REDACTED], Bishop, california 935142944
[REDACTED], Columbiaville, Michigan 48421
[REDACTED], LAGUNA NIGUEL, CA 92677
[REDACTED], San Jose, CA 95139-1162
[REDACTED], Dallas, Tx 75225-7402
[REDACTED], North Olmsted, Ohio 440703071
[REDACTED], Pittsboro, North Carolina 27312
[REDACTED], HIGH SPRINGS, FL 32643
[REDACTED] Salem, OR 97302
[REDACTED], Midlothian, Virginia 23112-6433
[REDACTED], Ogden, ut 844059265
[REDACTED], West Allis, WI 53227
[REDACTED], Detroit, Michigan 48205-1430
[REDACTED], Brown City, MI 484168238
[REDACTED], DACULA, GA 30019
[REDACTED], Murchison, Tx 75778
[REDACTED] Wabasha, Mn 559811911
[REDACTED], Pardeeville, Wisconsin 53954
[REDACTED], Branford, ct 06405-1355
[REDACTED], Coeur D Alene, ID 83814
[REDACTED], Franktown, CO 80116-8586
[REDACTED], Lincoln, Ne 68516
[REDACTED], Columbia, MO 652020154
[REDACTED], Three Rivers, California 932710453
[REDACTED], Kendall Park, Nj 88241244
[REDACTED], Bronx, new york 104573761
[REDACTED], Richmond, VA 232244138
[REDACTED], Lake Worth, FL 334676808
[REDACTED], Burlington, NC 27217
[REDACTED], Milledgeville, Ga 31061-8256
[REDACTED], Scottsdale, Arizona 85253-5328
[REDACTED], Lovettsville, Virginia 20180-2431
[REDACTED], Reseda, CA 91335
[REDACTED], Alhambra, CA 918034517
[REDACTED], Indianapolis, Indiana 46219
[REDACTED], Apache Junction, Arizona 85120-5016
[REDACTED], Fort Collins, CO 80525
[REDACTED], Fremont, CA 945395646
[REDACTED], Fort Walton Beach, FL 32548
[REDACTED], Ocean City, NJ 82262026
[REDACTED], Niagara Falls, NY 143042536
[REDACTED], Reno, NV 89509

[REDACTED], Norfolk, VA 235172266
[REDACTED], Dickinson, TX 77539
[REDACTED], Media, Pa 190635803
[REDACTED] Portland, OR 97209-3536
[REDACTED], Boca Raton, Fl 33431-4463
[REDACTED], Ashland, OR 97520
[REDACTED], Columbia, Missouri 65202
[REDACTED], Soquel, ca 950739729
[REDACTED], Spokane, WA 992236333
[REDACTED], Chicago, IL 606301507
[REDACTED], Hartsdale, ny 10530-1348
[REDACTED], Phoenix, Arizona 850761048
[REDACTED], Oconomowoc, WI 530662680
[REDACTED], Leicester, Massachusetts 1524
[REDACTED], Edinburg, VA 22824-2964
[REDACTED], Pflugerville, TX 78660-5964
[REDACTED], Pacific Grove, CA 939503146
[REDACTED], Lombard, IL 60148
[REDACTED], Sherman Oaks, CA 914114079
[REDACTED], Clearwater, Fl 33756-9194
[REDACTED], Pensacola, FL 325033051
[REDACTED], Sanford, MI 48657-9605
[REDACTED], Woodland Hills, CA 913676013
[REDACTED], Berkeley, CA 94708-1902
[REDACTED], Winchester, TN 37398
[REDACTED], Chicago, IL 60615-1921
[REDACTED], Kahoka, MO 63445
[REDACTED], NH 3077
[REDACTED], Conyers, GA 300945867
[REDACTED], Marvin, North Carolina 28173-6967
[REDACTED], Missouri 65202
[REDACTED], Amherst, MA 1002
[REDACTED], Midland, MI 48642-8312
[REDACTED], Lexington, MA 2420
[REDACTED], Elgin, IL 601204344
[REDACTED] Studio City, ca 91604-1681
[REDACTED], Seattle, MA 98125
[REDACTED], Newton, MA 24601631
[REDACTED], West Sacramento, Ca 95691
[REDACTED], Woodridge, IL 60517-1730
[REDACTED], Mohawk, ny 13407-3906
[REDACTED], Bainbridge Island, WA 98110
[REDACTED], Athens, GA 306012316
[REDACTED], Lancaster, CA 93536-8321
[REDACTED], Pittsburgh, PA 15209
[REDACTED], Westernport, MD 215622404
[REDACTED], GLOVERSVILLE, New York 12078
[REDACTED], Flora, Illinois 62839
[REDACTED], Reston, VA 20191
[REDACTED], New Rochelle, NY 108051158
[REDACTED], Westminster, CO 80021
[REDACTED], Las Vegas, NV 89135
[REDACTED], Billings, MT 59106
[REDACTED], Grants Pass, or 975276390

[REDACTED], Petersburg, VA 23805
[REDACTED], Apache Junction, AZ 85119-9311
[REDACTED], Gibsonia, PA 150444903
[REDACTED] Boise, ID 83709
[REDACTED], Philadelphia, PA 191513008
[REDACTED], Indianapolis, IN 46227
[REDACTED], Aliso Viejo, CA 926566203
[REDACTED], Austin, Tx 78741-5125
[REDACTED], Dallas, TX 75229-6901
[REDACTED] Aldie, Va 201055661
[REDACTED], Hempstead, New York 11550
[REDACTED], Bedford, NH 31106623
[REDACTED], JOLIET, Illinois 60435
[REDACTED], Hamilton, NJ 8690
[REDACTED], North Baldwin, NY 11510-1715
[REDACTED], Burlington, NC 272159782
[REDACTED]t, Inglewood, CA 90302-5854
[REDACTED], Casa Grande, AZ 85194
[REDACTED], Ankeny, IA 50023-8301
[REDACTED], MOBILE, AL 36604
[REDACTED], Pittsburgh, PA 15228
[REDACTED], Bristol, vermont 05443-5379
[REDACTED] Lone Tree, CO 80124
[REDACTED], Deerfield Beach, Fl 33442
[REDACTED], Arlington, Va 222131611
[REDACTED], N Syracuse, New York 13212
[REDACTED], Shoreview, MN 551262319
[REDACTED], San Francisco, CA 941182452
[REDACTED], Plum, Pa 152391030
[REDACTED], Saline, Mi 481768723
[REDACTED], Denver, CO 80211-2765
[REDACTED], Douglas, Ma 01516-2124
[REDACTED], Wildwood, MO 630401913
[REDACTED], Wilmington, NC 28409
[REDACTED], Lakewood, CO 80228
[REDACTED], Reno, NV 89509-3000
[REDACTED], York, PA 174049630
[REDACTED], Malibu, CA 90265-5630
[REDACTED], Minneapolis, MN 55416
[REDACTED], Portland, OR 97211-7235
[REDACTED], Staten Island, NY 103123619
[REDACTED] Beverly Hills, ca 902130437
[REDACTED]KS, Appleton, wi 549158129
[REDACTED] Portland, OR 97216-3009
[REDACTED], No, New York 13833
[REDACTED], Colorado Springs, CO 80904-2841
[REDACTED], Auburn, AL 368306922
[REDACTED] Fitchburg, MA 01420-4848
[REDACTED], Campbell, CA 95008
[REDACTED], West Sacramento, CA 95691-5462
[REDACTED], Tucson, AZ 85743
[REDACTED] Whitestown, IN 46075
[REDACTED], PHOENIX, AZ 85008
[REDACTED], Spokane Valley, Washinton 992122624

[REDACTED], Pembroke Pines, FL 330294505
[REDACTED], Irvine, CA 92620
[REDACTED], Wichita, KS 67205-1923
[REDACTED], Elizabeth, NJ 72011645
[REDACTED], Pagosa Springs, CO 81147-3483
[REDACTED], Chico, CA 95973-9771
[REDACTED], Tacoma, Wa 98407
[REDACTED], Northampton, MA 01060-1709
[REDACTED], Fayetteville, AR 72701
[REDACTED], Fairview, Utah 84629
[REDACTED], Saint Louis, Missouri 631293564
[REDACTED], Council Bluffs, IA 51501
[REDACTED], Manlius, NY 131041106
[REDACTED], Portland, OR 972136525
[REDACTED], Grand Prairie, Texas 75052
[REDACTED], Hilliard, OH 43026
[REDACTED], Albany, NY 122101026
[REDACTED], Safety Harbor, FL 346954033
[REDACTED], Everett, MA 21492470
[REDACTED], Arlington, Texas 760122112
[REDACTED], Keego Harbor, MI 483201342
[REDACTED], Cambridge, MA 2138
[REDACTED], Hudson, FL 346671535
[REDACTED], Aurora, CO 80013
[REDACTED], Southington, Ct 6489
[REDACTED], New York, NY 10075
[REDACTED], Wichita, KS 672152503
[REDACTED], Huntersville, North Carolina 280785332
[REDACTED], Deltona, Fl 327252618
[REDACTED], Vancouver, WA 98682-9548
[REDACTED], Carolina Beach, NC 28428
[REDACTED], Brookfield, Illinois 605131530
[REDACTED], Cobleskill, NY 12043
[REDACTED], Garfield, New Jersey 7026
[REDACTED], Beloit, WI 53511
[REDACTED], Palatine, Il 600747610
[REDACTED], Parma, OH 44134
[REDACTED], New York, NY 10023
[REDACTED], Dallas, Tx 75204-3459
[REDACTED], Morrisville, Pennsylvania 19067
[REDACTED], Kingston, MA 02364-2291
[REDACTED], Lomita, California 907171717
[REDACTED], Bellevue, WA 980076905
[REDACTED], Sacramento, CA 95825
[REDACTED], Lewistown, PA 17044
[REDACTED], Las Vegas, NV 89117-2346
[REDACTED], Lisle, IL 605323401
[REDACTED], Kentwood, MI 49512-7903
[REDACTED], Stillwater, Mn 55082-1537
[REDACTED], Elmhurst, NY 113734618
[REDACTED], Muskegon, Mi 49441-1119
[REDACTED], Bentonville, AR 72712-7423
[REDACTED], Conroe, Texas 77385-3415
[REDACTED], Chicago, IL 60615-3145

[REDACTED], Jacksonville, FL 322254437
[REDACTED], Cincinnati, Ohio 45238-5593
[REDACTED], Orinda, CA 94563-3922
[REDACTED], Keedysville, MD 21756
[REDACTED], Aurora, Illinois 60504-5974
[REDACTED], Jamaica Plain, Massachusetts 02130-3664
[REDACTED], Vacaville, CA 95687-5993
[REDACTED], Mount Vernon, Washington 982744047
[REDACTED], Gouldsboro, Maine 4607
[REDACTED], Northridge, CA 91325-2407
[REDACTED], North Brunswick, NJ 89022859
[REDACTED], Jefferson, Maryland 21755
[REDACTED], Oslo, OR 1251
[REDACTED], Whitinsville, MA 01588-1081
[REDACTED], Westland, MI 48185
[REDACTED], North Hills, CA 91343
[REDACTED], Tallahassee, FL 323154183
[REDACTED], Torrance, CA 90501-3801
[REDACTED], Lincoln City, Oregon 973672472
[REDACTED], Janesville, MN 560485502
[REDACTED], Gig Harbor, Washington 98335-7933
[REDACTED], PA 15090-8780
[REDACTED], Colorado Springs, CO 80916-3140
[REDACTED], Chicago, IL 60622
[REDACTED], Aptos, CA 95003
[REDACTED], Gallatin, Tennessee 370668257
[REDACTED], Melissa, Texas 75454-2260
[REDACTED], Los Angeles, CA 90025-3978
[REDACTED], Bentonville, AR 72712-4481
[REDACTED], Clarksville, OH 45113
[REDACTED], Baltimore, MD 212313560
[REDACTED], Suwanee, GA 30024-6683
[REDACTED], NOTTINGHAM, NH 3290
[REDACTED], Vancouver, WA 986851339
[REDACTED], Deming, New Mexico 88030
[REDACTED], Taunton, MA 27807501
[REDACTED], Winter, Wisconsin 54896
[REDACTED], Center Conway, NH 03813-0267
[REDACTED], West Des Moines, IA 50266-3313
[REDACTED], Gulf Breeze, FLORIDA 32563-9727
[REDACTED], Bend, OR 97701-7070
[REDACTED], RI 02888-1528
[REDACTED], Live Oak, FL 32064
[REDACTED], Mantua, OH 44255
[REDACTED], Whitethorn, CA 95589-0201
[REDACTED], Glendale, New York 853086346
[REDACTED], Hobe Sound, Florida 33455
[REDACTED], Fort Worth, TX 76104
[REDACTED], Philadelphia, PA 191361227
[REDACTED], Suffolk, VA 23434
[REDACTED], Charlottesville, VA 229036572
[REDACTED], Springfield, Vermont 5156
[REDACTED], Sault Sainte Marie, MI 49783
[REDACTED], Albany, NY 12222

██████████, Destin, Florida 32541-3106
██████████, Austin, Texas 78745
██████████, Hampton Bays, NY 11946-1109
██████████, San Diego, CA 92123
██████████, Fox Point, WI 532173860
██████████, Parsippany, NJ 70541826
██████████, Gahanna, OH 432301975
██████████, Logansport, Indiana 46947-1543
██████████, Aguas Buenas, PR 703
██████████, Roseburg, Oregon 97470
██████████, Williamsport, Pa 1771
██████████, Victor, Idaho 834553600
██████████, Everett, Was 982043885
██████████, Roberts, Wi 540238327
██████████, Catonsville, Md 21228-2001
██████████, Aurora, CO 80011
██████████, Aurora, co 802473506
██████████, Boulder, CO 80303-2610
██████████, Roscoe, IL 610737120
██████████, Saxtons River, VT 5154
██████████, Asheboro, NC 27205-0981
██████████, Denver, CO 802205170
██████████, New York, NY 100241221
██████████, Raleigh, NC 27609-6018
██████████, Columbia, MD 210455137
██████████, Cedar Hill, Missouri 630163525
██████████, Long Beach, CA 90808
██████████, itag, Alexandria, VA 223101354
██████████, Trinidad, Ca 95570-0715
██████████, Salt Lake City, Utah 84103
██████████, Columbus, OH 43204
██████████, San Francisco, Ca 94110-5622
██████████, Candler, NC 287158193
██████████, TOOELE, UT 84074-3260
██████████, Tacoma, Washington 98407
██████████, Los Angeles, Ca 900245707
██████████, Gilroy, CA 95020-7726
██████████, Plymouth, MI 48170
██████████, Papillion, NE 68046-2541
██████████, St Petersburg, florida 337107911
██████████, Shepherdstown, West Virginia 25443-4663
██████████, Hoschton, GA 305488237
██████████, Maricopa, AZ 85138
██████████, Pine River, wi 54965-9402
██████████, Lawrenceville, GA 30043
██████████, Bainbridge Island, WA 98110-3474
██████████, Van Buren, Arkansas 72956-3019
██████████, Las Vegas, NV 891351758
██████████, Sicklerville, NJ 08081-1074
██████████, Ventura, CA 93004
██████████, Laguna Niguel, CA 92677
██████████, Haddon Township, nj 08108-3401
██████████, La Mesa, ca 91941-6923
██████████, Steamboat Springs, Colorado 80487-9735

[REDACTED], Miami, florida 33133-3347
[REDACTED], Flemington, NJ 8822
[REDACTED], Evansville, Indiana 47714-4058
[REDACTED], Norfolk, VA 23503
[REDACTED], Bath, PA 18014
[REDACTED], Knoxville, TN 37919
[REDACTED], Edmonton, Alberta T5x4g7
[REDACTED], Commack, NY 11725
[REDACTED], Santa Maria, CA 93455
[REDACTED], Jesup, GA 31545
[REDACTED], Dallas, Texas 75229
[REDACTED], Dearborn Heights, MI 48125-3317
[REDACTED], Boerne, TX 78006
[REDACTED], Carmichael, CA 95608-7313
[REDACTED], St Petersburg, FL 337011616
[REDACTED], Santa Barbara, CA 93101
[REDACTED], Aloha, OREGON 970074732
[REDACTED], Carnation, WA 98014-5800
[REDACTED], Davis, California 956161269
[REDACTED], La Selva Beach, CA 950761609
[REDACTED], Douglassville, PA 19518
[REDACTED], Fonda, NY 12068-5409
[REDACTED], Bealeton, VA 22712
[REDACTED], Beverly Hills, California 90210
[REDACTED], Sandy, Ut 84094
[REDACTED], Camden, DE 19934-4506
[REDACTED], Pace, Florida 325716787
[REDACTED], Riverside, CA 92506-5843
[REDACTED], Canon City, COLORADO 81212-2271
[REDACTED], Canadensis, PA 18325-7797
[REDACTED], Santa Monica, CA 90403
[REDACTED], Louisville KY, KY 40241
[REDACTED], Downey, CA 90240
[REDACTED], Las Vegas, Nevada 89121-3904
[REDACTED], Solvang, Ca 93463
[REDACTED], Farmingdale, NY 11735-3720
[REDACTED], Candler, NC 28715-8834
[REDACTED], SEBASTOPOL, CA 95472
[REDACTED], Portland, Oregon 97206-4117
[REDACTED], Highland Park, IL 60035-5244
[REDACTED], Pittsburgh, Pa 15241-3506
[REDACTED], Westminster, CA 92683
[REDACTED], Bellows Falls, VT 5101
[REDACTED], Lexington, KY 40502
[REDACTED], Vancouver, WA 98682-1985
[REDACTED], Friday Harbor, Wa 98250
[REDACTED], Ridgewood, New York 11385-3319
[REDACTED], Belvidere, il 61008-3813
[REDACTED], Fairfax, VA 22030-6531
[REDACTED], Edmond, Oklahoma 73013-7575
[REDACTED], Crestwood, KY 40014
[REDACTED], Glendale, California 91202-2434
[REDACTED], Arvada, CO 800078027
[REDACTED], Tucson, Az 857182417

[REDACTED], Valley Center, CA 920825016
[REDACTED], Dunnellon, FL 34431
[REDACTED], Austin, TX 78724
[REDACTED], Vashon, WA 98070
[REDACTED], Council Bluffs, IA 51503
[REDACTED], Monument, CO 80132
[REDACTED], Wilmington, Delaware 19808-4846
[REDACTED], PHILADELPHIA, PA 19130
[REDACTED], Kissimmee, FL 34747
[REDACTED], Jacksonville, Florida 32226-4770
[REDACTED], Longmont, Colorado 805014852
[REDACTED], Attica, MI 48412-9314
[REDACTED], Tryon, NC 28782
[REDACTED], Nederland, CO 804669600
[REDACTED], Cathedral City, CA 92234
[REDACTED], Lock Haven, PA 177458153
[REDACTED], SOUTHAMPTON, PA 18966
[REDACTED], Lake Villa, Illinois 60046-6403
[REDACTED], Ojai, CA 930231553
[REDACTED], Chicago, Illinois 60605
[REDACTED], Spring Branch, TX 78070
[REDACTED], Mabank, Texas 75156-7201
[REDACTED], Corvallis, OR 973309783
[REDACTED], Tryon, NC 28782-5554
[REDACTED], Franklin, Ohio 450055811
[REDACTED], Sheridan, WY 82801
[REDACTED], Stillwater, OK 74075
[REDACTED], San Carlos, CA 94070-4827
[REDACTED], Carbondale, Colorado 816231738
[REDACTED], Phoenix, arizona 85003-1251
[REDACTED], Newark, California 94560
[REDACTED], Tucson, Arizona 85704-****
[REDACTED], Foothill Ranch, CA 926102429
[REDACTED], Boulder, Colorado 80304-2825
[REDACTED], Albuquerque, NM 87123
[REDACTED], La Vale, MD 21502
[REDACTED], Wyoming, MN 55092
[REDACTED], Addison, IL 60101-4847
[REDACTED], POMPANO BEACH, Florida 33060
[REDACTED], ALTADENA, CA 91001
[REDACTED], Hot Springs, VA 24445
[REDACTED], San Diego, CA 92130
[REDACTED], Monte Sereno, CA 95030-4219
[REDACTED], Monee, Illinois 604499548
[REDACTED], Tuckahoe, New York 107072119
[REDACTED], Austin, Texas 787492214
[REDACTED], Naples, Florida 34102
[REDACTED], Longview, Wa 986321729
[REDACTED] Torto, Rio De Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro 22270
[REDACTED], San Antonio, Texas 78209
[REDACTED], Gaithersburg Montgom, MD 20879
[REDACTED], Orlando, FL 328045748
[REDACTED], Bethlehem, PA 18020
[REDACTED], Harmony, FL 347736077

██████████, Santa Fe, NM 87505
██████████, Denver, CO 802234308
██████████, Pompano Beach, Florida 33064-1403
██████████, Champaign, IL 61821-4521
██████████, Hopewell Junction, NY 125335705
██████████, Story, WY 82842
██████████, Chesterfield, Nh 03443-0044
██████████, Beaverton, OR 970051360
██████████, New Philadelphia, oh 446636884
██████████, Hampton, Virginia 23666-5024
██████████, Englewood, NJ 76312603
██████████, Ramer, TN 38367
██████████, Van Nuys, California 91401
██████████, Silver City, NM 88061
██████████, Ellsworth, ME 46053471
██████████, Egg Harbor Township, Nj 82347806
██████████, Newnan, Georgia 30263
██████████, Boise, Idaho 83702-1218
██████████, Keansburg, NJ 7734
██████████, Torrington, CT 67904453
██████████, Sa, California 95053
██████████, San Francisco, CA 94109
██████████, Middleton, MA 1949
██████████, Denver, CO 80204
██████████, Phoenix, AZ 85008
██████████, New York, NY 10019
██████████, Ada, mi 49301-9710
██████████, Cannon Beach, OR no 97110-0108
██████████, Houston, Texas 77080-1209
██████████, Bethlehem, CT 06751-1721
██████████, Holladay, Utah 84121
██████████, Wayne, PA 19087
██████████, Lehigh Acres, Fl 339732097
██████████, Rochester, NY 14607
██████████, Shelton, WA 98584-7789
██████████, Chicago, IL 60660-4396
██████████, Calabasas, CA 91372-8212
██████████, Norwalk, CT 06855-2402
██████████, Vallejo, CA 94591
██████████, Ventura, CA 93001
██████████, New Port Richey, Florida 34753
██████████, Vero Beach, Fl. 32963
██████████, Las Vegas, Nevada 89144
██████████, New Whiteland, IN 461841824
██████████, Fort Wayne, IN 468148226
██████████, Spotsylvania, VA 225534145
██████████, Hopkins, MN 55343-4119
██████████, Falmouth, MA 2540
██████████, Appleton, WI 549152701
██████████, Mesa, AZ, United States 85213

Address: Washington, DC 20005
United States of America
Outside Organization: National Wildlife Federation Action Fund Non-Governmental
Received: Nov,09 2023 10:29:47
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Director Williams and Director Sams,

Below are 1,001 of 8,415 comments submitted by advocates and supporters of the National Wildlife Federation Action Fund in regards to the Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/Environmental Impact Statement, North Cascades.

Thank you for releasing an environmental impact statement and draft plan that outlines a path forward to recover and restore grizzly bears in the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE).

Grizzly bears belong in the North Cascades. They roamed the region for thousands of years and their eventual decline was a loss to biodiversity and to the cultural traditions of First Nations and Indigenous communities throughout the Pacific Northwest and British Columbia. Restoring and managing grizzlies in the North Cascades is an important step in bringing the full ecosystem back together and it's a critical step to larger grizzly bear recovery efforts in the lower 48.

I'm grateful for your leadership on this issue and encourage you to continue the recovery process in coordination with Tribal governments, local partners, and other stakeholders. Doing so will ensure that grizzly bears maintain a path towards full recovery for the benefit of future generations.

Sincerely,

██████████, Asheville, NC 28806-4103
██████████, Highland, Ca 923462130
██████████, Longmont, CO 80501-6923
██████████, Saint Cloud, Fl 34769
██████████, Scottsdale, AZ 85250-5428
██████████, Niagara Falls, Ny 14305-1239
██████████, Holliston, MA 01746-1624
██████████, Ft Oglethorpe, Georgia 307421132
██████████, West Chester, PA 19380
██████████, Wheat Ridge, CO 80033
██████████, DeKalb, Illinois 60115
██████████, Coarsegold, Ca 93614-1104
██████████, Ithaca, New York 14850-4136
██████████, Golden, CO 80401-6904
██████████, Alexandria, VA 22310-1354
██████████, Lafayette, CA 945494210
██████████, Hubbardston, MA 1452
██████████, New Braunfels, Texas 78132-3660
██████████, Colorado Springs, Colorado 80906
██████████, Merced, Ca 953400750
██████████, Raleigh NC 27604, nc 276042523
██████████, Urbana, Il 61801-3933
██████████, Wayne, MI 48184-2258
██████████, Goleta, CA 93117-1004
██████████, Lake Forest, ca 92630-7405
██████████, Grand Forks, ND 58201-3102
██████████, Simi Valley, CA 93063
██████████, Mechanicsburg, PA 17050
██████████, Key Largo, FL 33037
██████████, Hiram, GA 30141

[REDACTED], Detroit, MI 48221
[REDACTED] Santa Barbara, ca 931052740
[REDACTED] Columbia, MO 65203
[REDACTED] Yonkers, New York 10704
[REDACTED] San Mateo, Ca 94401-2510
[REDACTED], Laguna Beach, Ca 92651-6774
[REDACTED], Vancouver, Wa 986838943
[REDACTED], Clearwater, FL 337601550
[REDACTED] Bus, Dippoldiswalde, Germany 1744
[REDACTED], Ballwin, Mo 63011-4155
[REDACTED], Gulf Breeze, FL 32561-4214
[REDACTED], Preston, CT 06365-8509
[REDACTED], Gainesville, FL 32653
[REDACTED], Heflin, AL 36264
[REDACTED], Redondo Beach., CA 90278, CA 90278
[REDACTED], Santa Monica, CA 90409
[REDACTED] Oak Park, MICHIGAN 48237
[REDACTED], Milmay, New Jersey 8340
[REDACTED], Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19128-2526
[REDACTED], Phoenix, Az 85044-9138
[REDACTED], Joliet, Illinois 60432-9663
[REDACTED] ny, Lewes, DE 199585588
[REDACTED], Norwalk, CT 06850-3323
[REDACTED], Rio Rancho, New Mexico 871242002
[REDACTED], Bellingham, WA 982254844
[REDACTED], Soldotna, Alaska 99669-6300
[REDACTED], Fresno, California 93721-2513
[REDACTED], Sussex, WI 530892274
[REDACTED], Columbia, MD 21044
[REDACTED], Palos Hills, Illinois 60465+1658
[REDACTED], Lakeland, FL 33813
[REDACTED], Needham, MA 2492
[REDACTED], Seattle, Washington 981992110
[REDACTED], Laguna Woods, California 92637
[REDACTED], Temecula, CA 92592-2644
[REDACTED], Bloomington, in 474019430
[REDACTED], Fishkill, NY 12524
[REDACTED] elis, Seattle, WA 98136
[REDACTED], Lake Oswego, OREGON 97035-2339
[REDACTED], Saratoga Springs, NY 12866
[REDACTED], Portland, OR 972152528
[REDACTED], Austin, TX 78727-1623
[REDACTED], Tipp City, OH 453717611
[REDACTED], Haverford, Pa 190411208
[REDACTED], Sunnyvale, CA 94088-4605
[REDACTED], Cheshire, CT 06410-2157
[REDACTED], Columbia, Missouri 65203-1292
[REDACTED], Fall River, MA 27202061
[REDACTED], Alexandria, VA 22301-1711
[REDACTED], Chicago, Illinois 606313918
[REDACTED], Brooklyn, NY 11226-1783
[REDACTED], Alamo, California 94507-1926
[REDACTED], Tucson, Arizona 85717-1624
[REDACTED], Bronx, New York 104676069

[REDACTED] PhD MPA, Bloomington, IN 47404
[REDACTED], Gainesville, FL 32608
[REDACTED], Keizer, Oregon 973033564
[REDACTED], Waltham, MA 24512228
[REDACTED], Santa Cruz, CA 95060
[REDACTED], SOUTHBURY, CT 6488
[REDACTED], Eagan, MN 55122-2154
[REDACTED], Camarillo, california 93012-5602
[REDACTED], Tucson, Arizona 85712
[REDACTED], Mamaroneck, NY 10543
[REDACTED], LUMBERTON, New Jersey 8048
[REDACTED], Canton, Mi 481881533
[REDACTED] South Lake Tahoe, CA 96158
[REDACTED], Boston, MA 02114-1406
[REDACTED], Frankford, Delaware 199453733
[REDACTED], Burlington, Wi 531052084
[REDACTED], Brooklyn, NY 11230
[REDACTED], Walnut Creek, CA 94595
[REDACTED], Black Diamond, 98010 98010
[REDACTED], Richmond, Virginia 23230
[REDACTED], Lawrenceville, NJ 86481448
[REDACTED], Brookline, MA 24462614
[REDACTED], San Rafael, Calif 949012560
[REDACTED], Plainfield, illinois 605866965
[REDACTED], Bay Village, Ohio 441401113
[REDACTED], Colorado Springs, CO 80909-1446
[REDACTED], Round Rock, Texas 78664-4529
[REDACTED], Chesterfield, VA 238386287
[REDACTED], Concord, ca 945212910
[REDACTED], East Hampton, CT 64241356
[REDACTED], San Jose, Ca 951262533
[REDACTED], Hershey, Pennsylvania 17033-2118
[REDACTED], Millsboro, Delaware 19966-2521
[REDACTED], Thousand Oaks, CA 91360-7038
[REDACTED], Pierrefonds, Quebec H8Y3H6
[REDACTED], Chelsea, MI 48118
[REDACTED], Peekskill, NY 10566
[REDACTED], Tinley Park, IL 604771500
[REDACTED], Havertown, Pennsylvania 19083-3740
[REDACTED] II, Marietta, GA 30064
[REDACTED], Austin, TX 78757-2240
[REDACTED], Mountlake Terrace, WA 980432449
[REDACTED], Downingtown, PA 19335-4007
[REDACTED], Gaithersburg, Maryland 20877-4127
[REDACTED], Nokomis, Florida 34275-5346
[REDACTED], Anderson, south carolina 296212595
[REDACTED], Santa Maria, CA 93454-1567
[REDACTED], Cypress, TX 77433
[REDACTED], NJ 07733-3119
[REDACTED], St.Louis Park, MN 55416
[REDACTED], Avon Lake, OH 44012-1445
[REDACTED], Plainfield Charter Township, MI 49306-9711
[REDACTED] Davenport, Houston, TX 77043-4718
[REDACTED], Trustee Monmouth County Audubon, Red Bank, NJ 77010542

[REDACTED], St Petersburg, FL 337026424
[REDACTED], Victorville, CA 92392
[REDACTED], San Rafael, CA 94903-3107
[REDACTED], Denver, Co 80231
[REDACTED], Woodstock, Georgia 30188-4280
[REDACTED], Camillus, NY 13031
[REDACTED], Horton, Mi 492469662
[REDACTED], Phoenix, AZ 850327562
[REDACTED], Blanchardville, WI 53516-9710
[REDACTED], Emeryville, Ca 94608-1635
[REDACTED], Leesburg, Va 20176-4908
[REDACTED], CLEARWATER, FL 33763
[REDACTED], Chicago, Illinois 60651-2159
[REDACTED], Langley, KY 41645
[REDACTED], Virginia Beach, Virginia 23452-2371
[REDACTED], Anthony, Florida 326170437
[REDACTED], McKinney, TX 75071-7030
[REDACTED], Phoenix, AZ 85022-4340
[REDACTED], Los Angeles, CA 90045
[REDACTED], Vero Beach, Florida 32960
[REDACTED], Huntington, Wv 257051620
[REDACTED], Murrieta, CA 925633408
[REDACTED], Conley, GA 30288
[REDACTED], Billerica, Massachusetts 18211401
[REDACTED], Phoenix, AZ 85051-8117
[REDACTED], Palmdale, CA 93550
[REDACTED]ak, Cottonwood, AZ 86326
[REDACTED], Covina, California 91723
[REDACTED], Middleway, WV 25430-5601
[REDACTED], Bozeman, Montana 597158819
[REDACTED], Sacramento, ca 95841-4713
[REDACTED], Bellingham,WA, WA 98225
[REDACTED], Naperville, IL 60564-5902
[REDACTED], PORTLAND, OR 97213-4738
[REDACTED], Petaluma, CA 949527529
[REDACTED], Sterling Heights, MI 48313
[REDACTED], Dunedin, FL 346985969
[REDACTED], Minneapolis, Minnesota 554195009
[REDACTED], Topeka, KS 66614
[REDACTED], Mullica Hill, nj 80629356
[REDACTED], JACKSONVILLE, FL 32223
[REDACTED], Spokane, WA 99201
[REDACTED], Romney, WV 26757-5016
[REDACTED], Beachwood, NJ 08722-3921
[REDACTED], Louisville, Kentucky 40241
[REDACTED], Newport Beach, CA 92660-4932
[REDACTED], Baltimore, MD 212243117
[REDACTED], Devens, Massachusetts 01434-5236
[REDACTED], Branch, MI 49402-9685
[REDACTED], Round Lake, IL 60073-8162
[REDACTED], Shelby Township, Michigan 48316-4563
[REDACTED], Corp Christi, Texas 78410-2137
[REDACTED], Kansas City, Kansas 66109-5809
[REDACTED], Hillsborough, New Jersey 8844

[REDACTED], Spring City PA, PA 19475
[REDACTED], Salt Lake City, UT 841082653
[REDACTED] New York, NY 10128
[REDACTED], Newport Beach, CA 92663-2109
[REDACTED], Supply, North Carolina 284626046
[REDACTED], Delray Beach, Florida 334455619
[REDACTED], Savannah, GA 31420-0752
[REDACTED] Appleton, Wisconsin 549151133
[REDACTED], Arvon, VA 230042054
[REDACTED], Long Beach, California 90803+7514
[REDACTED] Sebastopol, California 95471
[REDACTED], Austin, TX 78758-3316
[REDACTED], PA 17543
[REDACTED], San Diego, Ca 921204537
[REDACTED], Louisville, Kentucky 402994385
[REDACTED], Westfield, MASSACHUSETTS 01085-5120
[REDACTED], LAKEWOOD RANCH, FL 34202-4146
[REDACTED] Wyncote, Pa 190951819
[REDACTED], Ada, MI 49301-9554
[REDACTED], New York, new york 10018
[REDACTED], West Allis, WI 532273155
[REDACTED], Lewisville, TX 75067-7414
[REDACTED], Phoenix, Arizona 85018
[REDACTED], Tarpon Springs, FL 34689-3059
[REDACTED], Deltona, Florida 32725-2741
[REDACTED], Sarasota, Florida 34241-6118
[REDACTED], Princeton, NJ 8540
[REDACTED], Mullica Hill, NJ 08062-2654
[REDACTED], Charlotte, NC 28210-3201
[REDACTED] RHINELANDER, WI, WI 54501
[REDACTED], COLUMBIA, SC 29212
[REDACTED], Kuna, ID 83634
[REDACTED], Seattle, WA 98102
[REDACTED], Encinitas, CA 920242837
[REDACTED], Mason City, IA 50401
[REDACTED] Denver, CO 80202
[REDACTED], Houlton, Maine 04730-1126
[REDACTED], Nashville, Tennessee 37013-1842
[REDACTED], Saint Louis, missouri 631092839
[REDACTED], Lisle, Illinois 605321046
[REDACTED], Albany, Oregon 973227299
[REDACTED], Round Rock, TX 78665-3523
[REDACTED], Green Village, Green Village, NJ 7935
[REDACTED] Bloomington, MN 55431
[REDACTED], Philadelphia, PA 19118-4335
[REDACTED], Greenough, Montana 59823
[REDACTED], Arcadia, ca 910076917
[REDACTED] North Bend, OR 974592020
[REDACTED], Towson, Maryland 212867302
[REDACTED], Loveland, CO 80538-9420
[REDACTED], Redding, Ca 96001-3459
[REDACTED], Barrington, RI 28062646
[REDACTED], Manchester, Nh 03109-5915
[REDACTED], Hoffman Estates, Illinois 60169-2615

[REDACTED], Greenville, South Carolina 296152115
[REDACTED]s, Levittown, new york 11756-4332
[REDACTED], Sterling, VA 20165
[REDACTED], Encinitas, Ca 92024
[REDACTED], Sugar Grove, NC 28679
[REDACTED], Norwalk, CT 06851-6016
[REDACTED]aus, Richardson, TX 75081
[REDACTED], North Manchester, IN 46962-9658
[REDACTED], Fresno, Ca 93728
[REDACTED], Brooklyn, NY 11222
[REDACTED], Omaha, Nebraska 68116
[REDACTED], Taos, NM 875717202
[REDACTED] Antonio, tx 782604500
[REDACTED], Two Harbors, MN 55616
[REDACTED], Ponte Vedra, FL 320818399
[REDACTED], Naperville, IL 60563-1056
[REDACTED], Moriah, new york 129602312
[REDACTED], Bethlehem, PA 180182344
[REDACTED], Novato, CA 949496804
[REDACTED], San Francisco (SFO), CA 94121
[REDACTED], Brooklyn, NY 11217
[REDACTED]Stafford, New York 14143
[REDACTED], Roseville, MN 551132026
[REDACTED] BURBANK, California 91505-3649
[REDACTED], Montgomery, IL 605383364
[REDACTED], Castro Valley, CA 94546
[REDACTED], Cottonwood Heights, Utah 841213008
[REDACTED], Cheney, Wa 990042138
[REDACTED], Waynesboro, GA 30830
[REDACTED], Portland, Oregon 972681078
[REDACTED]Seattle, WA 98168
[REDACTED], Lakewood Ranch, FL 34202-4183
[REDACTED], Seattle, WA 981174604
[REDACTED], Brooklyn, NY 11230
[REDACTED], Hazleton, Pa 18201
[REDACTED], Lake Balboa, CA 914064654
[REDACTED], Wallowa, Oregon 97885-0306
[REDACTED], Santa Fe, nm 875054514
[REDACTED], St Petersburg, FL 337034537
[REDACTED], Miami, Florida 33125-2768
[REDACTED], CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA 22902
[REDACTED], Elkmont, AL 356204634
[REDACTED], Sarasota, Florida 34238-3327
[REDACTED], Florissant, MO 63031
[REDACTED], Ashland, Virginia 23005
[REDACTED], Jackson Heights, new york 113725233
[REDACTED], Davenport, Florida 33897
[REDACTED], Lemon Grove, Ca 91945
[REDACTED], Sacramento, CA 958201704
[REDACTED], South Riding, VA 20152
[REDACTED], Kingsport, TN 37664-2540
[REDACTED], Angwin, USA /California 94508
[REDACTED], Gleneden Beach, Oregon 97388
[REDACTED], Roseburg, OR 974714669

[REDACTED], North Haven, Connecticut 64733022
[REDACTED], Lake City, SC 295602219
[REDACTED], Peekskill, NY 10566
[REDACTED], Orland Park, Illinois 604622500
[REDACTED], Kansas 66203
[REDACTED], Lynbrook, New York 11762
[REDACTED], Alachua, FL 32615
[REDACTED] San Mateo, California 944024029
[REDACTED], Ephrata, PA 175222143
[REDACTED], Sunnyvale, CA 940874054
[REDACTED], Richmond, CA 94803-2332
[REDACTED], Fishers, Indiana 460381907
[REDACTED], Cleveland, OH 44109
[REDACTED], Cle, Ohio 44118
[REDACTED], Palo Alto, California 943034858
[REDACTED], Huntington, NY 11743-0778
[REDACTED] Brooksville, Florida 34602-6207
[REDACTED] West Palm Beach, Fl 334101498
[REDACTED], Sequim, WA 98382-3247
[REDACTED], Wilmington, Delaware 198043505
[REDACTED], Clinton Twp, MI 480362044
[REDACTED], Aurora, CO 80014-1127
[REDACTED], San Jose, CA 951161526
[REDACTED], Phoenix, Arizona 850191702
[REDACTED], Valley Village, ca 916073052
[REDACTED], Miami Beach, Florida 331394060
[REDACTED], Waterbury, CT 67083306
[REDACTED], Willis, TX 773781353
[REDACTED] Cherry Hill, New Jersey 08034-3724
[REDACTED], Columbus, OH 43221
[REDACTED], Rochester, MI 483064591
[REDACTED], Naperville, Illinois 60563
[REDACTED], WINSTON SALEM, NC 27104
[REDACTED], San Francisco, CA 94102-4122
[REDACTED], Sunol, CA 94586
[REDACTED], Pagosa Springs, CO 81147
[REDACTED] Thousand Oaks, CA 91362
[REDACTED], Richmond, CA 94803-3230
[REDACTED], Ridgway, CO 81432
[REDACTED], Pacific Grove, CA 93950
[REDACTED], Lawson, MO 640628351
[REDACTED], Catonsville, Maryland 21228
[REDACTED], Park Forest, Illinois 604661803
[REDACTED], Richardson, TX 75080
[REDACTED], Pebble Beach, CA 93953
[REDACTED], Clinton, IN 47842
[REDACTED], Washington, DC 20015
[REDACTED], Alpine, Texas 798310523
[REDACTED], Kailua, Hawaii 96734-3518
[REDACTED], Minneapolis, Mn 554132527
[REDACTED], Norristown, PA 19403
[REDACTED], Apo, AP 96326
[REDACTED], Bellmore, New York 117103519
[REDACTED], Portland, OR 97211

[REDACTED], Staten Island NY, NY 10301-2301
[REDACTED], Jacksonville, NC 285406106
[REDACTED], Easthampton, MA 10276102
[REDACTED], Salem, Oregon 97301-4801
[REDACTED], Knoxville, Tn 379196643
[REDACTED], North Miami, Florida 331614532
[REDACTED], Mechanicsburg, PA 17050
[REDACTED], Atlanta, GA 30350
[REDACTED], Tolland, CT 6084
[REDACTED], Harriman, NY 10926-3819
[REDACTED], Asheville, NC 288031303
[REDACTED]g, Lawrence Township, NJ 08648-4238
[REDACTED], Temecula, Ca 92591-0339
[REDACTED], Brooklyn, New York 11201
[REDACTED], Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53210-1727
[REDACTED], Santa Clara, CA 950510968
[REDACTED], San Clemente, CA 92672-5140
[REDACTED]ar, Tampa, FL 33603
[REDACTED], Kansas City, Missouri 64152-1744
[REDACTED], Marana, AZ 85658-8101
[REDACTED], Aberdeen, New Jersey 07747-2208
[REDACTED], Flushing, NY 11358-3812
[REDACTED], Eugene, OR 97402-9717
[REDACTED], Waukee, Iowa 50263-8024
[REDACTED], Chicago, Illinois 60611
[REDACTED], Spokane, WA 99224-8211
[REDACTED] Carbondale, IL 62903
[REDACTED], Lake Havasu City, Arizona 86404
[REDACTED], Portland, Oregon 97229
[REDACTED], El Sobrante, CA 94803-2124
[REDACTED], Ozone Park, NY 11417
[REDACTED], Lagrange, GA 30240-6319
[REDACTED], Cambridge, ma 02139-2976
[REDACTED] Oakton, Virginia 22124
[REDACTED], Cocoa, Florida 32927
[REDACTED], Fort Myers, Florida 33907-5224
[REDACTED], Pearland, TX 77584
[REDACTED], Chicago, Il 60640-3481
[REDACTED], Santa Barbara, Ca. 931091313
[REDACTED], Phoenix, AZ 850226018
[REDACTED], Fayetteville, NC 28311
[REDACTED], Cullman, Al 350552019
[REDACTED], Youngsville, LA 70592
[REDACTED], Hockessin, DE 19707
[REDACTED], Oceanside, NY 11572
[REDACTED], Canyon Country, Ca 91351-1027
[REDACTED], Matthews, NC 28105-3962
[REDACTED], Dry Fork, VA 24549
[REDACTED] Spokane, WA 992244484
[REDACTED], Douglas, az 856080496
[REDACTED], Lemoyne, Pennsylvania 170432037
[REDACTED], Tarzana, Ca 913565728
[REDACTED], Tarzana, Ca 91356
[REDACTED], Oakland, CA 94602

[REDACTED], Oakland, California 94611
[REDACTED], Ciudad Autonoma De Buenos Aires, None 1426
[REDACTED], North Canton, OH 44720
[REDACTED], Wichita, KS 67213
[REDACTED], Salisbury, New Hampshire 32685307
[REDACTED], Florence, OR 974399377
[REDACTED] North Miami Beach, FL 331603121
[REDACTED] edrich, Simi Valley, CA 93063
[REDACTED], Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15236-1612
[REDACTED], San Antonio, Texas 78240
[REDACTED], Sequim, WA 983826661
[REDACTED], SEATTLE, WA 98177
[REDACTED] Alwood, York, PA 174022914
[REDACTED], Saint Louis, Missouri 63119-1805
[REDACTED] Sparks, NV 89431
[REDACTED], Enfield, Connecticut 60826205
[REDACTED] Washington, DC 20009-3004
[REDACTED], Pearland, TEXAS 775842202
[REDACTED], Moriah, NY 129602312
[REDACTED], Arlington, TX 76002
[REDACTED] Westampton, NJ 08060-3727
[REDACTED], Veneta, Oregon 97487
[REDACTED], Fairfield, CONNECTICUT 68246389
[REDACTED], Adrian, Mi 492213157
[REDACTED], Morgantown, WEST VIRGINIA 26501-6571
[REDACTED], Lancaster, California 935361616
[REDACTED], Las Vegas, Nevada 89145-4217
[REDACTED] a, Downey, CA 90240-2978
[REDACTED], Reno, NV 89503
[REDACTED], Brick, New Jersey 87236361
[REDACTED], Millsboro, Delaware 199665927
[REDACTED], Sarasota, Florida 342384501
[REDACTED], Las Vegas, Nv 891102004
[REDACTED], Lawrence Township, NJ 86481058
[REDACTED], Pittsboro, North Carolina 27312-5037
[REDACTED], Terry, MT 59349-0586
[REDACTED], SANTA CRUZ, California 95062
[REDACTED] Birnamwood, WI 54414
[REDACTED], Roseburg, Or 974719510
[REDACTED], Calverton, NY 11933
[REDACTED], Tallahassee, FL 32301-5717
[REDACTED], Paramus, NJ 7652
[REDACTED], Herndon, va 201703773
[REDACTED], New York, New York 10128-7850
[REDACTED], New Orleans, LA 70114
[REDACTED], Fairfield, Iowa 52556-3628
[REDACTED] Hurley, SD 570362014
[REDACTED], Fridley, MN 55432
[REDACTED], North Attleboro, MA 2760
[REDACTED], Fort Myers, FL 33908
[REDACTED], Batavia, OH 45103
[REDACTED], Pomona, CA 91767
[REDACTED], Maricopa, arizona 851384482
[REDACTED], Norfolk, Virginia 23513

██████████, Winter Garden, FL 347871729
██████████, Binghamton, NY 139052331
██████████, Citrus Heights, ca 956211810
██████████, New York, NY 10025
██████████, El Cajon, CA 92020
██████████, Anthem, AZ 850864911
██████████, Gulf Stream, FL 334837235
██████████, Washoe Valley, Nevada 89704-9648
██████████, Bronx, New York 10473
██████████, East Rockaway, NY 115181211
██████████, Keego Harbor, Michigan 48320-1254
██████████, Vermillion, SD 57069-2738
██████████, t, Athens, Georgia 306053074
██████████, Eugene, Or 974041292
██████████, Camano Island, Wa 98282-8237
██████████ MD, PLACERVILLE, CA 95667
██████████, Richmond, TX 774061526
██████████, Littleton, NH 03561-3902
██████████ Castle Rock, Co 801042043
██████████, Grand Island, FL 327358920
██████████, Vermilion, Ohio 44089-2067
██████████, Fort Worth, Tx 76137-5738
██████████, Bloomington, IN 474031932
██████████, Whitestone, NY 11357
██████████, West Hollywood, CA 90069
██████████, Las Vegas, Nv 89117-5744
██████████, Aptos, California 95003-4214
██████████, West Hollywood, CA 90069-5525
██████████, Galveston, Texas 775506257
██████████, Boca Raton, Florida 33486-3529
██████████, Harrisonburg, VA 228024822
██████████, Capitola, CA 95010-1626

Correspondence ID: 12473Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Tahuya, WA 98588
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,09 2023 10:30:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Good morning,

I am writing you in regards to the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service and National Park Service's desire to bring grizzly bears back into Washington, specifically the Cascade Mountain Range. Grizzlies are an amazing beast and should be respected for their fierce and unwillingness to back down. They are truly an aggressive predatory animal that is at the top of the food chain. This makes them unafraid of humans and able to attack hunters, hikers and livestock. As a lifelong resident of Washington state, I love the great outdoors and have always been thankful that growing up I did not have to fear coming across grizzlies or wolves as a kid in the woods. As a father to six I do not look forward to an increase in predatory animals, especially wolves and grizzlies. It is my responsibility to protect my wife and kids, and purposely bringing grizzlies into Washington is viewed as an attack against my family. We love hiking and camping, and never worry about black bears because they are generally afraid of people when encountered in the wild. Grizzlies on the other hand are known to attack people in the wild. Take a minute or two and research grizzly bear attacks in Montana and elsewhere, it won't take long to find innumerable stories. With all of this said, I am pleading with you to do everything within your power to stop this re-introduction of Grizzlies into our state.

VR

Correspondence ID: 12474Project:112008Document:132104
Address: mcleary, WA 98557
United States of America
Outside Organization: backcountry horsemen Non-Governmental
Received: Nov,09 2023 10:31:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the Alternative A - the No Action alternative

Correspondence ID: 12475Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Yelm wa 98597, WA 98597
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,09 2023 10:40:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: No need to bring them in the area.
Hunted this area for years and the elk and deer are down from wolf's. This will just make it worth

Correspondence ID: 12476Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Washington, DC 20005
United States of America
Outside Organization: National Wildlife Federation Action Fund Non-Governmental
Received: Nov,09 2023 10:53:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Director Williams and Director Sams,

Below are 999 of 8,415 comments submitted by advocates and supporters of the National Wildlife Federation Action Fund in regards to the Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/Environmental Impact Statement, North Cascades.

Thank you for releasing an environmental impact statement and draft plan that outlines a path forward to recover and restore grizzly bears in the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE).

Grizzly bears belong in the North Cascades. They roamed the region for thousands of years and their eventual decline was a loss to biodiversity and to the cultural traditions of First Nations and Indigenous communities throughout the Pacific Northwest and British Columbia. Restoring and managing grizzlies in the North Cascades is an important step in bringing the full ecosystem back together and it's a critical step to larger grizzly bear recovery efforts in the lower 48.

I'm grateful for your leadership on this issue and encourage you to continue the recovery process in coordination with Tribal governments, local partners, and other stakeholders. Doing so will ensure that grizzly bears maintain a path towards full recovery for the benefit of future generations.

Sincerely,

██████████, Bend, OR 97701
██████████, Ravenna, OH 44266
██████████, Murfreesboro, TN 371277614
██████████ Golden Valley, Minnesota 554223411
██████████ Mattydale, New York 13211-1132
██████████, Denver, Denver 80206-4400

[REDACTED], Little Egg Harbor Twp, New Jersey 80871647
[REDACTED], Sylmar, CA 91342
[REDACTED], Fremont, CA 945552241
[REDACTED], Gardner, MA 1440
[REDACTED], Wind Gap, Wind Gap, Pa 180919784
[REDACTED], Rialto, CA 92377
[REDACTED], Akron, OH 44301
[REDACTED], Olympia, WASHINGTON 98513
[REDACTED] Peoria, AZ 85383
[REDACTED], Alhambra, CA 91803
[REDACTED] San Diego, Ca 92116
[REDACTED], Reading, PA 196061652
[REDACTED], Haverhill, MA 1832
[REDACTED], Bandon, Oregon 97411
[REDACTED], East Greenwich, Rhode Island 02818-4533
[REDACTED], Reading, PA 196061652
[REDACTED], Salinas, CA 93906
[REDACTED], Winfield, IL 601901801
[REDACTED], New Freedom, pennsylvania 173498801
[REDACTED], Wynnewood, PA 19096
[REDACTED], Salem, OR 97301
[REDACTED], Sapulpa, OK 74066
[REDACTED], Cypress, Tx 77429-5499
[REDACTED], Big Bear City, CA 92314-9721
[REDACTED], Orlando, Florida 32828-7324
[REDACTED], Parker, Colo 801387934
[REDACTED], Montoursville, PA 17754
[REDACTED], Cincinnati, Ohio 45220
[REDACTED], Mission Viejo, CA 92691-1723
[REDACTED], Reno, nv 89508-5073
[REDACTED] Valparaiso, IN 463856038
[REDACTED], Redding, California 96001-9558
[REDACTED], Oregon City, OR 97045
[REDACTED], Lacey, Washington 98513
[REDACTED], Greenfield, wisconsin 532214620
[REDACTED], Wilmington, DE 19809
[REDACTED], Rockville Centre, NY 115706005
[REDACTED], Havre De Grace, Maryland 21078-4151
[REDACTED], Sonoma, US CA 954768408
[REDACTED], Glen Ellyn, IL 601373692
[REDACTED], Corona, CA 92882
[REDACTED], Acton, MA 1720
[REDACTED], Germanton, NC 27019
[REDACTED], Oak Park, IL 60302
[REDACTED], Lewisville, TX 750675833
[REDACTED], Westport, ct 68803757
[REDACTED], Lake Geneva, Wisconsin 531471964
[REDACTED], Philadelphia, PA 19128
[REDACTED], Rockledge, Florida 32955
[REDACTED], Lynn, MA 1902
[REDACTED], New York, new york 10011
[REDACTED], Skillman, NJ 8558
[REDACTED], Los Angeles, CA 900655051
[REDACTED], Syracuse, NY 13214-1300

[REDACTED], Lake Linden, MI 49945
[REDACTED], Florence, OR 97439
[REDACTED], Round Hill, VA 20141-3538
[REDACTED], Clinton, MD 20735
[REDACTED], Georgetown, Texas 78633-4568
[REDACTED], Glenview, IL 600251750
[REDACTED], Fort Payne, AL 35967
[REDACTED], Reno, NV 89509
[REDACTED], Lancaster, PA 17603
[REDACTED], Santa Clarita, CA 91390-4063
[REDACTED], Halifax, PA 17032
[REDACTED], Phoenix, AZ 85051
[REDACTED], Pembroke Pines, FL 33026-2308
[REDACTED], Athens, ga 30607-1070
[REDACTED], Seattle, WA 98103-4327
[REDACTED], Littleton, colorado 80123-3495
[REDACTED], Saugerties, Ny 12477-3111
[REDACTED], Oxnard, California 930309242
[REDACTED], Houston, TX 770478124
[REDACTED], Cincinnati, Ohio 45255
[REDACTED], Tallahassee, Florida 32303-4657
[REDACTED], Ventura, CA 93003-1411
[REDACTED], New York, New York 100168943
[REDACTED], Wentzville, Missouri 63385-6169
[REDACTED], Tucson, AZ 857326432
[REDACTED], Bridgeport, CT 66062068
[REDACTED], Marblehead, MA 19452533
[REDACTED], New York, NY 10038
[REDACTED], Chandler, Arizona 85249
[REDACTED], Balsam Lake, Wisconsin 54810-6302
[REDACTED], New York, NY 10023-2780
[REDACTED], Albany, New York 122054003
[REDACTED], Sarasota, FL 34232
[REDACTED], Bethany, CT 06524-3083
[REDACTED], Santa Rosa, CA 95409-6357
[REDACTED], Soquel, Ca 950732779
[REDACTED], Richmond, IN 47374
[REDACTED], Hamburg, NY 14075-4720
[REDACTED], San Francisco, CA 94124
[REDACTED], Clearlake, CA 95422
[REDACTED], Bridgeport, CT 6605
[REDACTED], Greenville, South Carolina 29617
[REDACTED], Plantation, Florida 333231760
[REDACTED], Austin, TX 78704-4400
[REDACTED], Catonsville, MD 212283602
[REDACTED], Evanston, IL 60203-1218
[REDACTED], Marlboro, MA 1752
[REDACTED], Port Angeles, WA 98362
[REDACTED], South River, Nj 08882-1564
[REDACTED], Louisville, KY 40207
[REDACTED], Martinsville, NJ 08836-2236
[REDACTED], Naperville, IL 60563-6524
[REDACTED], Glenside, PA 19038-4144
[REDACTED], Jackson, MI 49201-9607

██████████ Chicago, IL 60610
██████████, Southern Shores, NC 27949
██████████, Hickory, NC 286025244
██████████, Green Bay, WI 54302-2225
██████████, Marquette, Michigan 49855-9424
██████████, Palm City, FL 34990
██████████, Mt Pleasant, MI 488584333
██████████, Rubicon, wi 53078
██████████, Summerfield, florida 344913987
██████████, Houston, TX 77089
██████████, Los Angeles, CA 900311533
██████████, Ithaca, NY 14850-6218
██████████, Bothell, WA 98021-8353
██████████, Spring, Texas 77373-7684
██████████, Santa Monica, CA 90403
██████████, Santa Ana, CA 927061114
██████████, SACRAMENTO, CA 95826
██████████, Griswold, Ct 63511335
██████████, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55406
██████████, Los Angeles, California 900322306
██████████, Cleveland, Ohio 44102
██████████, Grand Junction, CO 81507
██████████, Ukiah, California 95482-3939
██████████, San Diego, CA 92115-1628
██████████, Milford, Michigan 483812413
██████████, Saint Anne, Illinois 609644039
██████████, Keizer, OR 97303
██████████, Rio Vista, CA 94505
██████████, Nicholasville, KY 40356
██████████, Hopkinton, MA 17482722
██████████, Kapaau, HI 96755-1367
██████████, Burbank, CA 915054312
██████████, Battle Ground, WA 986048353
██████████, Mooreasville, NC 28115
██████████, Burnsville, NC 28714
██████████, Huntington Beach, California 92649
██████████, Van Nuys, California 91406-5213
██████████, Pittsburgh, PA 15237
██████████, Carrollton, GA 30117
██████████, Las Vegas, NV 89147
██████████, New York, NY 10034-1277
██████████, Houma, LA 70360
██████████, Albuquerque, NM 87120
██████████, Phoenix, Az 850222966
██████████, Great Falls, MT 594056151
██████████, Tucson, Az 857187203
██████████, Los Angeles, CA 90049
██████████, Clearwater, FL 33755
██████████, Howell, new jersey 77312096
██████████, Scottsdale, Arizona 852507431
██████████, Livingston, Texas 77399
██████████, Silver Spring, MD 20910-4819
██████████, Las Vegas, NV 89129-2184
██████████, Woodland Hills, Ca 91364

[REDACTED], Williamsburg, VA 23188
[REDACTED], Mulberry, AR 72947
[REDACTED], Winston Salem, NC 27127-4784
[REDACTED], Omaha, nebraska 681053671
[REDACTED], Walnut, CA 91789-4208
[REDACTED], Joelton, TN 37080-4703
[REDACTED], Portland, Oregon 972033636
[REDACTED], Palmetto Bay, FL 331572164
[REDACTED], Des Moines, Iowa 50324-1626
[REDACTED], Portland, OR 97215
[REDACTED], Palmyra, Pennsylvania 17078
[REDACTED], Wilmington, DE 198072153
[REDACTED] Brooklyn, NY 11201-2856
[REDACTED], Englewood, FL 34224
[REDACTED], Markham, Illinois 604285614
[REDACTED], NY, New York 10025
[REDACTED], West Palm Beach, FL 334131235
[REDACTED], Quincy, FL 32351-0493
[REDACTED], Pensacola, Florida 32503-6687
[REDACTED], Granville, Ohio 43023-9317
[REDACTED], West Deptford, nj 08086-1907
[REDACTED], Delaware, OH 43015-1097
[REDACTED], Poughkeepsie, NY 126036311
[REDACTED], Swartz Creek, Michigan 48473
[REDACTED], Dewitt, Michigan 48820-9139
[REDACTED], Ukiah, California 95482
[REDACTED], Neosho, Missouri 64850-4504
[REDACTED], Sandy, utah 84070-1174
[REDACTED], Huntersville, NC 28078
[REDACTED], Chesapeake, VA 233231951
[REDACTED], Folsom, CA 95630-7643
[REDACTED], Waldport, Oregon 973940698
[REDACTED], Henderson, nv 89052-3086
[REDACTED], Puyallup, WA 98373-1469
[REDACTED], Casselberry, FL 32707
[REDACTED], Summerville, GA 30747
[REDACTED], San Francisco, CA 94122
[REDACTED], Lauderdale Lakes, Florida 333196741
[REDACTED], Highland Park, NJ 8904
[REDACTED], Houston, HARRIS/TX 77099
[REDACTED], Killingworth, CT 6419
[REDACTED], Southaven, Mississippi 38672-6305
[REDACTED], ALISO VIEJO, Ca 92656
[REDACTED], Plainville, Ma 02762-1403
[REDACTED], New Oxford, PA 173506107
[REDACTED], Littleton, CO 80128
[REDACTED], BOTHELL, WA 98021-7058
[REDACTED], Van Nuys, CA 91405-1426
[REDACTED], Sarasota, FL 34240
[REDACTED], Sullivan, Maine 4664
[REDACTED], Palm Springs, CA 92264-0510
[REDACTED], Greensburg, PA 15601
[REDACTED], Baltimore, MD 21217-4316
[REDACTED], Franklin, North Carolina 287343786

██████████ ██████████ Decatur, GA 30030
██████████ ██████████, Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33418
██████████ ██████████, Hardeeville, SOUTH CAROLINA 29927-2108
██████████ ██████████, Chapel Hill, NC 275178508
██████████ ██████████, Houston, Texas 77063-3815
██████████ ██████████, Grapevine, TX 760516631
██████████ ██████████, San Francisco, CA 94115-3500
██████████ ██████████, New York, New York 100112371
██████████ ██████████, Missoula, mt 59801
██████████ ██████████, Reno, Nevada 89521-5231
██████████ ██████████, Ludlow, Vermont 514996668
██████████ ██████████, Arlington, Virginia 222074313
██████████ ██████████, Ocala, FL 34470
██████████ ██████████, Redmond, Washington 98052
██████████ ██████████, Elizabeth, NJ 07208-1649
██████████ ██████████, Palmetto Bay, Florida 33157-5924
██████████ ██████████ New Hyde Park, NY 11040-5435
██████████ ██████████, Somerset, NJ 8873
██████████ ██████████, La Porte, INDIANA 46350
██████████ ██████████, San Jose, California 95112
██████████ ██████████, Scotland, Connecticut 6264
██████████ ██████████ Arlington, Massachusetts 02476-5748
██████████ ██████████, LEBANON, Tennessee 37090
██████████ ██████████, SAINT PAUL, Minnesota 55119-6676
██████████ ██████████, Durham, North Carolina 277055437
██████████ ██████████, Punta Gorda, Florida 339825110
██████████ ██████████, Vacaville, California 95687-5704
██████████ ██████████, New Jersey 7834
██████████ ██████████, Malvern, PA 19355
██████████ ██████████, Livermore, Ca 94551
██████████ ██████████, Las Vegas, NV 89169
██████████ ██████████, New York, NY 10128
██████████ ██████████, Loveland, CO 80538
██████████ ██████████, Trenton, NJ 08618-5015
██████████ ██████████, Soddy Daisy, TN 37379-8256
██████████ ██████████, El Paso, TX 79912-2023
██████████ ██████████, Nicasio, California 949469757
██████████ ██████████, Littleton, Colorado 80126
██████████ ██████████, Tucson, Arizona 85730
██████████ ██████████, Las Vegas, NV 89121
██████████ ██████████, Sturbridge, MA 01566-2315
██████████ ██████████, Georgetown, TX 78626-7414
██████████ ██████████, Midland Park, NJ 74321312
██████████ ██████████, Kirksville, MO 63501
██████████ ██████████, Canonsburg, Pa 153173136
██████████ ██████████, Knoxville, TN 37917
██████████ ██████████, Valley Springs, California 952521136
██████████ ██████████, Fresno, CA 93711
██████████ ██████████, Phoenix, AZ 85014
██████████ ██████████, Sonoma, California 95476-7534
██████████ ██████████, Wilmette, IL 600912869
██████████ ██████████, Bluff Dale, TX 77433
██████████ ██████████, Cullman, AL 35057-4028
██████████ ██████████, Woodland Hls, CA 91364-5915

[REDACTED], Conway, SC 295263992
[REDACTED] Sound Beach, NY 11789
[REDACTED], Iron Mountain, Bi 49801-2328
[REDACTED], Loveland, CO 805376896
[REDACTED], PARKER, CO 80134-6602
[REDACTED], Flagstaff, AZ 86004
[REDACTED] Palenville, NY 124630252
[REDACTED], Scottsdale, Az 852512801
[REDACTED], Dekalb, IL 60115
[REDACTED], Batavia, Ohio 45103-4007
[REDACTED], Plainfield, mass 10709767
[REDACTED], West Chester, PA 193827600
[REDACTED], Irvine, CA 92604
[REDACTED], Oklahoma 74962
[REDACTED], Evanston, IL 602014510
[REDACTED], Medford, OR 97504-9457
[REDACTED], Avenel, NJ 7001
[REDACTED], Jackson, GA 30233
[REDACTED], Vian, Oklahoma 74962
[REDACTED], Auburn, wa 98092-9289
[REDACTED], Austin, Texas 78749-3401
[REDACTED], Elkins Park, PA 19027
[REDACTED], Oakland, CA 946055326
[REDACTED], Baldwin, MD 21013-9738
[REDACTED], Miami Beach, FL 33139
[REDACTED] City Beach, FL 32407-0402
[REDACTED], Conway, Arkansas 72034
[REDACTED], Federal Way, Washington 98003
[REDACTED], Wilmington, NC 28403-4171
[REDACTED], Kingsport, Tenn. 37664
[REDACTED], Kingston Springs, Tennessee 37082
[REDACTED], Lynnwood, WA 980876509
[REDACTED], Bigfork, Flathead/Montana 59911-6014
[REDACTED], Boulder, CO 80304-1300
[REDACTED], Sylvan Lake, MI 48320-1761
[REDACTED], Jackson, Wy 83001
[REDACTED], Fairfield, Iowa 52556-3155
[REDACTED], West Mifflin, PA 15122
[REDACTED], Portland, OREGON 97266-5800
[REDACTED], Elkhorn, WI 53121-3669
[REDACTED], Allentown, PA 18102
[REDACTED], Phoenix, AZ 85022-3021
[REDACTED], San Diego, CA 92127
[REDACTED], Highlands Ranch, CO 801308027
[REDACTED], Los Alamitos, CA 90720-5243
[REDACTED], Asheville, NC 28803-2236
[REDACTED], Huntingdon Valley, Pa 190068419
[REDACTED], Fresh Meadows, NY 113661525
[REDACTED], Sherman Oaks, CA 914035033
[REDACTED], LEXINGTON, OK 73051
[REDACTED], Waukesha, WI 531881441
[REDACTED] Spring, MD 209056054
[REDACTED], Lincoln, MA 1773
[REDACTED], Wauwatosa, WI 53213

[REDACTED], Santa Rosa, CA 95403-0134
[REDACTED], Talmage, CA 95481
[REDACTED], Hemet, CA 92543-3077
[REDACTED], Twinsburg, Ohio 44087-2734
[REDACTED], El Cajon, CA 92021
[REDACTED], Montgomery, pa 177520112
[REDACTED], Baltimore, Maryland 21211
[REDACTED], Carson City, NV 89706
[REDACTED], Norcross, GA 30071
[REDACTED], Wadsworth, Ohio 44281-8027
[REDACTED], Florence, OR 97439-7627
[REDACTED], Monroe, Michigan 48161
[REDACTED], Ashford, Alabama 363127303
[REDACTED] Riverview, FL 33569
[REDACTED], Punta Gorda, FL 33983
[REDACTED], Pottstown, PA 194645042
[REDACTED], Aylett, VA 23009
[REDACTED], Redwood City, CA 94061-3620
[REDACTED], Lisbon, NH 3585
[REDACTED], Linden, nj 70363808
[REDACTED], Reno, NV 89512
[REDACTED], Lees Summit, Missouri 64086-5804
[REDACTED], Santa Clara, CA 95051
[REDACTED], Portland, Oregon 97225-6454
[REDACTED], Hawthorne, California 90250-8395
[REDACTED], Braintree, MA 02184-4018
[REDACTED], Pahoia, HI 96778
[REDACTED], Greenville, OH 45331
[REDACTED], Corte Madera, CA 94925-1002
[REDACTED] Fremont, CA 94555-3236
[REDACTED], Franklin, MI 48025
[REDACTED], Schenectady, New York 12302-9621
[REDACTED], Centreville, Virginia 201203438
[REDACTED], Rutland, VT 5701
[REDACTED], Greensboro, GA 306425472
[REDACTED], Portland, OR 972026834
[REDACTED], Streamwood, IL 60107-2261
[REDACTED], Thonotosassa, FL 335922660
[REDACTED], Southworth, WA 98386-0061
[REDACTED], Blue Bell, Pennsylvania 19422
[REDACTED], Phillips, Maine 4966
[REDACTED], Spring, tx 77381
[REDACTED], Brewster, MA 2631
[REDACTED], Las Vegas, Nevada 89129-5761
[REDACTED], Leicester, Ma 1524
[REDACTED] Middleton, WI 535621037
[REDACTED], Weston, FL 333262416
[REDACTED] Rankin, PA 15104
[REDACTED], Henrico, VA 232293801
[REDACTED], Carbondale, CO 81623-2213
[REDACTED] Santa Cruz, CA 95060
[REDACTED], Snohomish, WA 98296
[REDACTED], Nashville, tn 37215
[REDACTED], Plattsburgh, NY 12901

[REDACTED], Kapaa, HI 96746-9426
[REDACTED], Diamond Springs, CA 95619-1252
[REDACTED], Brooklyn, New York 11231-3761
[REDACTED], Avondale, á'Éá'ç 85323
[REDACTED], Seattle, WA 98115
[REDACTED], El Paso, TX 79901-2031
[REDACTED], Tucson, Arizona 85712
[REDACTED], SPRINGFIELD, Massachusetts 1108
[REDACTED], Stockton, California 95212
[REDACTED] Hamden, CT 06518-1516
[REDACTED], Selbyville, delaware 19975-4221
[REDACTED] Livonia, Mi 48154-2262
[REDACTED] Hanover, NH 03755-3113
[REDACTED], Costa Mesa, ca 92627
[REDACTED], Overland Park, Kansas 66212-3369
[REDACTED], Wheat Ridge, CO 800334044
[REDACTED], Cary, North Carolina 27513-4753
[REDACTED], Bolingbrook, IL 60440
[REDACTED], Watertown, WI 53098-3702
[REDACTED], MERRITT ISLAND, FL 32953-4731
[REDACTED], Brooklyn, NY 11230
[REDACTED], Chatsworth, California 913111532
[REDACTED], North Canton, OH 447208108
[REDACTED], Port Townsend, WA 983689584
[REDACTED], Huntington Beach, california 92648-2861
[REDACTED], Ellsworth, WI 54011
[REDACTED], Wallowa, OR 978858500
[REDACTED], Gilbert, AZ 85295-7212
[REDACTED], Freedom, PA 150429357
[REDACTED], Columbia, Md 21045-5149
[REDACTED], Encino, ca 914361530
[REDACTED], Pasadena, CA 91107
[REDACTED], Champaign, IL 618222333
[REDACTED], Boulder, CO 80304
[REDACTED], Portland, ME 4101
[REDACTED], Valley, WA 99181-9718
[REDACTED], Mc Donald, TN 373534027
[REDACTED], Palm Bay, FL 32908-1124
[REDACTED], Kyle, Texas 78640
[REDACTED], Hollis Center, ME 4042
[REDACTED], Henderson, NV 89012
[REDACTED], Brooklyn, NY 11215
[REDACTED], Ann Arbor, MI 48104-3196
[REDACTED], Portland, oregon 97225-6247
[REDACTED], Fort Bragg, CA 954378127
[REDACTED], Valhalla, new York 10595-1639
[REDACTED], New York, NY 100233618
[REDACTED], Williamsburg, VA 23185
[REDACTED], San Antonio, TX 782182302
[REDACTED], Lebanon, TN 37090
[REDACTED], Tucson, AZ 85749
[REDACTED], Chester Sprgs, PA 194251901
[REDACTED], Middlesboro, KY 40965
[REDACTED], Oakland, CA 94611

[REDACTED], Blowing Rockblowing Rook, NC 28605
[REDACTED] Brunswick, me 04011-7421
[REDACTED], Carnegie, Pennsylvania 151062101
[REDACTED], New Orleans, LA 70118
[REDACTED], Lancaster, CA 935366235
[REDACTED], Palo Alto, CA 94303-3409
[REDACTED], South Lake Tahoe, California 96150-3456
[REDACTED], Rancho Cordova, CA 95670
[REDACTED], San Antonio, TX 78228
[REDACTED], Portland, ME 4101
[REDACTED], Minneapolis, MN 55403
[REDACTED], Colorado Springs, CO 80917-5221
[REDACTED], Nashua, NH 03062-3511
[REDACTED], Snohomish, wa 98296-4924
[REDACTED], BRISTOL, CT 6010
[REDACTED], Bloomington, IL 61701
[REDACTED], San Francisco, California 94110-5209
[REDACTED], Cambridge, Mass. 02141-1355
[REDACTED], Raymond, wa 985779492
[REDACTED], Lewisville, Texas 75077-7628
[REDACTED], Elkhart Lake, WI 53020-1903
[REDACTED], Saint Clair Shores, mi 48081-1342
[REDACTED], Littleton, CO 80120-4315
[REDACTED], Eugene, OR 97405
[REDACTED], Carnation, Washington 98014
[REDACTED], Florham Park, NJ 07932-2816
[REDACTED], Mendocino, CA 95460
[REDACTED], Seal Beach, CA 907407969
[REDACTED], San Diego, Ca 921032127
[REDACTED], Manistee, MI 49660-1962
[REDACTED], Rancho Santa Fe, Rancho Santa Fe, CA 92067-0190
[REDACTED], Oldsmar, Florida 34677-5229
[REDACTED], Bethlehem, PA 18015
[REDACTED], Akron, Ohio 44333-4750
[REDACTED], San Antonio, TX 78250
[REDACTED], Honeoye Falls, New York 14472
[REDACTED], Hereford, AZ 85615
[REDACTED], Charlotte, North Carolina 28210-7208
[REDACTED], Apex, NC 27502-2250
[REDACTED], Lenoir City, TN 377717630
[REDACTED], Aurora, CO 80014-5506
[REDACTED], Wilton, CT 06897-2201
[REDACTED], Whiting, NJ 87591500
[REDACTED], Homer, NY 13077-9351
[REDACTED], Woodside, CA 94062
[REDACTED], Madeira Beach, FL 33708
[REDACTED], Centennial, Colorado 80015-5436
[REDACTED], Tulsa, Oklahoma 74105
[REDACTED], Los Angeles, California 90025-4902
[REDACTED], Los Lunas, NM 87031
[REDACTED], Colorado Springs, Colorado 809091321
[REDACTED], Chester Springs, PA 194251609
[REDACTED], Eugene, OR 97402-4256

[REDACTED], Charleston, Sc 29412-4425
[REDACTED], Chesapeake, Virginia 23325
[REDACTED], Valrico, f 33596-6150
[REDACTED] Fort Wayne, IN 468351418
[REDACTED], BOYNTON BEACH, FL 33472
[REDACTED], Silverdale, WA 98383
[REDACTED], Cleveland, OH 441192214
[REDACTED], Boise, ID 837035849
[REDACTED], Roanoke, VA 24018-2625
[REDACTED], Pittsburgh, PA 15215-2704
[REDACTED], Toms River, NJ 8755
[REDACTED], Moncks Corner, SC 29461
[REDACTED], Manhattan, KS 66503
[REDACTED], Manhasset, NY 11030
[REDACTED], Pflugerville, TX 78660-3457
[REDACTED], West Palm Beach, FL 33417
[REDACTED] Aztec, New Mexico 874101612
[REDACTED], Panama City, Florida 32401
[REDACTED], Brooklyn, NY 11204
[REDACTED], New Port Richey, Florida 34652-6237
[REDACTED], Marysville, Michigan 480402053
[REDACTED], Cary, North Carolina 27513
[REDACTED], Santee, CA 92071-2206
[REDACTED], Los Angeles, CA 90024-1712
[REDACTED], Cleveland Hts, OH 44118
[REDACTED], Novi, MI 483743445
[REDACTED], Los Angeles, Ca 90069-1344
[REDACTED], Charlotte, North Carolina 28277-2091
[REDACTED], Madison, WI 537051308
[REDACTED], Red Bank, NJ 07701-1067
[REDACTED], Saline, Michigan 481760772
[REDACTED], Medina, Ohio 44256-7314
[REDACTED], Carmel, Indiana 46033
[REDACTED], San Francisco, california 94109
[REDACTED], Apache Junction, AZ 85120
[REDACTED], Snowflake, AZ 859375468
[REDACTED], Severn, MD 21144
[REDACTED], Weston, FL 33326-1631
[REDACTED], Denver, Co 80218-0593
[REDACTED], West Warwick, RI 02893-6056
[REDACTED], Worcester, Massachusetts 1608
[REDACTED], Lugoff, SC 29078
[REDACTED], San Mateo, CA 94403
[REDACTED], Rochester Hills, Michigan 483093659
[REDACTED], East Longmeadow, Ma 01028-2614
[REDACTED], Pataskala, Ohio 430627667
[REDACTED], East Aurora, NY 14052
[REDACTED], Prior Lake, MN 55372-1477
[REDACTED], Tonasket, Washington 98855-1060
[REDACTED], Arlington Heights, Illinois 60004-6331
[REDACTED], Meridian, idaho 83642-7141
[REDACTED], Floresville, Texas 781146210
[REDACTED], Sausalito, CA 94965
[REDACTED], Huntington, ny 11743-3023

████ Glendale, CA 91208
████ Marina Del Rey, California 90292
████, Floyds Knobs, IN 471199320
████, Escondido, CA 92026
████, Martinsburg, Pennsylvania 166621059
████, Kyle, TX 786405589
████, Cincinnati, OH 45230
████, Washington, DC 20016
████, Northfield, Ohio 44067-1803
████, Hartly, DE 199531838
████, Struthers, Ohio 444711635
████, Washington, DC, DC 20003
████, Daly City, CA 940151963
████, Buffalo, New York 142231207
████, Naples, Florida 34113-1703
████ Liverpool, NY 13088
████, Seguin, TX 781550904
████, Brooklyn, ny 11222-5594
████, New York, NY 10027
████, Saint Louis, MO 63109-1608
████, Lambertville, New Jersey 08530-1034
████, Hubertus, WI 53033
████, Wilmington, NC 28403-4171
████, Virginia Beach, VA 23454
████ Eureka, CA 955023753
████, DEWEY, AZ 86327
████, Buena Vista, Colorado 81211-8507
████, Norristown, PA 19403
████, Genoa, Ohio 43430
████, Humboldt, Tn 38343-3501
████, Marina, CA 93933
████, Brookhaven, Pa 19015-1933
████, Cambridge, MA 02139-3783
████, Essex, CT 6426
████, Vancouver, WA 98661
████, Thornton, CO 80229
████, Donna, Texas 78537-9502
████, Wickenburg, AZ 85390-1554
████, New York, New York 100283060
████, Tonawanda, NY 14150
████, Lynnwood, WA 98036
████, Fort Worth, TX 76133-2159
████, North Dinwiddie, VA 23803-7700
████, North Chesterfield, Virginia 23235-6291
████, Bozeman, MT 59718-8265
████, Pleasant Hill, OR 97455-9710
████, Phoenix, Az 850235276
████, Fullerton, California 928321110
████, Los Angeles, CA 90025
████, Buffalo Grove, IL 60089-2416
████, Preston, CT 63658642
████, Independence, Kansas 67301
████ Santa Fe, NM 87505
████, Lindon, Utah 84042-1394

[REDACTED], Omaha, NE 681386165
[REDACTED], Cambridge, Maryland 216131354
[REDACTED], Castle Hayne, NC 28429-5926
[REDACTED], Elkhart, Indiana 465149726
[REDACTED], Midlothian, VA 23112-2120
[REDACTED], Bedford, NH 3110
[REDACTED], Richmond, VA 232331742
[REDACTED], Newberg, OR 97132
[REDACTED], New York, NY 10021
[REDACTED], Center Harbor, NH 32263419
[REDACTED], Roseville, MN 551136467
[REDACTED], Cambridge, VT 05444-9718
[REDACTED], YARDLEY, PA 19067
[REDACTED], King William, VA 23086
[REDACTED] Rogersville, TN 37857
[REDACTED], Tacoma, WA 984052210
[REDACTED], Sunset, SC 29685
[REDACTED], Portland, OR 97220
[REDACTED], Burlington, Iowa 52601-3829
[REDACTED], Saint Albans, Vermont 54781631
[REDACTED], Roseville, MN 55113-2814
[REDACTED], Rancho Cucamonga, California 91701
[REDACTED], Center Rutland, VT 5736
[REDACTED], Edina, MN 554361106
[REDACTED], Watsonville, CA 95076-3157
[REDACTED], Minneapolis, MN 55413
[REDACTED], Tampa, FL 33626-2333
[REDACTED], While House, Tennessee 37188
[REDACTED], Mill Valley, CA 94941
[REDACTED], Laredo, Texas 780413222
[REDACTED], Port Saint Lucie, FL 34983
[REDACTED], Medinah, Illinois 60157
[REDACTED], San Antonio, TX 782481206
[REDACTED], Broomfield, CO 800201158
[REDACTED], Centreville, Va 20120
[REDACTED] Fallbrook, CA 92028-4518
[REDACTED] Rocky Hill, Connecticut 6067
[REDACTED], Little Rock, AR 72210-1714
[REDACTED], Suffern, NY 10901-1511
[REDACTED], Saint Peters, Missouri 633045653
[REDACTED], Bloomington, Il 617044641
[REDACTED], Cheyenne, Wy 82001
[REDACTED], San Diego, CA 92117-3542
[REDACTED], Greensburg, KY 42743
[REDACTED], Cornish, NH 3745
[REDACTED], Montecito, California 931082705
[REDACTED], Saint Louis, MO 63129-4820
[REDACTED], Los Angeles, CA 90028
[REDACTED], Santa Cruz, California 950602006
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED], Oakland, CA 94601
[REDACTED]e, Northfield, MN 55057
[REDACTED], Weston, Massachusetts (MA) 2493
[REDACTED] Hampstead, NC 284432769

[REDACTED], Croydon, Pennsylvania 190216823
[REDACTED], Melbourne Beach, FL 32951-3502
[REDACTED], Fort Myers, Florida 339089220
[REDACTED], Yakima, Washington 98908
[REDACTED], Keansburg, New Jersey 07734-1153
[REDACTED], Bryn Mawr, PA 19010-3203
[REDACTED], Cedar Park, Texas 786136964
[REDACTED] Green Valley, AZ 85614-5945
[REDACTED], Esperance, NY 12066-2309
[REDACTED], Vacaville, CA 95688
[REDACTED] Fond Du Lac, WI 54937-9349
[REDACTED] Heights, MI 483131763
[REDACTED], Denver, CO 80203-3608
[REDACTED], Santa Ynez, Ca 93460-9350
[REDACTED], Brighton, MI 48114-8657
[REDACTED], North Wilkesboro, NC 28659-4034
[REDACTED], Rio Rancho, NM 871441016
[REDACTED], Ankeny, Iowa 500231067
[REDACTED], Hebron, Illinois 600349202
[REDACTED], Huntington, New York 117432066
[REDACTED], Chicago, IL 606401413
[REDACTED], Lakeland, Florida 33801
[REDACTED], Spanaway, WA 983875775
[REDACTED], Menifee, Ca 925863847
[REDACTED], Hanoverton, OH 44423-9764
[REDACTED], C. C., NV 89703
[REDACTED], Brooklyn, NY/NY 11201-6051
[REDACTED], Exeter, NH 3833
[REDACTED], Joliet Illinois, 60435, Illinois 604356874
[REDACTED], View Park, CA 900432012
[REDACTED], Randolph, New Jersey 7869
[REDACTED], Pittsburgh, pa 15212-1900
[REDACTED], Tigard, OR 97223
[REDACTED], Rocklin, CA 95677-3144
[REDACTED] Elmhurst, NY 11373
[REDACTED], Easthampton, MA 1027
[REDACTED], Marietta, GA 30062
[REDACTED], Three Rivers, CA 932719731
[REDACTED], Cobalt, Idaho 83229
[REDACTED], Los Angeles, CA 90065
[REDACTED], Irvine, California 92604-3145
[REDACTED], Islamorada, Florida 33036-4111
[REDACTED], Olympia, WA 985069665
[REDACTED], Berwyn, IL 60402
[REDACTED], Chandler, Arizona 85249
[REDACTED], Spokane, WA 99208-8969
[REDACTED], East Brunswick, NJ 8816
[REDACTED], Sterling, VA 20165-5728
[REDACTED], Springfield, OR 974772317
[REDACTED], Brunswick, Maryland 217161423
[REDACTED] New Brunswick, new jersey 08901-2112
[REDACTED], Nolensville, TN 37135-1695
[REDACTED], Los Angeles, CA 90026-5530
[REDACTED] Brook, New York 11206-5329

[REDACTED], Poulsbo, Washington 98370
[REDACTED], San Jose, ca 951245466
[REDACTED], Sacramento, CA 95820
[REDACTED], Long Beach, CA 90804
[REDACTED], West Keansburg, NJ 7734
[REDACTED], Eugene, OR 974052578
[REDACTED], Durand, MI 48429
[REDACTED], Milton, DE 19968
[REDACTED], Poway, CA 920645618
[REDACTED], Portland, Oregon 97206
[REDACTED], Marco Island, FL 341456814
[REDACTED], New York, New York 10010-4024
[REDACTED], Lafayette, NY 130849668
[REDACTED], Eastport, Y 11941-1123
[REDACTED], Virginia Beach, VA 234563525
[REDACTED], Jamaica, NY 11434-3902
[REDACTED], Plainview, ny 11803-6022
[REDACTED], Lexington, MA 24200006
[REDACTED], Franklin, TN 370678164
[REDACTED], Cheswick, Pa 150242300
[REDACTED], Dewey, AZ 86327
[REDACTED], Fayetteville, NC 283035235
[REDACTED], Belvidere, IL 61008
[REDACTED], Brooklyn, NY 11209
[REDACTED], Appleton, WI 549157290
[REDACTED], Indio, California 92203
[REDACTED], Tupelo, MS 38804
[REDACTED]pienza, Carrsville, KY 42081
[REDACTED] Los Osos, CA 93402-2704
[REDACTED], BURBANK, CA 91505
[REDACTED], Federal Way, WA 98003
[REDACTED], Tampa, FL 33629
[REDACTED], Sacramento, California 95814-5735
[REDACTED], Los Angeles, CA 90017-3501
[REDACTED], St. Petersburg, FL 33701
[REDACTED], Las Vegas, NV 89108-5469
[REDACTED], Port Jefferson Station, NY 117763417
[REDACTED], Seattle, WA 981033193
[REDACTED], El Cerrito, CA 94530-2573
[REDACTED], AGOURA HILLS, CA 91301
[REDACTED], OLYMPIA, Washington 98501
[REDACTED], YORK HARBOR, Maine 3911
[REDACTED], Tonawanda, NY 14150
[REDACTED], New Orleans, LA 70117-3727
[REDACTED], San Jose, CA 95112-3295
[REDACTED], Chula Vista, CA 91910
[REDACTED], Portland, OR 97206
[REDACTED], Tucson, AZ 857479223
[REDACTED], Framingham, MA 1702
[REDACTED], Blue Mounds, wisconsin 535179680
[REDACTED], Pittsburg, TX 75686
[REDACTED]no, Mims, Florida 327545732
[REDACTED], Gulfport, Mississippi 39507-2244
[REDACTED] Abilene, TX 79605

[REDACTED], Liberty, PA 169309663
[REDACTED], Exeter, ME 04435-3409
[REDACTED], West Monroe, LA 71291
[REDACTED], Buckeye, AZ 853962272
[REDACTED], Central Square, NY 13036
[REDACTED], North Bennington, VT 52579210
[REDACTED], Oak Harbor, WA 98277-8590
[REDACTED], WI 54944
[REDACTED], Bronx, NY 10465
[REDACTED], Somerdale, NJ 08083-1704
[REDACTED], Hastings, Mn 550331917
[REDACTED], Bloomingburg, New York 12721
[REDACTED], Tucson, AZ 85719-4930
[REDACTED], Mertztown, PA 19539
[REDACTED], Tijeras, NM 87059
[REDACTED], Holly, MI 48442
[REDACTED], DEERFIELD BCH, Florida 33442
[REDACTED], Philadelphia, PA 19147
[REDACTED], Eagan, Mn 551232216
[REDACTED] Felton, CA 95018
[REDACTED], Venice, CA 90291-4966
[REDACTED], Tallahassee, FL 32308-3947
[REDACTED], Vernon Hills, Illinois 60061
[REDACTED], Sebastopol, CA 954729183
[REDACTED], Salado, TEXAS 765715119
[REDACTED], Vancouver, WA 98682-0067
[REDACTED], CAMP HILL, PA 17011-8308
[REDACTED], Danvers, MA 19234821
[REDACTED], Mansfield, OH 44903
[REDACTED], Apex, NC 275398877
[REDACTED], CAMPBELL, California 95008-5123
[REDACTED] Berkeley, Ca 947061525
[REDACTED], San Jose, CA 95111
[REDACTED], Muir Beach, California 94965
[REDACTED], Lakeville, Minnesota 55044
[REDACTED], Los Angeles, ca 900491707
[REDACTED], Otisville, MI 48463
[REDACTED], Navarre, Florida 32566
[REDACTED], Pittsburgh, PA 152021034
[REDACTED], San Luis Obispo, CA 93401-3028
[REDACTED], Belleville, Michigan 48111-9375
[REDACTED], Marietta, Georgia 30066-4592
[REDACTED], Gilford, New Hampshire 3249
[REDACTED], Jurupa Valley, CA 91752
[REDACTED], Bethlehem, GA 30620
[REDACTED], Canton, MA 2021
[REDACTED], Coloma, mi 49038-8606
[REDACTED], North Chesterfield, VA 23235
[REDACTED], Prescott Valley, AZ 86312
[REDACTED], Fort Collins, CO 80527-4001
[REDACTED], Brooklyn, NY 11211-8599
[REDACTED] Marion, Illinois 629599587
[REDACTED], Saint Petersburg, FL 33701
[REDACTED] Austin, TX 78754-5732

[REDACTED], AZ - Phoenix, AZ 85016
[REDACTED]ano, Los Angeles, Ca 90025-3261
[REDACTED], Mount Vernon, NY 10552-3906
[REDACTED], McHenry, IL 60051
[REDACTED], Jackson, New Hampshire 38460277
[REDACTED], Byron Center, Michigan 49315-8802
[REDACTED], Saint Louis, MO 63146-4415
[REDACTED], Warren, Pa 16365-2865
[REDACTED], Pleasanton, CA 94588
[REDACTED], Bronx, NY 10465-1531
[REDACTED], Basel, Basel-Stadt 4000
[REDACTED], Milwaukie, OR 97222
[REDACTED], Oak Park, IL 60302
[REDACTED], Castroville, CA 95012
[REDACTED], Lake Isabella, CA 93240
[REDACTED], Danville, Illinois 61832-7960
[REDACTED], Belleville, AR 72824
[REDACTED], Tustin, CA 92780
[REDACTED], Suwanee, Ga 300242994
[REDACTED], Englewood, CO 80111
[REDACTED], Redondo Beach, California 902784823
[REDACTED], Collegeville, PA 194264194
[REDACTED], Clarkston, Washington 99403
[REDACTED], Derby, NY 14047
[REDACTED], N Las Vegas, Nevada 89084-3805
[REDACTED], Aliso Viejo, California 92656
[REDACTED], Santa Monica, CA 904023005
[REDACTED], Bedminster, NJ 79212116
[REDACTED], Salem, MA 19702766
[REDACTED], Saint Clair Shores, MI 480812537
[REDACTED], East Patchogue, NY 11772
[REDACTED], Brunswick, ME 40119460
[REDACTED], Oakley, california 94561-2492
[REDACTED], Vacaville, CA 95688
[REDACTED], Middleton, MA 1949
[REDACTED] Holly Springs, North Carolina 27540
[REDACTED], East Haven, Ct 65121308
[REDACTED], Norfolk, Virginia 235051174
[REDACTED], Marietta, NY 131103131
[REDACTED], Port Norris, New Jersey 8349
[REDACTED], Petaluma, CA 94954
[REDACTED], Los Angeles, ca 900196713
[REDACTED], Phoenix, AZ 85007
[REDACTED], Chiefland, Florida 326260502
[REDACTED], Erdenheim, PA 19038
[REDACTED] Newmarket, NH 03857-1639
[REDACTED], Reseda, ca 91335-4100
[REDACTED], Ledbetter, Kentucky 42058-9762
[REDACTED], Miami Gardens, FL 33169-3801
[REDACTED], Waynesboro, PA 17268-1628, PA 17628
[REDACTED], Brooklyn, New York 11229-5742
[REDACTED], Boise, ID 83709-6817
[REDACTED], Prairieville, Louisiana 70769
[REDACTED], Minneapolis, MN 55419

[REDACTED], Mission Viejo, CA 92692
[REDACTED], Newmarket, NH 03857-1639
[REDACTED], Isle, MN 56342
[REDACTED], Lancaster, NY 14086
[REDACTED], Minneapolis, MN 55406
[REDACTED], Thousand Oaks, California, United States, CA 91360
[REDACTED] Honolulu, HI 96808-0974
[REDACTED], FAIRFIELD, CA 94533-6405
[REDACTED], Mayfield Hts, OH 44124
[REDACTED] Indianapolis, IND 462352316
[REDACTED], Austin, TX 78745-3018
[REDACTED], Isle, MN 563424772
[REDACTED], Rushville, IN 461731242
[REDACTED], Santa Monica, CA 90405-2603
[REDACTED], Miami, flo 33172
[REDACTED], Naperville, IL 60564-4694
[REDACTED], Rochester, NY 14626-1866
[REDACTED], Topeka, Kansas 666099492
[REDACTED], Paradise Valley, Az 85253-3576
[REDACTED], Manhattan Beach, CA, CA 90266
[REDACTED], Kansas City, Kansas 66104-1456
[REDACTED] Jacksonville Beach, Fl 32250-6725
[REDACTED], Valley Glen, CA 91401
[REDACTED], Delavan, wi 531152309
[REDACTED] Charlottesville, Va 22903-4747
[REDACTED], San Francisco, CA 94122
[REDACTED], Riverbank, CA 953679608
[REDACTED], Roxboro, NORTH CAROLINA 27574
[REDACTED], HEDGESVILLE, WV 25427
[REDACTED] nlea, Nashua, Nh 3060
[REDACTED], Pgh, PA 15218
[REDACTED], Atlanta, GA 30327
[REDACTED], Park Ridge, IL 60068-3041
[REDACTED], Manchester, nj 08759-4638
[REDACTED], Durham, NC 27713
[REDACTED], Burbank, Illinois 604591311
[REDACTED], Worcester, MA 16053203
[REDACTED], Brooksville, Florida 346015501
[REDACTED], Olympia, WA 98501-5900
[REDACTED], Freehold, New Jersey 7728
[REDACTED], Los Angeles, CA 900498205
[REDACTED], Appleton, Wisconsin 54914-1972
[REDACTED], Columbus, OH 43229
[REDACTED], Studio City, CA 91604-2867
[REDACTED], New York, New York 100130874
[REDACTED], Mooresville, Nc 28117-8318
[REDACTED], Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
[REDACTED], Newport News, VA 23601
[REDACTED], Eclectic, Al 36024
[REDACTED], Depoe Bay, Oregon 97341-9530
[REDACTED], Kingman, AZ 864091712
[REDACTED], Joliet, IL 60433
[REDACTED], Homer Glen, IL 60491
[REDACTED], Poughkeepsie, NY 126031111

██████████, Babylon, NY 11702-2634
██████████, Oakland, CA 94609-1746
██████████, Trinity, Florida 34655-5330
██████████ Missoula, Montana 59803-1226
██████████, Matteson, IL 60443
██████████, Aylmer, on N5H 1T2
██████████, Stephenson, Virginia 22656
██████████ ans, Seattle, WA 981174957
██████████, Medford, NJ 8055
██████████, Manassas, Virginia 20112
██████████, Cottonwood Heights, Utah 84121-2728
██████████, Mpls, MN 55423
██████████, Victorville, CA 92394
██████████ Ft Lauderdale, Florida 333084351
██████████, Miami Lakes, FL 330152163
██████████, Medford, Or 97501-1289
██████████, Omaha, Nebraska 68138-7429
██████████ Saint Louis, mo 631232609
██████████ Braintree, MA 2184
██████████, North Royalton, Ohio 44133-4102
██████████, Worthington, Ohio 430853219
██████████ Westlake Village, California 91361
██████████, Lake Oswego, OR 97034
██████████, Fort Lee, NJ 7024
██████████, Murray, Utah 841076584
██████████, Rodeo, California 94572-1445
██████████, Yuba City, CA 95991-8866
██████████, Nokomis, Florida 34275-3330
██████████, Geneva, NY 14456-2033
██████████, Massapequa Park, NY 11762
██████████, Eden Prairie, Mn 55347-2188
██████████, Franklin, KY 42134
██████████, Burlington, WI 531058744
██████████, Northbridge, MA 1534
██████████, Palmdale, California 935502861
██████████, Walnut Creek, California 945972242
██████████ Middlesex, NJ 08846-1613
██████████, Sausalito, California 94965-1727
██████████, Trinity, NC 27370
██████████ Clinton, IL 61727
██████████, Poulsbo, WA 98370
██████████, San Francisco, CA 94109
██████████, Washington, DC 200023716
██████████, Tonawanda, New york 141503341
██████████, Birmingham, AL 35206
██████████, Gloucester, MA 01930 - 3119
██████████, Memphis, Tennessee 38111-4335
██████████, Fort Bragg, CA 95437
██████████, Overland Park, KS 66210
██████████, Phoenix, AZ 85078
██████████, Bryn Mawr, PA 19010-2237
██████████, Depew, New York 14043
██████████, Port Angeles, WA 98362
██████████, Buffalo, NY 14225-3712

[REDACTED], Rochester, NY 146261866
[REDACTED], Anderson, IN 46013
[REDACTED], Wappingers Falls, NY 12590
[REDACTED], Sellersville, PA 18960-1422
[REDACTED], Cranford, NJ 7016
[REDACTED], Syracuse, NY 13212
[REDACTED], Santa Fe, NM 875012720
[REDACTED], Salem, OR 97306-8802
[REDACTED], Westfield, MA 10854623
[REDACTED], PITTSBURG, California 94565-6247
[REDACTED], Truth Or Consequences, NM 879017218
[REDACTED], Bethlehem, Pennsylvania 18018-1807
[REDACTED], Telluride, CO 814352902
[REDACTED], Milwaukee, WI 532281450
[REDACTED], Bellingham, WA 982292634
[REDACTED], Stormville, NY 125825624
[REDACTED], Spring Valley, Ca 919773722
[REDACTED] New Hudson, MI 48165
[REDACTED], Mount Vernon, WA 98273
[REDACTED], Granada Hills, CA 913444807
[REDACTED], Nashville, Michigan 490738717
[REDACTED], Cottonwood, AZ 86326
[REDACTED], Lakewood, CO 80232-6419
[REDACTED], Henderson, Nevada 89052-3147
[REDACTED], Charlottesville, VA 22901
[REDACTED], Green Valley, AZ 85614
[REDACTED], Estes Park, Colorado 80517-7679
[REDACTED]sh, Belen, NM 87002
[REDACTED], Fairfax, VA 22032-3233
[REDACTED], Johns Island, SOUTH CAROLINA 29455
[REDACTED], Charlotte, NC 282168824
[REDACTED], Placerville, CA 95667-8737
[REDACTED], Detroit, Michigan 48209
[REDACTED], Brunswick, ME 04011-3213
[REDACTED], Yardley, Pa 19067
[REDACTED], Jasper, Tn 37347-0192
[REDACTED], Princeton, NJ 8540
[REDACTED] Brooklyn, New York 112355578
[REDACTED], Ventura, Ca 930043150
[REDACTED], Rossville, GA 30741
[REDACTED], Sterling Heights, Michigan 48314
[REDACTED], CHADRON, Nebraska 69337
[REDACTED], Rsm, CA 926883879
[REDACTED], Saint Cloud, MN 56303
[REDACTED]raft, South Lake Tahoe, ca 961551031
[REDACTED], Houston, TX 77019-4084
[REDACTED], Sarasota, Florida 342384536
[REDACTED], Mahopac, NY 10541
[REDACTED], Knoxville, TN 37920-2535
[REDACTED], Boulder, Colorado 80302-9489
[REDACTED], Taos, NM 87571-6646
[REDACTED], Sacramento, California 95817
[REDACTED], Jeffersonville, IN 47130-6904
[REDACTED], Leesburg, Fl 347485735

[REDACTED], Fort Wayne, Indiana 46818-1707
[REDACTED] Hyde Park, NY 110403005
[REDACTED], Scituate, MA 02066-4831
[REDACTED], Cusler, MI 49405-9785
[REDACTED], Clinton, MD 20735-1542
[REDACTED], Oakville, CT 06779-1958
[REDACTED], Ithaca, NY 14850
[REDACTED], Waterloo, IA 50702-5438
[REDACTED], Hillsboro, Mo 63050
[REDACTED], Marlborough, Massachusetts 17527223
[REDACTED], Philadelphia, PA 19118
[REDACTED], Bend, Oregon 97708
[REDACTED], Gold Canyon, AZ 85118
[REDACTED] Valley, PA 161201826
[REDACTED], Prattsburgh, New York 14873
[REDACTED], Otis Orchards, Washington 99027
[REDACTED], Monterey Park, Ca 917544708
[REDACTED], Palmer, AK 996459228
[REDACTED] Anchorage, AK 99502
[REDACTED] Candler, Nc 28715-9494
[REDACTED], Johnson City, Tennessee 37604
[REDACTED], Babcock Ranch, FL 339822286
[REDACTED], Union City Ca, CA 94587
[REDACTED], BIDDEFORD, ME 4005
[REDACTED], Provo, UT 84601
[REDACTED], Los Angeles, CA 90034
[REDACTED], Lindsay, Ok 730520494
[REDACTED], Sierra Vista, Arizona 856504232
[REDACTED], Port Hueneme, Ca 93041-1911
[REDACTED], Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33418-8067
[REDACTED], Scarborough, Maine 40748529
[REDACTED], Coburg, Oregon 97408-1329
[REDACTED], Bayamon, Puerto Rico, PR ft Dr 9613253
[REDACTED], Charlotte, NC 28211
[REDACTED], Amarillo, Texas 79109
[REDACTED] raintree, MA 02184-8256
[REDACTED], Mountain View, CA 94041-1160
[REDACTED], Spokane Valley, WA 99206-5728
[REDACTED], Albuquerque, NM 87114
[REDACTED], Collegeville, PA 19426
[REDACTED], Belleville, MI 48111
[REDACTED], San Clemente, California 926732720
[REDACTED], Anderson, Mo 64831-9661
[REDACTED] Stockton, CA 95207-8811
[REDACTED], Ada, Minnesota 56510-1000
[REDACTED], Holland, OH 43528
[REDACTED], Phoenix, OR 85042
[REDACTED], Corona, CA 928814402
[REDACTED], Olympia, WA 98507
[REDACTED], Lorton, VA 22079
[REDACTED], Boca Raton, FL 334964065
[REDACTED] South Richmond Hill, New York 11419-2101
[REDACTED], Portland, OR 972014835
[REDACTED], Dearborn, Michigan 48126

[REDACTED], Milltown, Montana 59851
[REDACTED], Tempe, AZ 85281
[REDACTED], Citrus Heights, CA 95610
[REDACTED], New Berlin, WI 53151
[REDACTED], Dublin, OH 43017-8793
[REDACTED], St Petersburg, FL 33708-4800
[REDACTED] E E Wlson, Little Deer Isle, ME 04650-3010
[REDACTED], Minneola, Florida 347157779
[REDACTED], Rochester Hills, Michigan 483063955
[REDACTED], King City, Or 97224-2559
[REDACTED], Conroe, Texas 773859534
[REDACTED], Beaverton, OR 97007
[REDACTED], Colorado Springs, CO 80907
[REDACTED], Fallston, MD 210471003
[REDACTED], Davis, California 956185051
[REDACTED], Stanhope, NJ 7874
[REDACTED], San Diego, CA 92108-6737
[REDACTED], Ft Lauderdale, Fl 33308-5709
[REDACTED], Cromwell, CT 64162186
[REDACTED], Philadelphia, PA 19146-2434
[REDACTED], Kewanee, IL 61443
[REDACTED] El Sobrante, CA 94803-3548
[REDACTED], Lombard, Illinois 60148-2834
[REDACTED], Independence, OR 97351
[REDACTED], Plainfield, CT 06374-2100
[REDACTED], Bradenton, FL 34207
[REDACTED], Ashland,)r 97520-9634
[REDACTED], Skokie, illinois 60077
[REDACTED], Pensacola, FL 32526
[REDACTED], Aptos, California 95003
[REDACTED], Staten Island, NY 10314
[REDACTED], Knoxville, Tennessee 37924
[REDACTED], Sherman Oaks, CA 914231019
[REDACTED], Eugene, Oregon 97401-2893
[REDACTED], Nampa, Nampa idaho 83686-6754
[REDACTED], Lafayette, Louisiana 70507-7006
[REDACTED], Levittown, Pennsylvania 19054
[REDACTED], 4, New Jersey 7666
[REDACTED], Baywood-Los Osos, CA 93402
[REDACTED], Wilmington, DE 19803
[REDACTED], Rockford, IL 61114-6142
[REDACTED], SIMSBURY, CT 06070-1942
[REDACTED] Otis, MA 01253-0306
[REDACTED], Downers Grove, IL 60515-1247
[REDACTED], Boston, MA 2109
[REDACTED], The Woodlands, Texas 77381
[REDACTED], San Francisco, CA 941092717
[REDACTED], Huntsville, AL 35824
[REDACTED], West Deptford, New Jersey 80862567
[REDACTED], Coronado, CA 92118-2344
[REDACTED], Enola, PA 17025
[REDACTED], Melrose, MA 2176
[REDACTED], White Lake, MI 48386
[REDACTED], Lancaster, NY 14086

[REDACTED], Winnipeg, Manitoba 58201-6018
[REDACTED], Riverton, NJ 80771445
[REDACTED], Argyle, TX 76226-7373
[REDACTED], Eagan, MN 55122-1634
[REDACTED], Belleville, Illinois 62223
[REDACTED], Omaha, NE 68144
[REDACTED], Richardson, TX 75081
[REDACTED], Sedley, VIRGINIA 23878-2603
[REDACTED], Birmingham, AL 35215
[REDACTED], Farmington, mo. 63640-1942
[REDACTED], Chelsea, Massachusetts 2150
[REDACTED], Kittredge, CO 80457
[REDACTED], Brooklyn, NY 11217
[REDACTED], Saint Louis, Missouri 63105-2264
[REDACTED], Glen Arm, Maryland 21057-9140
[REDACTED], Sound Beach, NY 11789
[REDACTED], Ferndale, Michigan 48220-3215
[REDACTED], Sutton, VT 05867-9801
[REDACTED], Stuart, FL 34994
[REDACTED], Chesterfield, Mi 480471781
[REDACTED], Tujunga, CA 91042
[REDACTED], Chicago, Illinois 60660-3430
[REDACTED], Muscle Shoals, Alabama 356611249
[REDACTED], Trenton, NJ 86185003
[REDACTED], Jamaica Plain, MA 21302416
[REDACTED], Manchester, CT 6040
[REDACTED], Lowell, MA 1852
[REDACTED], Pittsburgh, PA 15202
[REDACTED], Fairlawn, ohio 44333-3122
[REDACTED], Point Pleasant Boro, NJ 08742-4933
[REDACTED], Miami, FL 33179-6413
[REDACTED], Manhattan Beach, CA 90266
[REDACTED], Arlington, Virginia 22201
[REDACTED], Evanston, IL 602014967
[REDACTED], Granada Hills, CA 91344-2857
[REDACTED], Longmont, CO 805015328
[REDACTED], Alexandria, VA 22305-1808
[REDACTED], Los Angeles, California 90024-5741
[REDACTED], Grass Valley, CA 959455761
[REDACTED] Center, WA 986295568
[REDACTED], Crest Hill, IL 60403-1858
[REDACTED], Manchester, NH 3103
[REDACTED], Healy, AK 997430058
[REDACTED], Naples, FL 341093358
[REDACTED], West Norriton, Pa 19403-2717
[REDACTED], San Diego, CA 921314226
[REDACTED], Louisville, Ky 402423633
[REDACTED] Ashland, MA 17212158
[REDACTED], Laguna Hills, CA 92653
[REDACTED], Dix Hills, NY 117467027
[REDACTED], Langley, WA 98260
[REDACTED], Pittsfield, MA 1201
[REDACTED], Chattanooga, TN 37421
[REDACTED], Wilmington, delaware 19805-1077

[REDACTED], Waunakee, Wisconsin 535979519
[REDACTED], Kennewick, WA 99337-3927
[REDACTED]kson, Silverthorne, CO 80498-1867
[REDACTED], Denville, NJ 7945
[REDACTED]ndrews, Castle Rock, Colorado 801042277
[REDACTED], New York, NY 10011
[REDACTED], Ipswich, MA 01938-1639
[REDACTED], Valley Glen, California 91401-3041
[REDACTED], Cranston, RI 2920
[REDACTED], Bozrah, CT 6334
[REDACTED], Fort Worth, Texas 761094727
[REDACTED], Zephyrhills, FL 33542
[REDACTED], Bronx, NY 10465-1531
[REDACTED], Park Hills, MO 63601
[REDACTED], Cottonwood, Arizona 863268941
[REDACTED], Palm City, Florida 34990
[REDACTED], Mount Joy, PA 17552-7222
[REDACTED], Laguna Hills, CA / US 926531604
[REDACTED], Julian, CA 92036
[REDACTED], Brooktondale, NY 148179716
[REDACTED], Weehawken, NJ 70866906
[REDACTED], Pinehurst, north carolina 283749759
[REDACTED], Racine, WI 534035400
[REDACTED], Eugene, Oregon 974021457
[REDACTED], Stamford, NY 12167
[REDACTED], Ontario, CA 91761
[REDACTED], Detroit, MI 48227-1459
[REDACTED], Oneonta, NY 13820
[REDACTED] Anacortes, WA 98221
[REDACTED], Moorpark, CA 930212919
[REDACTED], Tucson, Az 85735-1619
[REDACTED], Pine, AZ 85544
[REDACTED], Matthews, NC 28105
[REDACTED], New Windsor, New York 12553
[REDACTED], Chevy Chase, MD 20815-6201
[REDACTED], Madison, Indiana 472508330
[REDACTED], Perkasio, PA 18944-4121
[REDACTED], Gold Beach, Oregon 97444
[REDACTED] Silver City, NM 88061
[REDACTED], Arcata, CA 95521
[REDACTED], San Marcos, Ca 920786347
[REDACTED], Greenbelt, MD 20770-7776
[REDACTED], Buckeye, AZ 85396
[REDACTED], Charlotte, North Carolina 28205-8312
[REDACTED], Spruce Grove, Alberta T7X1P7
[REDACTED], Apopka, FL 32712
[REDACTED], Woodside, New York 11377-4221
[REDACTED], Clearwater, FL 337651808
[REDACTED], Buffalo Grove, IL 60089-2056
[REDACTED], Sonoma, California 95476
[REDACTED], CHICAGO, Illinois 60602
[REDACTED], Encino, CA 91316-1013
[REDACTED], West Springfield, MA 01089-3342
[REDACTED], Lake Barrington, IL 60010

[REDACTED], Greenville, TX 75402-8150
[REDACTED], Glenmoore, PA 19343-9543
[REDACTED], New London, CT 06320-5823
[REDACTED], Weirton, WV 26062-2912
[REDACTED], Chicago, IL 60630-1050
[REDACTED], Lakewood, Ohio 441072326
[REDACTED], Ashtabula, Ohio 44004-2702
[REDACTED], Miami, FL 33136
[REDACTED], Sun City West, Arizona 85375-5174
[REDACTED], BEAVERTON, OR 97007
[REDACTED], Wilmington, ma 18871709
[REDACTED], Nv 89431-1239
[REDACTED], Canal Winchester, Ohio 43110-1205
[REDACTED] Longmont, CO 80501-5504
[REDACTED], Springfield, Oregon 974774636
[REDACTED], Mountlake Terrace, WA 980435981
[REDACTED], Lewiston, NY 14092
[REDACTED] Fernandina Beach, FL 32034-4660
[REDACTED], Lincoln, CA 956481513
[REDACTED], MALVERN, OH 44644
[REDACTED]allone, Bronx, New York 10462-2215
[REDACTED], Vallejo, California 945903352
[REDACTED], Fayetteville, PA 172221141
[REDACTED], CLAREMONT, CA 91711
[REDACTED], Homosassa, Fl 344464341
[REDACTED], Billings, Montana 59101-5908
[REDACTED], Los Gatos, CA 95033
[REDACTED], Stafford, tx 774773096
[REDACTED], Columbus, OH 43214
[REDACTED], New Kensington, PA 150685736
[REDACTED], Portland, OR 97231-1429
[REDACTED], Santa Rosa, Ca 954093507
[REDACTED], Chicago, IL 60616
[REDACTED], Yorba Linda, CA 928863624
[REDACTED], Daly City, CA 94014-1555
[REDACTED], TOLEDO, OH 43623
[REDACTED], Pendleton, IN 46064
[REDACTED], Moore, SC 29369
[REDACTED], Richmond, Virginia 232251957
[REDACTED], Prescott, AZ 86301
[REDACTED], Anaheim, California 92801
[REDACTED], Brielle, New Jersey 8730
[REDACTED], WATERFORD, CT 6385
[REDACTED], Teepee Creek (Sexsmith), Alberta T0H 3C0
[REDACTED], Chesterfield, MI 48047-2334
[REDACTED]r, York, PA 17408-9755
[REDACTED], Clarkston, MI 48346
[REDACTED], Los Angeles, CA 90026
[REDACTED], Charleston, IL 61920
[REDACTED], Oroville, ca 95966-6310
[REDACTED], Sandwich, MA 02563-1871
[REDACTED], Capo Beach, CA 926241023
[REDACTED], Pasadena, California 91101
[REDACTED], Davis, WV 262608312

██████████ CHEYENNE, WY 82001
██████████, Trumbull, CT 66113344
██████████, Williamsburg, Virginia 23185
██████████, Kalamazoo, MI 49006
██████████, Sparks, NV 89434-1766
██████████, Wisconsin 545208855
██████████, Watsonville, California 95076
██████████, Santa Rosa, CA 95403
██████████, Shingle Springs, California 95682
██████████, Lodi, NJ 7644
██████████, TUCSON, AZ 85712
██████████, Stevenson Ranch, California 91381-1111
██████████, Fortuna, CA 955409784
██████████, Ballston Lake, NY 12019
██████████ ella, Beaver, PA 15009
██████████, Naperville, il 60565
██████████, Ventura, CA 93001
██████████, Independence, KY 41051
██████████, Valencia, CA 91355
██████████, Celebration, Florida 34747-5027
██████████, Babbitt, MN 55706-8018
██████████, Ironwood, MI 49938-9746
██████████, Hollywood, fl 330206038
██████████, MENTOR, OH 44060
██████████, Miami, FL 33131
██████████, Lutz, FL 33558
██████████, Houston, Texasl 772799781
██████████, Boise, Idaho 83702
██████████, Arlington, Wa 98223-4718
██████████, St. Petersburg, FL 33705
██████████, Pasadena, ca 911011107
██████████, Colorado Springs, CO 80918
██████████, Webster, MO 63119
██████████, Philadelphia, PA 191035719
██████████, Redington Beach, fl 337081614
██████████, Winter Haven, FL 33881
██████████, Long Beach, ca 90808
██████████, Sun City, Arizona 85373-2133
██████████, Houston, Texas 77057-5317
██████████, Rockford, IL 611096401
██████████, Gainesville, Florida 326091381
██████████, Malibu, Ca 902654628
██████████ Woodland Park, CO 808639158
██████████, Lewis Center, Ohio 430358476
██████████, Saint Petersburg, FL 33713
██████████, Urbana, IL 61801
██████████, Las Vegas, NV 89108-1342
██████████, Richford, Vt 05476-1122
██████████, Monroe, Michigan 48161
██████████, North Wales, PA 19454
██████████, Marshall, Va 20116-0253
██████████, Toledo, OH 43606-3065
██████████, Bealeton, VA 22712
██████████, Roslyn Heights, New York 11577-2309

██████████, Dallas, TX 75225-2323
██████████, Chicago, Illinois 60652
██████████, Monrovia, CA 91016
██████████, Naperville, IL 60540
██████████, Parlier, CA 93648
██████████, Queens Village, NY 11427-2114
██████████, Pacific Grove, CA 93950
██████████, Austin, Texas 78704-4615
██████████, Livingston, MT 59047-1806
██████████, San Antonio, TX 78228-2060
██████████, Flemington, nj 08822-5600
██████████, Niceville, FL 325789730
██████████, Soquel, California 95073-9725
██████████, Marinette, Wisconsin 54143
██████████, Pittsburgh, PA 15232-1722
██████████, Montana City, MT 596349646

Correspondence ID: 12479Project:112008Document:132104

Address: San Bernardino, CA 92404
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,09 2023 11:01:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: SAVE THE GRIZZLY BEARS

Correspondence ID: 12480Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kent, WA 98031
United States of America
Outside Organization: None Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,09 2023 11:07:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I oppose putting grizzly bears in Washington state because they are the most aggressive bears. They are a threat to wildlife and humans and can kill. There are more people moving into Cities near the Cascades away from the big cities and moving into such cities as Easton. Cle Elum, Rosylyn etc and other cities near the Cascades and It will put them at risk to these types of bears. I'm living in Kent and I hear about an occasional citing of a bear even in Renton and other closely populated Cities more and more. Do we need to worry about possibly seeing a grizzly bear getting into some of these populated cities by putting them In the Cascades. There could be a chance they may wander and endanger humans, wildlife etc. The population has grown in Washington state since they have been here. Why would you jeopardize human life and others doing this? California got rid of the massive grizzly which was seen as a threat to livestock or as a commodity or both back in the 1700's gold rush. Doing research on this on Google the bears were chased off lands newly occupied by sheep and cattle, often killed For a bounty, their pelts or meat. Because there are more hunters than Ever before this is bound to happen to the bears again. In Oregon state the grizzly has Been extinct since the 1930's, a victim of habitat destruction and over-hunting, Our human population has grown over the past decades and we don't need a threat to human life and wildlife since they are one of the most aggressive bears there are and can attack and kill. I was Born in Montana and my mother was chased by a bear in the 1950's In Kalispell Mt so do we need to put them in Washington a growing

populated state? My daughter lives on 8 acres in Cle Elum near Upper Peoh point do I have to worry about a Grizzly possibly wandering over there? That is the question we need to answer and Is it a possibility that this could happen.in these growing cities threat to Human life and Livestock animals?

Correspondence ID: 12481Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Washington, DC 20005
United States of America
Outside Organization: National Wildlife Federation Action Fund Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,09 2023 11:09:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Director Williams and Director Sams,

Below are 2,610 of 8,415 comments submitted by advocates and supporters of the National Wildlife Federation Action Fund in regards to the Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/Environmental Impact Statement, North Cascades.

Thank you for releasing an environmental impact statement and draft plan that outlines a path forward to recover and restore grizzly bears in the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE).

Grizzly bears belong in the North Cascades. They roamed the region for thousands of years and their eventual decline was a loss to biodiversity and to the cultural traditions of First Nations and Indigenous communities throughout the Pacific Northwest and British Columbia. Restoring and managing grizzlies in the North Cascades is an important step in bringing the full ecosystem back together and it's a critical step to larger grizzly bear recovery efforts in the lower 48.

I'm grateful for your leadership on this issue and encourage you to continue the recovery process in coordination with Tribal governments, local partners, and other stakeholders. Doing so will ensure that grizzly bears maintain a path towards full recovery for the benefit of future generations.

Sincerely,

██████████, Lakeland, FL 338036901
██████████, Asheville, NC 28801
██████████, Glen Allen, VA 23060
██████████, Tracy City, TN 37387-4638
██████████, Rochester, Ny 14623-2326
██████████, Philadelphia, PA 191192406
██████████, Charlotte, NC 28210
██████████, Aiea, HI 96701-1886
██████████, Buffalo, NY 142141682
██████████, Suches, Ga 305722423
██████████, Hampton, NH 3842
██████████, Oakdale, CA 953618932
██████████, Reno, NV 89523-2781
██████████, New Rochelle, New York. 10801
██████████, Stockton, CA 95205
██████████, Glendora, California 91740
██████████, Temple Terrace, FL 33617-4010
██████████, Washington, DC 20020-3314
██████████, Easley, SC 296407008
██████████, San Luis Obispo, california 934015822
██████████, Bayside, Queens New York 113642818
██████████, Hopewell Junction, Ny 125331305

[REDACTED], Vineland, NJ 08360-4118
[REDACTED], PROSSER, WA 99350-6523
[REDACTED], Bloomington, IN 474015867
[REDACTED], Belleville, Illinois 622266520
[REDACTED], Cheyenne, WY 82009-4209
[REDACTED], Houston, Texas 77059-6011
[REDACTED], Vienna, VA 22180
[REDACTED] Antlers, Oklahoma 745230333
[REDACTED] Flushing, NY 11355-1719
[REDACTED], Benbrook, Tx 761095755
[REDACTED], Snow Camp, NC 273499694
[REDACTED], Lakewood, Colorado 80214-2163
[REDACTED], Bellevue, Nebraska 68005
[REDACTED], Fairbanks, Ak 99710
[REDACTED] Lafayette, CO 80026
[REDACTED], Bushnell, Florida 33513-5046
[REDACTED], Plano, texas 750240377
[REDACTED] Congers, NY 109202702
[REDACTED], Fayetteville, Arkansas 72701-7403
[REDACTED], Jenkintown, PA 19046
[REDACTED]erson, Madison, wis 537041831
[REDACTED], Colbert, Georgia 30628-2511
[REDACTED], East Alton, IL 62024
[REDACTED], West New York, New Jersey 07093-2208
[REDACTED], Taylorsville, UT 84129
[REDACTED], Canton, OH 44710
[REDACTED], Moon Township, Pa 15108-9034
[REDACTED], Carol Stream, Illinois 60188-3707
[REDACTED], Miami, Florida 33145
[REDACTED], GARRISON, NY 10524-7420
[REDACTED], CLEVELAND, OH 44102
[REDACTED] Massapequa Park, NY 11762
[REDACTED], Fargo, ND 58103-7170
[REDACTED], Bow, NH 33043716
[REDACTED], Eleva, Wi 547386001
[REDACTED], Port Orange, FL 32127
[REDACTED], Norwalk, OH 44857, USA, OH 44857
[REDACTED], Chaumont, New York 136222226
[REDACTED], Fyzabad, San-Fernando 0
[REDACTED], Medford, NJ 08055-9325
[REDACTED] Tampa, Florida 33604
[REDACTED], Rock Island, Il 61201-4914
[REDACTED], Seattle, WA 981158150
[REDACTED], Norfork, AR 72658
[REDACTED] Rising Sun, IN 47040
[REDACTED], New York, NY 10022
[REDACTED], Santa Clarita, California 913501309
[REDACTED], Fairplay, CO 80440
[REDACTED], Greenland, NH 03840-2287
[REDACTED] San Marcos, Texas 786662831
[REDACTED], Valrico, Florida 335943577
[REDACTED], Valley City, Ohio 442809704
[REDACTED], Mertzown, PA 195399617
[REDACTED], Folsom, CA 956307928

[REDACTED], Seattle, Washington 981255904
[REDACTED] Cleveland, OH 44125
[REDACTED], Columbia, MD 21045-2403
[REDACTED], Malibu, California 90265
[REDACTED], Sunnyvale, CA 940871749
[REDACTED], McLean, VA 22101-6004
[REDACTED], East Norwich, New York 117321028
[REDACTED], Ledbetter, Ky 42045
[REDACTED], Abrams, WI 541019422
[REDACTED], Bartlesville, Oklahoma 74003-5916
[REDACTED], Gallatin, TN 37066-8509
[REDACTED], Paso Robles, California 93446
[REDACTED], Maryville, Tennessee 37804-3272
[REDACTED], Greendale, WI 53129-2625
[REDACTED], Lake Elsinore, CA 92532
[REDACTED], Freehold, New Jersey 77288595
[REDACTED], Campbell, NY 14821
[REDACTED], Union City, Pa 164381149
[REDACTED], PASO ROBLES, CA 93446
[REDACTED], Levittown, Pa 190572009
[REDACTED], Phoenix, AZ 850442434
[REDACTED], Garberville, CA 95542-9405
[REDACTED], Hartford, MI 49057
[REDACTED], Seattle, WA 98112
[REDACTED], Columbus, OH 43212
[REDACTED] Phoenix, AZ 85028
[REDACTED], Swansea, Illinois 62226
[REDACTED], Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53220-2323
[REDACTED], Portsmouth, VA 23701
[REDACTED], Mercer Island, WA 98040-3286
[REDACTED], Mannington, WV 26582-5180
[REDACTED], Port Arthur, Tx 776420230
[REDACTED], Clearfield, PA 16830
[REDACTED], Melbourne Beach, FL 32951-3856
[REDACTED], SAN JOSE, CA 95128
[REDACTED], Garden City, NY 11530
[REDACTED] Pt Charlotte, fl 33952
[REDACTED], Michigan City, Indiana 46360
[REDACTED], Springfield, Mo 658037229
[REDACTED], Henrico, VA 23231-3908
[REDACTED], Tonawanda, NY 14150-3921
[REDACTED], Fairhope, AL 36532-3044
[REDACTED], Casper, WY 82609
[REDACTED], Pine, CO 80470
[REDACTED] tcheson, Portland, TN 37148
[REDACTED], Stratford, CT 06614-8193
[REDACTED], Webster, Massachusetts 15701817
[REDACTED], Greensburg, PA 15601
[REDACTED], Belle Isle, FL 32812-4832
[REDACTED], Cincinnati, Ohio 45238
[REDACTED], Blowing Rock, NC 28605
[REDACTED], OMAHA, NE 68124
[REDACTED], Monterey, California 93940
[REDACTED], Albemarle, NC 28001-7925

[REDACTED], Mechanicsburg, PA 17050
[REDACTED], Lansing, Michigan 489114806
[REDACTED], Ashland City, Tennessee 370159410
[REDACTED], Stevens Point, WI 54481
[REDACTED] Vancouver, WA 98683
[REDACTED], Littleton, CO 801288204
[REDACTED], Medway, MA 2053
[REDACTED], Portland, Oregon 97224
[REDACTED], Colora, MD 219171174
[REDACTED], St. Louis, Missouri 63122
[REDACTED], Cleveland, NC 27013
[REDACTED], LAKE WORTH, Florida 33463
[REDACTED], Sparks, NV 89436
[REDACTED], Severn, Md 21144-3508
[REDACTED], Vienna, VA 22181
[REDACTED], Dennis, Massachusetts 2638
[REDACTED], Saint Clair, MO 630771246
[REDACTED], GLEN ELLEN, California 95442
[REDACTED], Clarksville, TN 37043-6810
[REDACTED], Milwaukee, WI 53207
[REDACTED], Fort Washington, PA 190341625
[REDACTED], Spring, Texas 77386-3118
[REDACTED], Bozeman, MT 59718
[REDACTED], Foster City, California 944041909
[REDACTED], FORT WALTON BEACH, FL 32547
[REDACTED] n, San Diego, CA 92122
[REDACTED], Floral Park, NY 11001
[REDACTED], Crozet, VA 22932
[REDACTED], Kapolei, HI 967072009
[REDACTED], Falmouth, ME 04105-1818
[REDACTED], Diamond Bar, CA 91765
[REDACTED], N VERSAILLES, PA 15137-1138
[REDACTED], Orlando, Florida 32825
[REDACTED], Milton, Georgia 300048244
[REDACTED], Stonington, CT 06378-1515
[REDACTED], Nyack, NY 10960-2569
[REDACTED], Vadnais Heights, MN 55127-7823
[REDACTED], Signal Hill, CA 907556013
[REDACTED], Crown Point, IN 46307
[REDACTED], Phoenix, Az 850325439
[REDACTED], Rochester, NY 146102725
[REDACTED], New York, NY 10036
[REDACTED] Albany, NY 12203
[REDACTED], Albany, NY 12209-2105
[REDACTED], La Fayette, NY 130849600
[REDACTED], Youngsville, North Carolina 27596-2106
[REDACTED], Avon, ct 60014514
[REDACTED], Chelan, WA 98816
[REDACTED], Mesick, MI 49668
[REDACTED], CHICAGO, IL 60612-4806
[REDACTED], Florham Park, NJ 7932
[REDACTED], Sacramento, California 958117105
[REDACTED], Henderson, KY 42420
[REDACTED], Conneaut, OH 44030

[REDACTED], Dearborn Hts, MI 481252839
[REDACTED], Platte City, Missouri 64079
[REDACTED], Shakopee, MN 553797718
[REDACTED], Burtonsville, MD 20866
[REDACTED], Atlanta, GA 303063229
[REDACTED], Canton, ohio 44720-3021
[REDACTED], Panama City, FL 32404
[REDACTED], Waverly, TN 37185-0414
[REDACTED], Denver, CO 802314731
[REDACTED], Macedon, NY 14502
[REDACTED], Memphis, Tennessee 38104
[REDACTED], Elwood, IN 46036
[REDACTED] MANTECA, CA 95336
[REDACTED], Marina Del Rey, CA 90292
[REDACTED], Blue Island, Illinois 60406
[REDACTED], Nazareth, Pennsylvania 18064
[REDACTED], Sugar Land, TX 774792745
[REDACTED], Pittsburgh, pa 152124926
[REDACTED], New Britain, CT 6051
[REDACTED], Douglassville, Pa 195189792
[REDACTED], Staten Island, New York 10308-1871
[REDACTED], Peoria, IL 61603
[REDACTED], De Leon Springs, FL 321303809
[REDACTED], Sultan, WA 98294-9439
[REDACTED], Saint Clair Shores, MI 480802302
[REDACTED], Franklin, Ohio 45005-3551
[REDACTED], Sherman Oaks, CA 91411
[REDACTED], Boca Raton, FL 334315832
[REDACTED], Suffolk, Virginia 234331305
[REDACTED], Bessemer City, NC 28016
[REDACTED], City, wa 98105
[REDACTED], Kutztown, PA 19530
[REDACTED], Arlington, Texas 760133747
[REDACTED], Lisle, Illinois 605322716
[REDACTED], Ocala, FL 34476
[REDACTED], Baton Rouge, LA 70815
[REDACTED], Lake Mary, FL 32746
[REDACTED], Salinas, CA 93905-4905
[REDACTED], Clinton Twp, Michigan 48036
[REDACTED], Clearwater, Florida 337556102
[REDACTED], Superior, WI 54880-5308
[REDACTED], Fresno, CA 310034
[REDACTED], Baltimore, MD 21239-1905
[REDACTED], Palm Coast, FL 321378496
[REDACTED], San Antonio, TX 782122510
[REDACTED], Melbourne, FL 32935
[REDACTED], Lexington, SC 29072-7425
[REDACTED], Jacksonville, FL 322578118
[REDACTED], Norman, ok 73072-5015
[REDACTED] So. Yarmouth, MA 2664
[REDACTED], Waconia, MN 55387
[REDACTED], Bulverde, TX 78163-4594
[REDACTED], Irvine, CA 92618
[REDACTED], Tipton, IA 52772

[REDACTED], Newberry, Fl 32669-0643
[REDACTED], Port Charlotte, FL 339815193
[REDACTED] Pittsburgh, PA 15216-1723
[REDACTED], Chandler, Arizona 852864452
[REDACTED], Williamsburg, Virginia 23188-7415
[REDACTED], Raymond, wa 98577
[REDACTED], Gallup, NM 87301-4516
[REDACTED], The Plains, oh 457801084
[REDACTED], Tacoma, WA 984443222
[REDACTED], Watertown, NY 136013303
[REDACTED], Greenlawn, NY 11740
[REDACTED], PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA 15236
[REDACTED], Evanston, IL 602023199
[REDACTED], Harrisonburg, va 22802-5624
[REDACTED], Saylorsburg, Pennsylvania 183538527
[REDACTED], Dousman, WI 53118-9519
[REDACTED], Albuquerque, new mexico 871101450
[REDACTED], Colchester, VT 5446
[REDACTED], Lake Mary, FL 32746-6578
[REDACTED], Wheeling, WV 26003
[REDACTED], St Louis Park, mn 554165000
[REDACTED] GLENDALE, CA 91201
[REDACTED], Corpus Christi, TX 784123606
[REDACTED], Chicago, IL 60642
[REDACTED], Williamsburg, VA 23185-4733
[REDACTED], Little Neck, NY 113631737
[REDACTED], Sebastopol, California 95472
[REDACTED], Shelburne Falls, MA 01370-9671
[REDACTED], Mt.Arlington, NJ 7424
[REDACTED], Amarillo, TX 79124
[REDACTED], Black Mountain, North Carolina 28711
[REDACTED], Albuquerque, new mexico 871101450
[REDACTED], Bend, OR 977036990
[REDACTED], Hicksville, NY 11801
[REDACTED], Bokeelia, FL 33922
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED], Coventry, Ri 2816
[REDACTED] Lemont, IL 60439
[REDACTED], Lemont, IL 60439
[REDACTED], New Britain, Connecticut 6053
[REDACTED], Belmont, MA 2478
[REDACTED], Los Lunas, NM 87031
[REDACTED], Altamonte Spg, Florida 32714-1827
[REDACTED], Jim Falls, Wisconsin 54748-1704
[REDACTED], Ft Lauderdale, Florida 33308
[REDACTED], El Cajon, CA 92019
[REDACTED], Gresham, OR 97030-6931
[REDACTED], Livonia, Michigan 48154-4938
[REDACTED], Reno, NV 89503
[REDACTED], Orchard Park, NY 141272003
[REDACTED], Summit, NJ 07902-1405
[REDACTED] Omaha, Ne 68154
[REDACTED], West Warwick, RI 2893
[REDACTED], Sun Valley, Idaho, 833530005

[REDACTED], Rosholt, Wisconsin 544739551
[REDACTED], Portland, Oregon 97215
[REDACTED], North Truro, MA 2652
[REDACTED], Washington, DC 200011259
[REDACTED], Newton, MA 2458
[REDACTED], Omaha, NE 68154
[REDACTED], Thomasville, nc 27360-9557
[REDACTED], Downingtown, PA 193352324
[REDACTED], Augusta, Georgia 30906
[REDACTED], Gurnee, Illinois 60031-1660
[REDACTED], Angola, Indiana 46703
[REDACTED], Glastonbury, CT 06033-1404
[REDACTED], Norfolk, va 235031766
[REDACTED], San Diego, ca 92131-2389
[REDACTED], Appleton, Wisconsin 549151880
[REDACTED], Huntersville, MECKLENBURG / NC 28078
[REDACTED], Las Vegas, NV 89178
[REDACTED], Frankfort, KY 40601-7904
[REDACTED], Brentwood, Ca 945135663
[REDACTED], Grandview, Missouri 640302855
[REDACTED], Del City, OK 73115-1976
[REDACTED], Grand Rapids, Michigan 495045401
[REDACTED], FOREST HILLS, NY 11375
[REDACTED], Aurora, CO 800154184
[REDACTED], Cleveland, TN 37323-5490
[REDACTED], Vero Beach, Florida 32968
[REDACTED] West Windsor, New Jersey 8550
[REDACTED], Denver, CO 80210
[REDACTED], Carol Stream, Illinois 60188
[REDACTED], Spring Valley, California 91978
[REDACTED], Norfork, AR 72658
[REDACTED], Brentwood, New York 117882204
[REDACTED], La Habra, CA 90631-4002
[REDACTED], Williamsburg, VA 23185-2947
[REDACTED], Greenville, New York 12083
[REDACTED], Emerald Isle, NC, USA, NC 28594
[REDACTED], Flanders, NJ 78369711
[REDACTED], Santa Fe, New Mexico 87505-1725
[REDACTED], Emerald Isle, NC 28594
[REDACTED] Ferndale, Pennsylvania 189210025
[REDACTED], Kent, OHIO 44240-7252
[REDACTED], Oviedo, FL 32765
[REDACTED], Ballston Spa, Ny 12020-2203
[REDACTED], Shelton, CT 6484
[REDACTED], Luchsingen, Glarus 8775
[REDACTED], New York, NY 10011-3044
[REDACTED], Chester Springs, PA 19425-3890
[REDACTED], Lake Oswego, OR 97034-1657
[REDACTED], Forestville, California 95436
[REDACTED], Kountze, TX 776251489
[REDACTED], Middletown, Delaware 197099699
[REDACTED], Danvers, MA 1923
[REDACTED], Champaign, IL 61822-7221
[REDACTED], Black Hawk, CO 80422

[REDACTED], Eugene, OR 97408
[REDACTED], Woodbury Mn 55129, MN 55129
[REDACTED], Murphy, NC 28906-7728
[REDACTED], Orange, ca 928675846
[REDACTED], Oakland Park, FL 33334-6016
[REDACTED], Lexington, Kentucky 40509-1120
[REDACTED], Overland Park, KS 662232775
[REDACTED], Albuquerque, NM 87104
[REDACTED], Simi Valley, California 93065-6725
[REDACTED], Pueblo, CO 81003-2561
[REDACTED] ozler, Seattle, WA 98103
[REDACTED], WEARE, New Hampshire 3281
[REDACTED], Blue Jay, California 92317-0836
[REDACTED], Minneapolis, MN 55417-1701
[REDACTED], Roeland Park, KS 66205
[REDACTED], Pleasant Grove, AL 351271538
[REDACTED], Escalon, CA 953201925
[REDACTED], Mapleville, Rhode Island 2839
[REDACTED], Brooklyn, NY 11249
[REDACTED], Miami, FL 33199
[REDACTED], New York, NY 11103
[REDACTED], Albany, NY 122081208
[REDACTED], Durham, North Carolina 27705
[REDACTED], Los Angeles, CA 90045
[REDACTED] Saint Petersburg, fl 337071407
[REDACTED], Baraboo, WI 539133353
[REDACTED], Norristown, PA 19403
[REDACTED], Albany, New York 122053867
[REDACTED], Tallahassee, FL 32303-5110
[REDACTED] Diamond Bar, CA 91765
[REDACTED], Irving, Texas 75038
[REDACTED], Saint Louis, Missouri 63139
[REDACTED], Findlay, Ohio 458405515
[REDACTED], Norwalk, Ct 06852-0143
[REDACTED], Arivaca, Az 856010005
[REDACTED], Schaumburg, IL 60193-5317
[REDACTED], Redding, CA 960012609
[REDACTED], Watsonville, CA 95076
[REDACTED], Tampa, FL 33629-6118
[REDACTED], Madison, Connecticut 6443
[REDACTED], Oak Ridge, NJ 7438
[REDACTED], Mountainair, NM 87036-0957
[REDACTED], Geneva, Ny 144569713
[REDACTED], Hopatcong, NJ 78431521
[REDACTED], Rosamond, CA 935602262
[REDACTED], Acton, Massachusetts 17203537
[REDACTED], Henrico, Virginia 23229-6337
[REDACTED], Placentia, California 92870
[REDACTED], Ocklawaha, FL 32179
[REDACTED], Bourbon, IN 46504
[REDACTED], Aurora, CO 80015
[REDACTED], Lower Lake, Cca 95457-9120
[REDACTED], Corpus Christi, Texas 78410-2555
[REDACTED], Rockville, MD 208533148

[REDACTED], North Reading, MA 01864-2828
[REDACTED], Blaine, Washington 982309005
[REDACTED], Ventura, California 93003
[REDACTED], Oak Harbor, Wa 98277-4556
[REDACTED], Belleville, NJ 7109
[REDACTED], La Canada Flintridge, CA 91011-1740
[REDACTED], Alum Creek, West Virginia 25003
[REDACTED], Chicago, IL 60625
[REDACTED], Tolland, CT 06084-2023
[REDACTED], Charlottesville, Virginia 229013130
[REDACTED], Granby, Connecticut 60352715
[REDACTED], Sacramento, California 958412308
[REDACTED], Homosassa, FL 34448-5553
[REDACTED], Honolulu, HI 96826
[REDACTED], Bellerose, NY 114262315
[REDACTED], Green Bay, WI 54301
[REDACTED], Scottsbluff, NE 69361-2802
[REDACTED], ARLINGTON, VA 22207-2902
[REDACTED], MELBOURNE, FL 32940
[REDACTED], Phoenix, AZ 850427082
[REDACTED], Wake Forest, nc 275872671
[REDACTED], Hazle Township, PA 182023250
[REDACTED], Stone Mountain, Georgia 30087-1106
[REDACTED], Winchester, KY 403911221
[REDACTED], Kennesaw, GA 301445174
[REDACTED], Lemon Grove, CA 919453221
[REDACTED], Roseville, CA 956781702
[REDACTED], Atlanta, Ga 303161217
[REDACTED], Phoenix, AZ 85016
[REDACTED], Boise, Idaho 837045267
[REDACTED], Cleveland, OH 44109
[REDACTED], Deerfield Beach, FL 334429221
[REDACTED], SAINT LOUIS, MO 63116
[REDACTED], Independence, Mo 640552101
[REDACTED], Grovetown, GA 308134245
[REDACTED] Los Angeles, California 90035
[REDACTED], BUTLER, WI 53007-1209
[REDACTED], Racine, WI 53403
[REDACTED], Eastampton, NJ 08060-3262
[REDACTED], Kent, WA 98031
[REDACTED], Florence, OR 97439
[REDACTED], Chula Vista, CA 91914-2504
[REDACTED], Strongsville, OH 44136
[REDACTED] 11111
[REDACTED], Irvine, CA 926061780
[REDACTED], Brea, CA 92821-1849
[REDACTED], Manheim, Pennsylvania 175459776
[REDACTED], White Bear Lake, MN 55110
[REDACTED], Cupertino, CA 95014
[REDACTED] Rittiger, NORTH LAS VEGAS NV, NV 89081
[REDACTED], Omaha, NE 681043247
[REDACTED], Centennial, CO 80112
[REDACTED], Silver Spring, MD 20903+1110
[REDACTED], Auburn, WA 98001

[REDACTED], Sedona, AZ 86351-8967
[REDACTED], Mount Prospect, IL 600561543
[REDACTED], Delta, Pennsylvania 173148719
[REDACTED], Wilmington, NC 28401
[REDACTED], Miami, FL 331863228
[REDACTED], Manahawkin, NJ 08050-2920
[REDACTED], Las Vegas, Nevada 89156-3731
[REDACTED], New Franklin, Ohio 44319-5124
[REDACTED], Asheville, NC 288054522
[REDACTED], Mentor, Ohio 44060-5711
[REDACTED], Branchburg, New Jersey 8876
[REDACTED], Rapid City, South Dakota 57702
[REDACTED], Downey, CA 90240
[REDACTED], Tucson, AZ 85716
[REDACTED], Boiling Springs, PA 17007-9436
[REDACTED], Poway, CA 92064-6419
[REDACTED], Jacksonville, FL 32205-6218
[REDACTED], Bath, NY 14810-8338
[REDACTED], Indianapolis, Indiana 46226
[REDACTED], Richmond, Virginia 23225
[REDACTED], Mansfield, OH 44907
[REDACTED], Bainbridge Is, WA 98110-3669
[REDACTED], Villa Park, IL 60181
[REDACTED], Greensburg, PA 15601
[REDACTED], Montgomery, Texas 773163046
[REDACTED], Ocean View, NJ 8230
[REDACTED], Lincoln, KS 67455
[REDACTED], Bentonville, VIRGINIA 226101720
[REDACTED], Woodstock, VT 05091-1303
[REDACTED], Phoenix, AZ 85083-4408
[REDACTED], Casselberry, FL 327076731
[REDACTED], Berlin, MD 21811-5673
[REDACTED], Angola, IN 467035154
[REDACTED], Lancaster, PA 17601-5186
[REDACTED], La Crescenta, CA 912240674
[REDACTED], Evanston, Illinois 602023646
[REDACTED], Gallo, Coraopolis, Pennsylvania 15108
[REDACTED], Hawthorn Woods, IL 600477544
[REDACTED], Mesquite, TX 751494025
[REDACTED], Stone Mountain, Georgia 30087-1106
[REDACTED], Oak Park, IL 603023406
[REDACTED], Scioto Furnace, OH 45677
[REDACTED], Naperville, Illinois 60563-2642
[REDACTED], Tucson, AZ 85719-6900
[REDACTED], North Ridgeville, OH 44039-1782
[REDACTED], Tucson, AZ 857161800
[REDACTED], Akron, OH 443136534
[REDACTED], Fort Collins, CO 80521
[REDACTED], Seattle, Washington 98105
[REDACTED], Livingston, NJ 7039
[REDACTED], Chihuahua, Chihuahua 31205
[REDACTED], Sterling, VA 201641437
[REDACTED], Astoria, NY 11103
[REDACTED], Santee, CA 92071

[REDACTED], Sioux City, IA 51104
[REDACTED], New Richmond, Wisconsin 54017
[REDACTED], Saint Clair Shores, Michigan 480803198
[REDACTED], Elk Grove, California 95624
[REDACTED], Batavia, IL 605104569
[REDACTED], Las Vegas, NV 89134
[REDACTED], Saint Peter, Mn 560822000
[REDACTED], Mission, Hidalgo/Texas 785724550
[REDACTED] PhD, RN [Retired], Richmond, VA 23228
[REDACTED], Canton, MA 20211958
[REDACTED], Atascadero, CA 93423
[REDACTED], Wilson, WY 830140612
[REDACTED], Worthington, Ohio 430852935
[REDACTED], Delray Beach, FL 33445-4369
[REDACTED], Skiatook, Oklahoma 74070-3856
[REDACTED], Mason, OH 45040
[REDACTED], Bovey, Minnesota 55709
[REDACTED], San Antonio, TX 78247-3222
[REDACTED] Port Townsend, WA 983686015
[REDACTED], Salt Lake Cty, UT 84106-4319
[REDACTED], CHARLOTTE, NC 28226
[REDACTED], Morongo Valley, CA 92256
[REDACTED], Chicago, Illinois 60657
[REDACTED], Manchester, Vermont 05254-0846
[REDACTED], Havertown, PA 19083
[REDACTED], Lincoln, Texas 789486466
[REDACTED], Falls Church, VA 22046-4121
[REDACTED], New York, New York 100142587
[REDACTED]wski, Whitewater, WI 53190
[REDACTED] Brooklyn, NY 11235-6468
[REDACTED], Philmont, New York 12564
[REDACTED], Woodstock, New York 124981427
[REDACTED], New York, New York 10028-4670
[REDACTED] Kuna, Idaho 83634-2946
[REDACTED], Akron, Ohio 44303-2420
[REDACTED], Midvale, UT 84047
[REDACTED], San Diego, CA 92122
[REDACTED], Central Point, Oregon 975021379
[REDACTED] Santa Cruz, CA 95060
[REDACTED], Madison, WI 53704
[REDACTED], SPOKANE, WA 99208-5930
[REDACTED], San Antonio, Texas 782121203
[REDACTED], Brighton, MI 481168834
[REDACTED], Port Orchard, WA 983663830
[REDACTED], Point Lookout, NY 115693017
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] Townsend, MA 01469-1357
[REDACTED], Pascoag, R.I. 2859
[REDACTED], Mill Valley, CA 94941
[REDACTED] Dallas, TX 75227-2914
[REDACTED], Henderson, NV 89052-6826
[REDACTED] Sylmar, California 913422623
[REDACTED], San Francisco, CA 941101222
[REDACTED], LAKE GENEVA, WI 53147
[REDACTED], Pasadena, California 91105

[REDACTED], Santa Rosa, Ca 95403
[REDACTED], Chicago, IL 606406022
[REDACTED], Gresham, OR 970304148
[REDACTED], San Antonio, Tx 782231466
[REDACTED], Lyndhurst, NJ 7071
[REDACTED], Kolkata, WB 63455
[REDACTED], Maricopa, Arizona 85139
[REDACTED], New York, NEW YORK 10003-5918
[REDACTED], Brevard, NC 28712
[REDACTED], Las Cruces, NM 88005
[REDACTED], Fox Point, WI 53217-3935
[REDACTED], Sammamish, WA 98074
[REDACTED], Laguna Niguel, CA 92677-1974
[REDACTED] Dunwoody, Georgia 30338
[REDACTED], Mariposa, CA 95338
[REDACTED], Burlingame, Ca 94010-3643
[REDACTED] Zanesville, OH 43701-9169
[REDACTED], Å, Lvsj Å, Sweden 125 34
[REDACTED], Mexico City, CDMX 15900
[REDACTED], Durango, CO 81303
[REDACTED], Anaheim, CA 928022285
[REDACTED], Santa Rosa, CA 95405
[REDACTED], Boardman, oh 44512-3242
[REDACTED], East Moriches, NY 11940
[REDACTED], Celina, TX 750094618
[REDACTED], Batavia, Ohio 451034024
[REDACTED], New Orleans, LA 70118
[REDACTED], Portland, oregon 97214-3794
[REDACTED], Rancho Palos Verdes, California 90275-5004
[REDACTED], Ladoga, Indiana 479549347
[REDACTED], New Port Richey, Florida 34654
[REDACTED], Norwich, VT 05055-0334
[REDACTED], Sedona, AZ 86340-4382
[REDACTED], Arcadia, CA 910062501
[REDACTED], Tucson, AZ 85705-4780
[REDACTED], Pune, Maharashtra 411018
[REDACTED], Portland, OR 97225
[REDACTED], La Jolla, CA 92037-5176
[REDACTED], Jersey City, NJ 07302-2744
[REDACTED], Diamond Springs, CA 95619-0197
[REDACTED], Port Orchard, wa 98366-8929
[REDACTED], North Olmsted, Ohio 44070
[REDACTED], Travelers Rest, SC 29690-7889
[REDACTED], Prospect, KY 40059-8611
[REDACTED], Cumming, Ga 30041-7245
[REDACTED], Kaohsiung City, NONE 80046
[REDACTED], Spokane Valley, Washington 99216-0202
[REDACTED], Gold Beach, OR 974440247
[REDACTED], MIAMI, FL 33183
[REDACTED], Northampton, Pennsylvania 18067-1313
[REDACTED], Denver, CO 80236
[REDACTED], Tucson, AZ 85719
[REDACTED], Los Angeles, CA 90019-3523
[REDACTED], Houston, TX 770552404

[REDACTED], Albuquerque, NM 871234120
[REDACTED], Easton, Pennsylvania 180425407
[REDACTED], Mountain View, CA 94040-1278
[REDACTED], Voorheesville, NY 12186
[REDACTED], BURDWAN, West Bengal 713101
[REDACTED], Dracut, Massachusetts 1826
[REDACTED], Little Rock, AR 722114140
[REDACTED], Philadelphia, PA 19147-2420
[REDACTED], Redwood City, California 94063
[REDACTED], EAST MEADOW, New York 11554
[REDACTED], Santa Rosa, CA 95401
[REDACTED], Snohomish, WA 982905884
[REDACTED], SEBASTOPOL, CA 95472
[REDACTED], MILL VALLEY, CA 94941-4610
[REDACTED], Skokie, Illinois 600763513
[REDACTED], San Diego, CA 92120
[REDACTED], Santa Fe, Texas 775108944
[REDACTED], San Leandro, CA 94579
[REDACTED], WINTER HAVEN, Florida 33884-3901
[REDACTED], New Orleans, LA 70115-1840
[REDACTED], Unley, South Australia 5061
[REDACTED], Hagerstown, MD 21742-2636
[REDACTED], Abiquiu, nm 875100652
[REDACTED], Chicago, Il 60634-2909
[REDACTED], Beaverton, Or 97005-1134
[REDACTED], Ozona, Florida 34660-0515
[REDACTED], Roseville, Ca 95747-8247
[REDACTED], McAllen, TX 78504
[REDACTED], Wallingford, CT 6492
[REDACTED], Berkeley, California 94708-1238
[REDACTED], Deer Harbor, WA 98243
[REDACTED], Altadena, California 91003
[REDACTED], Vienna, IL 62995
[REDACTED], Omaha, NE 68135
[REDACTED], Marlton, NJ 80532901
[REDACTED], Bryan, TX 77803
[REDACTED], Wahpeton, ND 580753510
[REDACTED], Rancho Palos Verdes, ca 90275-2955
[REDACTED], Virginia Beach, Virginia 23462
[REDACTED], Greensboro, North Carolina 27406-3629
[REDACTED], Conneaut Lake, PA 16316
[REDACTED], Albany, CA 94706-2401
[REDACTED], Santa Cruz, California 950617447
[REDACTED], Union, New Jersey 70837628
[REDACTED], Hope, Mi 486280003
[REDACTED], Rochester, WA 98579
[REDACTED], New York, New York 10128
[REDACTED], Vancouver, WA 986862258
[REDACTED], DEWEY, IL 61840
[REDACTED], Pullman, WA 99163
[REDACTED], Eugene, Oregon 974029187
[REDACTED], Citrus Springs, Fl 344344051
[REDACTED], Madison, WI 53713
[REDACTED], Encino, CA 913162707

[REDACTED], Portland, Oregon 972291594
[REDACTED], Holts Summit, Missouri 65043-4721
[REDACTED], Colorado Springs, CO 80915
[REDACTED], Round Lake, IL 60073
[REDACTED], Glenside, Pa 19038-3324
[REDACTED], Tallahassee, Florida 32309-2875
[REDACTED], LOVELAND, Colorado 80537
[REDACTED] Taylor, MORGAN, UT 84050
[REDACTED], Bardwell, Ky 42023-8303
[REDACTED], Windsor Locks, CT 06096-2737
[REDACTED], Boston, MA 2114
[REDACTED], Pearl, MS 392085710
[REDACTED], San Francisco, CA 94134-2756
[REDACTED], Cedar Rapids, IA 52402-3517
[REDACTED], Houston, texas 77074-3323
[REDACTED], Petaluma, Ca 94954
[REDACTED], Caldwell, New Jersey 70065613
[REDACTED], Woodbridge, ct 65251603
[REDACTED], Bridgeport, ct 06605-3208
[REDACTED], Cicero, New York 13039-9720
[REDACTED], Northborough, Ma 01532-1229
[REDACTED], Milton, de 19968-1166
[REDACTED], Redondo Beach, CA 90277-4857
[REDACTED], Wilmette, Illinois 60091
[REDACTED], Columbia Station, OHIO 44028
[REDACTED], Camarillo, CA 930102147
[REDACTED], Davis, CA 95616-5621
[REDACTED], Seattle, WA 981256553
[REDACTED], Isle, Minnesota 563424623
[REDACTED]ver, Irvine, CA 92617
[REDACTED], Roseville, California 95747-8072
[REDACTED], Worth, IL 60482
[REDACTED], Monument, Colorado 80132
[REDACTED], Lisle, IL 60532-2007
[REDACTED], Yachats, OR 974980788
[REDACTED], La Mesa, CA 91941
[REDACTED], Norton Shores, MI 49441-5050
[REDACTED], New York, NY 10003
[REDACTED], Kapaa, hawaii 96746
[REDACTED], Monroe Township, NJ 8831
[REDACTED], El Paso, TX 79907-2954
[REDACTED] Billings, MT 59105-2260
[REDACTED]l, Los Banos, CA 93635
[REDACTED], Galveston, TX 775505118
[REDACTED], Vicente LÃ³pez, New York 1602
[REDACTED], Westmoreland, Ny 134901500
[REDACTED], Waterville, ME 4901
[REDACTED], Marietta, Pennsylvania 17547-9781
[REDACTED], Baldwin Park, Ca 91706-3151
[REDACTED], Navarre, FL 32566
[REDACTED], American Canyon, CA 94503
[REDACTED], Willow, AK 99688
[REDACTED] San Leandro, Ca 94579-2796
[REDACTED], Mansfield, TX 76063

[REDACTED], Los Angeles, California 90019
[REDACTED], Springfield, PA 19064-1543
[REDACTED], Santa Cruz, CA 95061-1174
[REDACTED], Rockwood, TN 37854-5742
[REDACTED], Cambridge, MA 02139-4986
[REDACTED], Escondido, Ca 92025
[REDACTED], Seminole, FL 33777
[REDACTED], Kissimmee, Florida 347444969
[REDACTED], Syracuse, NY 13205
[REDACTED], Ashland, MA 17211449
[REDACTED], ANN ARBOR, MI 48103
[REDACTED], Woonsocket, RI 2895
[REDACTED], South Deerfield, MA 13739777
[REDACTED], Lenox, MA 12402863
[REDACTED], Bronx, New York 10468
[REDACTED], Oakland Gardens, New York USA 113642827
[REDACTED], Chattanooga, TN 37421
[REDACTED], Salt Lake City, Utah 84102
[REDACTED] Erie, PA 165112363
[REDACTED], Tumwater, WA 985127941
[REDACTED], Wapiti, Wyoming 82450
[REDACTED], Lees Summit, MO 64063
[REDACTED], Wayland, NY 14572
[REDACTED], Two Rivers, WI 54241-3125
[REDACTED], Lakeland, FL 33813-3539
[REDACTED], Boynton Beach, FL 33437
[REDACTED], Spring Hill, FL 346081417
[REDACTED], Cherryville, NC 28021-8932
[REDACTED], Howard Beach, NY 11414-3239
[REDACTED], Oldsmar, Florida 346774546
[REDACTED], Granger, IN 46530-5099
[REDACTED], Beachwood, New Jersey 8722
[REDACTED], Concord, NH 03303-2046
[REDACTED], Boxford, MA 01921-2713
[REDACTED], Willowbrook, Illinois 60527
[REDACTED], Phoenixville, Pa 19460-2420
[REDACTED], Millbury, MA 01527-3450
[REDACTED], Sarasota, FL 34239
[REDACTED], La Grange, Illinois 60525-2820
[REDACTED], Beckley, WV 258014868
[REDACTED], Bloomington, IL 61701
[REDACTED], Lakeville, MN 55044-5651
[REDACTED], Mongaup Valley, NJ 127625020
[REDACTED], BLUE SPRINGS, MO 64015
[REDACTED], Keller, texas 76244
[REDACTED], Mansfield, AR 72944-2895
[REDACTED], Hopatcong, NJ 7843
[REDACTED], Waterford, Wi hi 53185-4940
[REDACTED], Pinellas Park, Florida 33782
[REDACTED], Gainesville, Florida 32606-0115
[REDACTED], Clinton, CT 06413-1411
[REDACTED], Kanab, Utah 84741-8190
[REDACTED], St Augustine, FL 320807585
[REDACTED], Bozeman, MT 597186151

[REDACTED], Point Pleasant Boro, NJ 87422716
[REDACTED], Salisbury, Md 21804-8606
[REDACTED], Carbondale, co 81623
[REDACTED], Tucson, AZ 857184830
[REDACTED], Mims, Florida 327543005
[REDACTED], Eldorado, Illinois 62930
[REDACTED] Halstead, SILVER SPRING, MD 20901
[REDACTED], Port Saint Lucie, fl 349534953
[REDACTED] Berea, Kentucky 40403
[REDACTED], Weymouth, MA 21912233
[REDACTED], Astoria, NY 11102-3563
[REDACTED] New York, NY 10028-7095
[REDACTED], Vancouver, Washington 98661-6671
[REDACTED] Desert Hot Springs, CA 92240-1143
[REDACTED], Conifer, CO 80433-0781
[REDACTED], Monterey, California 939402042
[REDACTED], Flanders, NJ 07836-4735
[REDACTED], Clay, Michigan 480014130
[REDACTED], Herndon, Virginia 20171
[REDACTED], Amelia Ct Hse, VA 23002
[REDACTED], Bloomington, Indiana 47401
[REDACTED], New York, NY 10033
[REDACTED], Scottsboro, Alabama 357696219
[REDACTED], Bryant, Ar 72022-6908
[REDACTED], Birmingham, AL 352443205
[REDACTED], Katy, Texas 77494-5846
[REDACTED], Conifer, Colorado 804335900
[REDACTED], Bluffton, SC 29909
[REDACTED], Smith River, Ca 955679317
[REDACTED], Berkeley, CA 947071702
[REDACTED], Oceanside, Ca 920580647
[REDACTED], Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53215
[REDACTED], Hickory, NC 28601
[REDACTED], Maple City, MI 49664-7714
[REDACTED] New Orleans, Louisiana 701301408
[REDACTED], Phoenix, Az 85018-5021
[REDACTED]e, Edwardsville, IL 62025-6412
[REDACTED] Harrisburg, PA 17126
[REDACTED], Loveland, CO 80537
[REDACTED], Monroe, LA 71203
[REDACTED], Young Harris, GA 305821535
[REDACTED], Greeneville, TN 37743-6645
[REDACTED], Portland, FL 34290
[REDACTED], North Miami Beach, FL 33162
[REDACTED], Sandy Valley, NV 89019
[REDACTED], O Fallon, MO 63366-4461
[REDACTED] Tuxedo, NY 10987
[REDACTED], Asheville, NC 28805
[REDACTED], Forest Park, Illinois 60130
[REDACTED], Rayle, GA 30660
[REDACTED], Lambertville, NJ 08530-3525
[REDACTED], Palm Beach, Florida 33480
[REDACTED], Sagle, Idaho 83860
[REDACTED], Pasadena, MD 21122-3414

██████████, Fontana, CA 92337
██████████, Howell, MI 48843
██████████, Allentown, PA 18103
██████████ Wynn Vale, al 5127
██████████, South Bend, IN 466141955
██████████, VERONA, Kentucky 41092-7954
██████████, Fairfax, Virginia 22030-8591
██████████, Shorewood, WI 53211-2462
██████████, Yardville, NJ 8620
██████████, Asheville, NC 28804-1109
██████████, Arcata, CA 95521-6414
██████████, Davis, CA 956165938
██████████, Woodcliff Lake, New Jersey 07677-7201
██████████, Buffalo, NY 14206
██████████, Lawrence, Kansas 66044-2776
██████████, Holland, MI 49423-7027
██████████, Oakland, CA 946191364
██████████ Battle Creek, MI 490174535
██████████, Rifle, Colorado 81650-2410
██████████, Springfield, Nh 32842402
██████████, 44647, Ohio 44647
██████████, Santa Cruz, California 95062
██████████, San Antonio, TX 78216-1803
██████████, Boynton Beach, Florida 33436-7519
██████████, Englewood Cliffs, Nj 07632-2810
██████████ Omaha, NE 68105
██████████, Martin, KY 41649-8503
██████████, St Charles, IL 60175-6145
██████████ I, NY, NY 10027
██████████, Denver, CO 80210-4906
██████████, RAPID CITY, SD 57701
██████████, Chicago, IL 60629-4124
██████████, Mukwonago, WI 53149-8523
██████████, Little Rock, Arkansas 722114080
██████████, Sinsinawa, Wisconsin 53824-9701
██████████, Egg Harbor City, NJ 82153730
██████████, Saylorsburg, PA 183538033
██████████, Monkton, MD 21111
██████████, Richmond, TX 77469-4579
██████████, Hastings, Nebraska 689016502
██████████, Fontana, Ca 923378948
██████████, Laramie, WY 82070
██████████, Dudley, Ma. 15716309
██████████, Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546-0100
██████████, Amarillo, TX 79109
██████████, Rushville, IN 46173-7737
██████████, Santa Barbara, CA 931091835
██████████, Navarre, FL 325663390
██████████, Ellicott City, Maryland 21042
██████████, Saint Louis, MO 63128-3784
██████████, Cuthbert, GA 398405541
██████████, Saint Petersburg, FL 33710
██████████, GENOA, OH 43430
██████████, LEVITTOWN, PA 19057-3313

[REDACTED], Brooklyn, New York 11230-6874
[REDACTED], Essex, MA 19291259
[REDACTED], Varysburg, NY 14167-9755
[REDACTED], San Diego, CA 921035052
[REDACTED], BAY VILLAGE, OH 44140
[REDACTED], El Segundo, CA 90245-3259
[REDACTED], San Rafael, CA 94903
[REDACTED], Detroit, Michigan 48202-1304
[REDACTED] Garibay, Midland, TX 79701
[REDACTED], Hawley, Texas 79525
[REDACTED], South Burlington, Vermont 5403
[REDACTED], Lafayette, CO 80026-1572
[REDACTED], Bel Air, Maryland 21014
[REDACTED], Sullivan, Illinois 619516396
[REDACTED] Irwin, SONORA, CA 95370
[REDACTED], Edwardsville, il 62025
[REDACTED] Indiana 46055-6282
[REDACTED], Kildeer, IL 60047
[REDACTED], Hendersonville, NC 287394118
[REDACTED], Kildeer, IL 600478638
[REDACTED], Panora, IA 50216-8691
[REDACTED], Chamberlain, ME 4541
[REDACTED], Cadott, WI 54727-5604
[REDACTED], Columbia, SC 29204-3414
[REDACTED], Salem, OR 97301
[REDACTED], Novato, CA 94949-7245
[REDACTED], Saint Louis, MO 63116
[REDACTED], Saint Louis, MO 63116
[REDACTED], South Glens Falls, NY 12803-5724
[REDACTED], Elmwood Park, Illinois 60707
[REDACTED], Lynn Haven, FL 324441946
[REDACTED], Waltham, Massachusetts 2453
[REDACTED], Tucson, Arizona 85747
[REDACTED], STAMFORD, CT 06907-1136
[REDACTED], Plattsburgh, NY 129015954
[REDACTED], Denver, Colorado 80249-7300
[REDACTED], San Pablo, California 948061582
[REDACTED], Morro Bay, California 934422353
[REDACTED], Maggie Valley, North Carolina 287511888
[REDACTED], Santa Rosa, CA 95409
[REDACTED], Phoenixville, penn 1946
[REDACTED], Harriman, NY 10926
[REDACTED] Gallatin, Missouri 64640
[REDACTED], COLORADO SPRINGS, CO 80921
[REDACTED], Columbia, South Carolina 29201
[REDACTED], Ceres, CA 95307-4155
[REDACTED], Clearwater, florida 337554630
[REDACTED], Lakewood Ranch, Fl 34202-2424
[REDACTED], Aiken, SC 29801
[REDACTED], Silverdale, WA 98383
[REDACTED], Mattawamkeag, ME 44593229
[REDACTED], Theodore, AL 36582
[REDACTED], Quinebaug, CT 62627719
[REDACTED] Holland, MI 49423-7027

██████████ Independence, Kansas 67301
██████████ California, MD 20619-7155
██████████, Pomona, Ks 66076-0283
██████████, Fenton, Mi 48430-3492
██████████, Gainesville, florida 32653-8341
██████████, New Orleans, LA 70117
██████████, Alexandria, Virginia 22309-1607
██████████, Delta, CO 81416-2575
██████████, Santa Fe, New Mexico 87505-8805
██████████, Sunnyvale, California 94089
██████████, St. Charles, Illinois 60174
██████████, Hobart, IN 46342
██████████, Brooklyn, NY 11222
██████████, Pawnee, Illinois 62558
██████████, North Chesterfield, VA 23237
██████████, Clifton Park, NY 12065
██████████, Moab, ut 84532
██████████, Las Cruces, NM 88012-9018
██████████, Eau Claire, WI 547031414
██████████, Columbia, MO 65202
██████████, Staunton, Virginia 24401-5071
██████████, Wake Forest, NC 27587
██████████, Stoughton, WI 53589
██████████, Westwood, NJ 07675-1818
██████████, Calhan, CO 80808-8548
██████████, Caddo Mills, Texas 75135-5803
██████████, BX, New York 10466
██████████, Bellingham, WA 98225-6249
██████████, Rutledge, Tn 37861
██████████, Aiken, SC 29801-2751
██████████, Bloomfield, NJ 07003-2504
██████████, Charlotte, NC 28278-7842
██████████, Florence, MT 59833
██████████, Temple Terrace, FL 33617
██████████, Sinking Spring, PA 196081361
██████████, San Luis Obispo, CA - California 93405
██████████, Seattle, washington 98102
██████████, Torrance, CA 905054512
██████████, Glassboro, NJ 8028
██████████, San Francisco, ca 94131-1016
██████████, Mission Viejo, CA 92691
██████████, Forest Grove, Oregon 971161021
██████████, McKees Rocks, PA 15136
██████████, Spring Lake, mi 494562829
██████████, Middletown, CT 64572623
██████████, Rancho Cucamonga, CA 917373017
██████████, Eugene, Oregon 974051991
██████████, Toledo, OR 97391-1011
██████████, Cleveland, TN 37311
██████████, Woodinville, WA 98072
██████████, Rochester, NY 146181031
██████████ Ocala, FL 34476
██████████, Manchester, NH 3104
██████████, Los Angeles, CA 90016-1710

[REDACTED], Philomath, OR 97370
[REDACTED], Guilford, CT 6437
[REDACTED], Joliet, il 60435
[REDACTED], Park City, KS 672191222
[REDACTED], Jupiter, Florida 33478
[REDACTED], Chicopee, Ma 10202612
[REDACTED], Pawleys Island, South Carolina 29585-7829
[REDACTED], Cleveland, OH 44125-3243
[REDACTED], Ann Arbor, MI 48104
[REDACTED], Lafayette, Co 800267001
[REDACTED], Ledyard, Ct I 63391410
[REDACTED], Winnipeg, Manitoba 58201-6018
[REDACTED], Downingtown, Pennsylvania 19335
[REDACTED], Suwanee, GA 300243030
[REDACTED], Grass Valley, California 95945
[REDACTED], Apple Valley, Ca. 923088445
[REDACTED], Slidell, LA 70460-5146
[REDACTED], Crockett, CA 945251338
[REDACTED], Middletown, CT 06457-2345
[REDACTED], San Diego, CA 92101-7722
[REDACTED], Toms River, NJ 8755
[REDACTED], San Antonio, TX 782312246
[REDACTED], Austin, TX 78739
[REDACTED], Rockaway, NJ 7866
[REDACTED], Ballston Spa, New York 120201929
[REDACTED], Panama City, FL 32404-5312
[REDACTED], Chesterton, IN 46304-9595
[REDACTED], MILLTOWN, New Jersey 08850-1545
[REDACTED], Ellensburg, WA 98926-2087
[REDACTED], Saint Augustine, FL 32080
[REDACTED], Canton, MI 48188
[REDACTED], Union City, CA 94587
[REDACTED], Edenton, NC 279329203
[REDACTED], Danville, Indiana 461220725
[REDACTED], Romney, WV 26757-1300
[REDACTED], Scarborough, Maine 4074
[REDACTED], Upper Darby, PA 190821302
[REDACTED], Atlanta, Georgia 30305
[REDACTED], Santa Fe, nm 875075060
[REDACTED], Galva, Illinois 61434
[REDACTED], Loris, SC 29569
[REDACTED], North Middletown, New Jersey 07748-3531
[REDACTED], Westlake, OH 441455343
[REDACTED], Salem, OR 973023247
[REDACTED], Mendocino, CA 95460
[REDACTED], Lawrence, KS 66047-9201
[REDACTED], Murray, KY 42071
[REDACTED], Helena, Montana 596027724
[REDACTED], Highland Park, NJ 08904-2213
[REDACTED], Zion, IL 60099-3045
[REDACTED], Tampa, Florida 33615
[REDACTED], Albany, New York 122052803
[REDACTED], Ladera Ranch, CA 92694
[REDACTED], Toledo, Ohio 436201005

[REDACTED], Sussex, WI 53089-2274
[REDACTED], Albany, NY 12205-3019
[REDACTED], Mount Pleasant, Wi 534061760
[REDACTED], E Town, Kentucky 427013054
[REDACTED], New York, New York 10011
[REDACTED], Auburn, CA 95602-9517
[REDACTED], Clarence, Ny 140311651
[REDACTED], Sedona, AZ 86336-9504
[REDACTED], Eagle Point, OR 97524
[REDACTED], Santa Fe, NM 87508
[REDACTED], Roswell, Georgia 30076-3702
[REDACTED], Midvale, UT 840471222
[REDACTED] Anchorage, AK 99503-1884
[REDACTED], Oakley, CA 94561-2403
[REDACTED], Newton, MA 24593151
[REDACTED], South Windsor, CT 60741588
[REDACTED], Rocky River, Ohio 441161448
[REDACTED], Danbury, CT 06811-5172
[REDACTED], San Mateo, FL 321872401
[REDACTED], Gulfport, FL 33707-4008
[REDACTED], Middle Island, New York 119531503
[REDACTED], Vermillion, SD 57069
[REDACTED], Cleveland, Tennessee 37323-8645
[REDACTED], Kuta, Bali 80361
[REDACTED], Sunnyvale, CA 94087
[REDACTED], Trafford, PA 15085
[REDACTED], Bellingham, WA 982264431
[REDACTED], Morrison, co 804652105
[REDACTED], Orlando, FL 32869
[REDACTED], Watsonville, California 95076
[REDACTED], Astoria, OR 97103-1205
[REDACTED], Rancho Cucamonga, CA 917377937
[REDACTED], Blowing Rock, NC 28605-2143
[REDACTED], Monroe Township, nj 08831-4015
[REDACTED], Oakland Park, FL 33334
[REDACTED], Portland, Oregon 97230
[REDACTED], Clark, Wyoming 82435-8177
[REDACTED], Farmington, Ny 14425-7031
[REDACTED], Pasadena, CA 91107-4618
[REDACTED], Hudson, FL 34667
[REDACTED], Covington, LA 70433
[REDACTED], Peabody, MA 1960
[REDACTED], Cleveland, OH 44111
[REDACTED], Berkeley, CA 94702
[REDACTED], Leominster, ma 14535628
[REDACTED], Jeannette, PA 15644
[REDACTED], Panama City, FL 32405
[REDACTED], Orangevale, CA 95662
[REDACTED], Cheyenne, WY 820012261
[REDACTED], Bettendorf, Iowa 527224773
[REDACTED], Dubuque, IA 52001
[REDACTED], Prospect Heights, Illinois 60070
[REDACTED], Santa Fe, New Mexico 87505
[REDACTED], Staten Island, NY 10306

[REDACTED], Boulder, CO 803040665
[REDACTED], Virginia 20176
[REDACTED], Bainbridge, ny 137333240
[REDACTED], Lafayette, Colorado 800261202
[REDACTED], Concord, CA 945182322
[REDACTED] Millbrae, California 94030-2716
[REDACTED], Redway, California 95560
[REDACTED], Eau Claire, WI 547032370
[REDACTED] San Francisco, CA 941025209
[REDACTED], NM - Rio Rancho, NM 87124
[REDACTED], Oxford, Maryland 21654-1021
[REDACTED], Stony Brook, New York 117901532
[REDACTED], East Greenville, PA 180412647
[REDACTED], North Pole, Ak 997056239
[REDACTED], BEND, OR 97703
[REDACTED], CALABASH, NC 28467-3078
[REDACTED], Topanga, CA 90290
[REDACTED] Ann Arbor, MI 48104-6451
[REDACTED], Sacramento, CA 95821
[REDACTED], Las Vegas, NV 89118
[REDACTED], Las Vegas, NV 89135
[REDACTED], Las Vegas, NV 89135
[REDACTED], Suffern, New York 10901-4250
[REDACTED], Miami Shores, FL 331501207
[REDACTED], Yorba Linda, Ca 92887-4917
[REDACTED], EDGEWATER, Florida 32141
[REDACTED], Pahoia, Hi 96778
[REDACTED], Concord, CA 945182322
[REDACTED], Lynnwood, washington 980368606
[REDACTED], Hammond, in 46324
[REDACTED], Yakima, WA 98902-4214
[REDACTED], Central Square, NEW York 130369530
[REDACTED], Rockville, Maryland 208502903
[REDACTED], Las Vegas, Las Vegas, nevada 891567173
[REDACTED], Riverview, FL 335692217
[REDACTED] Williamsport, Pa 17701
[REDACTED], Charleston, South Carolina 29414-9056
[REDACTED], Marion, Illinois 62959
[REDACTED], Sacramento, CA 958351303
[REDACTED], Manlius, NY 13104
[REDACTED], Interlachen, fl 321484147
[REDACTED], Denver, CO 80209
[REDACTED], Granada Hills, CA 91344-4805
[REDACTED], Canton, Georgia 30114-7191
[REDACTED], Brattleboro, VT 53016411
[REDACTED], Carbondale, IL 62902
[REDACTED], Franklin, Pennsylvania 16323
[REDACTED], Athens, GA 30606
[REDACTED], Henderson, NV 89011
[REDACTED], Hartford, CT 61052514
[REDACTED], Ashland, WI 54806
[REDACTED], Evanston, IL 60202
[REDACTED], TOULOUSE, OCCITANIE 31500
[REDACTED], Sayre, Pa 18840-1558

[REDACTED], Anderson, South Carolina 296214363
[REDACTED], Phoenix, Arizona 850354949
[REDACTED], Santa Barbara, CA 931091005
[REDACTED], Mesa, AZ 85203
[REDACTED], New Bern, NC 285605828
[REDACTED], Bonita Springs, FL 341347306
[REDACTED], San Juan, Puerto Rico 9275221
[REDACTED], Winchester, VA 22601-3745
[REDACTED], Mantua, oh 442558700
[REDACTED], Springfield, VA 221504921
[REDACTED], Burlington, vermont 5401
[REDACTED], Manchester, NH 31021251
[REDACTED], Fenton, michigan 484301555
[REDACTED], Petoskey, Mi 497700122
[REDACTED], Mattawan, MI 490719499
[REDACTED], Austin, TX 78753-6828
[REDACTED], Stow, OH 44224-1483
[REDACTED], Pleasanton, CA 945884440
[REDACTED], Princeton, NJ 85407417
[REDACTED], Boone, nc 28607-8134
[REDACTED], Peoria, AZ 85382
[REDACTED], Alvin, TX 77511
[REDACTED], Kent, Washington 98030-5030
[REDACTED], Green Bay, Wisconsin 54303
[REDACTED], Paducah, KY 42003
[REDACTED], Wilton Manors, FL 333342027
[REDACTED], Gurugram, You 41102
[REDACTED], San Jose, CA 95127
[REDACTED], Las Vegas, NV 89102-6118
[REDACTED], Wilmington, NC 28412
[REDACTED], Mesa, AZ 85209-3619
[REDACTED], Southington, OH 44470
[REDACTED], Brighton, MI 481144946
[REDACTED], You, You 81819
[REDACTED], Loveland, CO 80538-9188
[REDACTED], Manlius, NY 13104-9358
[REDACTED], Katy, Texas 774932151
[REDACTED], Vandergrift, PA 15690
[REDACTED], Sparta, MI 49345
[REDACTED], Henderson, Nevada 89011
[REDACTED], Montgomery, TX 77356-8043
[REDACTED], Raleigh, NC 27607-4099
[REDACTED], Cincinnati, OH 45243-3724
[REDACTED], Buena Park, CA 90620
[REDACTED], Hazlet, NJ 77304042
[REDACTED] Prescott, Az 86303-3727
[REDACTED], NOVI, MI 48377
[REDACTED] Billings, MT 59105
[REDACTED], Dallas, Texas 75206-5723
[REDACTED], Houston, Texas 77051-3001
[REDACTED], Hudsonville, MI 49426
[REDACTED], Portland, or 97224-4705
[REDACTED], Oviedo, Florida 32766-6612
[REDACTED], Warwick, RI 02886-1257

[REDACTED], Colchester, CT 06415-2047
[REDACTED], Pinellas Park, FL 33782
[REDACTED] Erie, MI 481339426
[REDACTED], Antioch, CA 94509
[REDACTED] Denver, Co 80224-2052
[REDACTED], Baltimore, MD 21210-2242
[REDACTED], Berlin, MI 48002-4401
[REDACTED], Flagstaff, AZ 86005
[REDACTED], Frankfort, New York 133404607
[REDACTED], Davenport, FL 33897-5627
[REDACTED], Ford City, PA 16226-1451
[REDACTED], Howell, New Jersey 77311938
[REDACTED], Kasaan, Alaska 99950
[REDACTED], Flushing, NY 11375-6216
[REDACTED], Minneapolis, MN 55412
[REDACTED] Brown, Henrico, Virginia 23229
[REDACTED], Carlton, Oregon 97111-9141
[REDACTED], Stillwater, New Jersey 07875-0005
[REDACTED], Colorado Springs, nv 80921-2837
[REDACTED], Brooklyn, New York 11205-4470
[REDACTED], Pensacola, Florida 32526
[REDACTED], Phoenix, AZ 85044
[REDACTED], Livonia, Michigan 48154-5109

Correspondence ID: 12482Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98227
United States of America

Outside Organization: Retired Fisheries Scientist Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 11:28:01

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: There are 3 reasons that Grizzlies should not be reintroduced to the N. Cascades:

- 1) their ecological niches have been taken over and occupied by other species
- 2) climate change has added a lot of uncertainty as to the suitability and potential threats of and to the habitat for bears
- 3) and most importantly, bears are smart, lazy, and efficient foragers always moving toward the highest quality prey which in this region would be endangered wild salmon and hatcheries. So just as the outdated Marine Mammal Protection Act directly conflicts with recovery of endangered Chinook and resident Orcas, reintroduction of Grizzlies will add another challenge to the recovery and maintenance of salmon runs. Please don't do it!

Correspondence ID: 12483Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 11:34:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I advocate implementing Alternative C as described in the Draft Plan and EIS. I am a lifelong admirer and visitor of Washington's varied and beautiful landscapes, including the areas proposed under this plan. I hold a strong conviction that the wilderness areas are some of the greatest gifts afforded to us all and we all have a responsibility to maintain them and if possible, improve them for future generations. Reintroducing the grizzly, in my opinion, is long overdue and if given a chance, it may play an important role in maintaining and improving the wilderness areas. I appreciate and understand the concerns of others regarding reintroducing the grizzly, but the grizzly is an important piece of the ecosystem that was forcibly removed and has long been missing from these critically few remaining areas where one can experience firsthand or at least take pride that we've chosen to keep these areas wild. Thank you for considering my comment.

Correspondence ID: 12484Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bow, WA 98232
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,09 2023 11:36:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hello,

I personally think that if grizzly bears are planted in the cascade's that we are setting them up for failure. There are too many people that have moved closer to their habitat. Also, if you have driven North Cross at all this summer you would have seen the hundreds of cars parked at all of the trailheads. This year, in my opinion, at least double the amount of people than a typical year.

We are being reassured that they will not harm humans and if the current news stories that you read on a weekly basis recently there have been several bear attacks in other states. Yes, I realize that not all were grizzly but many of them were. I will never be convinced that they will not harm humans.

Also, as a sportsman they will have a big impact on large game animals that have already declined tremendously in the past 10 years already.

I really hope that you truly do take into consideration the comments of those that DO NOT want them planted. If a few roam down from Canada then so be it, as we have no control over that. But, again I really feel that they will be set up to fail.

Sincerely,

Correspondence ID: 12485Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Olympia, WA 98512
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,09 2023 11:49:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: 11/9/2023
Ken Miller
11834 Family Forest Ln SW
Olympia, WA 98512

To whom it may concern:

I have farm and forestland where part of my stewardship plan to help a variety of critters survive and thrive, mainly by just avoiding the increasing pressure to convert.

I'm sure there are some biological reasons to what to introduce Grizzlies back into lands they may have existed before, particular to those folks who will never get off their couch but see something "cool" about this effort to help mother nature.

However, and especially when considering such an introduction into highly populated or high recreation areas for humans you must weigh the risks to humans against the benefits of reintroductions, particularly grizzlies.

Regardless of the cause, it's a certainty that such an introduction will lead to human deaths as some point in the future that would not have occurred without such an introduction. From a human moral standpoint you must assign a cost to that human life and weigh it against the benefits of introduction. If you decide the benefits are in fact worth more than one or more human lives then shame on you - and this would seem to open our government for some level of culpability for loss of human lives.

Maybe they will arrive naturally where you will have responsibilities to manage all possible for protection of human lives. . . . some culpability, but far more liability if you are responsible for introducing the grizzlies that ultimately/surely will kill some humans at some point of time (regardless of who's fault). It's one thing for humans to consciously go into grizzlie territory. . . . it's an entirely different decision for our government to intentionally put grizzlies into areas frequented by humans - where a human(s) are certainly going to be killed by bears at some point in time.

Beautiful, but dangerous animals have a place in our environments but that place is not where the risks of animal/human conflicts are high, and where at least some human deaths would have been avoided without such an introduction. Some decisions simply don't make sense regardless of what the laws/agencies seem to want/require - - this is one of those decisions where you can't go forward unless you are conscientiously asserting that introducing grizzlies is definitely more benefit to society than one or more human lives!!

Correspondence ID: 12487Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98101
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 11:51:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzlies are a keystone species that was driven to functional extinction by humans. Reintroducing should help bring back an important element to the ecosystem to help keep it in balance. While that isn't guaranteed, it is worth trying to validate the idea. While I understand hesitation others may have due to the dangers or inconvenience bears could pose to humans in the area, I think tools, strategies, and knowledge exists to allow us to coexist. While human safety and livelihoods should be respected and correctly planned for, we are not the only beings with a right to the land we live on and the land surrounding it. We don't fully understand our impact on the natural world around us or its impact on us. Every opportunity we can take to learn how to better coexist with it, as it was before we started making our impacts should be taken. This is the case because while we don't fully understand it, as the most powerful destructive force due to our infrastructure, tools, and intelligence, it is our responsibility to be stewards of the land. To me that means not assuming we know what is best, but doing what we can to mitigate our impact on it or doing what we can do restore it to what it was before. If it is not enough to believe it is our responsibility, I also believe the system is so sophisticated and complex, it is hubris for humans to think we know better. By restoring it, we are likely paving a road for the world to also be better for us. We have knowingly, but also importantly unknowingly done astonishing damage to the natural world we rely on to survive. I think the unknowing element is important, because even if we don't know or fully understand the benefit of working to restore what we destroyed, we can now equal work to unknowingly restore something that one day we may discover is hugely beneficial to our own survival and existence. I don't think restoring grizzly bears is the answer to the problem I am describing, but it is one of a multitude of solutions that are all necessary and important to embrace. We know we have done wrong before. We cannot let fear, lack of proof, or inconvenience stop us from doing what is right now.

Correspondence ID: 12488Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spokane, WA 99334
United States of America

Outside Organization: Back Country Horseman of Washington Ponderosa Chapter Non-Governmental

Received: Nov,09 2023 11:57:21

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think that there needs to be more study on this proposal. and the impact it will have on the outdoor activities in this area, Not only Horse camping but also back packers and hikers

Correspondence ID: 12490Project:112008Document:132104

Address: North Salt Lake, UT 84054
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 12:14:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm opposed to any actions that create further strain on the ungulate populations in Washington state. Recent actions by the WDFW Commission have increased predation pressure by wolves, cougars, and black bears throughout the state. Deer, elk, and moose populations are in decline as a result. Introducing yet another predator to the landscape further threatens herd health. It's a hard no from me on grizzly reintroduction.

The goal appears to be to spread grizzlies throughout the entire Cascade range and not limit them to the North Cascades National Park. I'm concerned that the implications of this are not being adequately communicated nor addressed with the public. The impacts of grizzlies are being minimized in NPS plan. And I see no discussion of cooperation among other agencies that will be affected, especially the WDFW Commission.

How will the grizzly population be managed if ungulate populations are foundering? Or if the grizzly population exceeds the goals laid out here? Will they be hunted or relocated to manage population numbers?

With how poorly wolf reintroductions have gone from an ungulate management perspective, I am firmly opposed to grizzly bear release in the North Cascades. I grew up in Washington and have spent countless days exploring and enjoying the North Cascades. I know that land intimately. Grizzly reintroduction is a hard no from me.

Correspondence ID: 12491Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Missoula, MT 59804
United States of America
Outside Organization: The Vital Ground Foundation Non-Governmental(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,09 2023 12:36:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: November 9, 2023

U.S Department of the Interior National Park Service and
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (via electronic submission)

Re: 2022 North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/Environmental Impact Statement

The Vital Ground Foundation strongly supports the agencies' alternatives B and C to actively restore a population of grizzly bears to their historical range in the North Cascades Ecosystem under the Endangered Species Act. Vital Ground supports designating this populational as a 10(j) experimental population and alternatively supports restoring the NCE grizzly population without an experimental population designation and varying the number and frequency of proposed grizzly bear releases into the NCE to achieve the restoration goal in a shorter time period. Vital Ground does not support the agencies' no action alternative A.

The Vital Ground Foundation is America's only nationally accredited land trust dedicated to protecting and restoring North America's grizzly bear populations for future generations by conserving wildlife habitat and by supporting programs that prevent conflicts between bears and humans. Vital Ground accomplishes this by partnering with landowners through voluntary, incentive-based conservation projects to protect habitat, and by supporting community programs to prevent bear-related conflicts.

The NCE is one of two intact ecosystems within historical grizzly bear range that does not currently host a functional population of grizzly bears. Spanning more than 6 million acres, the NCE offers a singular and irreplaceable opportunity to return the grizzly as a vital link in the nation's wildlife heritage. Restoration of the species to the NCE will make significant strides in restoring the biodiversity of the ecosystem, and also contribute to overall grizzly bear recovery and enhance the probability of its long-term survival in the lower 48 states - where the NCE is the only ecosystem capable of supporting the species that is situated outside of the Northern Rockies.

Ecosystems where grizzlies are recovering show that people and bears can coexist. Millions of people live and recreate in grizzly bear country annually, and numerous highly effective educational outreach programs ensure that this could occur in

the NCE. Embracing grizzly recovery in the NCE will focus additional energy and resources from around the nation on ensuring a future for both bears and the people who treasure the abundant natural values of the ecosystem. Recovery of the species will also stimulate positive economic impacts far beyond the reach of those partners immediately collaborating on the effort. Tourism industries anchored on the lower 48 State's two model ecosystems where grizzlies have recovered – the Yellowstone and the Northern Continental Divide Ecosystems – are a testament to the benefits that large, charismatic megafauna like grizzlies bring to communities, and moreover, to current and future generations of outdoors enthusiasts.

Sincerely,

██████████
██████████
The Vital Ground Foundation 30 Fort Missoula Rd.
Missoula MT 59804
██████████
██████████

Correspondence ID: 12492Project:112008Document:132104
Address: seattle, WA 98126
United States of America
Outside Organization: Woodland Park Zoo Conservation/Preservation
Received: Nov,09 2023 12:46:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Humans were responsible for removing grizzlies from the North Cascades and it's our responsibility to bring them back home. They are an important part of the ecosystem and should be reintroduced.

Correspondence ID: 12493Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Shelton, WA 98584
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,09 2023 13:02:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I will go on record as being against bringing the Grizzly bears to the North Cascades. There are too many livestock predators out there without introducing more. I have known of dairy goat attacks by cougars in the Cascades. The potential for human interaction is possible and should be considered
Please do not go further with this plan.

Correspondence ID: 12494Project:112008Document:132104
Address: PASCO, WA 99302
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,09 2023 13:05:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am FOR the re-introduction of the bears in WA state.

Currently Grizzlies from Mt and ID travel to and through Northeastern WA with little to no effect.

What concerns me is the forage for these predators. It would seem to me that strengthening the large game population of ungulates would be a pre-requisite.

Open up some logging and other development that spurs and supports other game (feed) species.

In Alaska, do the bears not feed primarily on Moose?

The nutsy Seattle libs need to understand that nature in all it's glory comes with risks.

Correspondence ID: 12496Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seabeck, WA 98380
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 13:15:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Take emotions OUT of this please, from both sides. Fall back on the biologists and their recommendations, do not take the biologists out of the conversation like the Washington Wildlife Commission has.

If reintroduction is based on the emotion of needing apex predators for a healthy ecosystem (trickle down) how is conservation being brought into the discussion; ie are they really needed?

Correspondence ID: 12497Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98122
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 13:16:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: People cannot believe humans are the cause of apex predator decline, solve it by 'righting the ship via reintroduction' AND THEN support evolution at the same time.

Correspondence ID: 12498Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98102
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 13:27:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm a parent who cares about wildlife, and I want my children to experience grizzly bears as an important part of our regional culture

Correspondence ID: 12500Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham WA 98226, WA 98226
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 13:40:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am against moving any grizzlies to the North Cascades. We have black bears here already and they are generally less aggressive. Considering that many hikers are using the area, introducing grizzlies puts both people and the grizzlies at risk. There are many individuals who are not concerned about keeping the wilderness pristine, and my fear is that those who leave food and garbage around would give the grizzlies a taste for human food and potentially cause danger to those who act responsibly. This would not only lead to potential injury and death for innocent humans but also lead to the destruction of the grizzlies responsible.

Correspondence ID: 12501Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Chimacum, WA 98325
United States of America

Outside Organization: Back Country Horsemen of Washington Non-Governmental

Received: Nov,09 2023 13:40:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: With respect to the Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan, I have to say that I think more information and more study is necessary before any plan is implemented.

I would be in favor of Alternative A (no action) until some safeguards are in place. The PCT has 10,000 thru-hiker permits per year and there are around a quarter million recreation visits in the NCE. There are just too many unanswered questions at this point to take any action.

Thank you for your consideration.

Correspondence ID: 12502Project:112008Document:132104

Address: San Jose, CA 95116
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 13:58:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The farmers in my family grazed their cattle on their own land. Public lands, national parks, monuments, whatever should not be used for domestic livestock. We humans are very egotistical about our species ranking number one in the environmental hierarchy. We forget that wild animals, including grizzly bears, were living first in many areas we are heedlessly crowding into. This is wrong. The wild areas are important and must be preserved. Grizzlies are magnificent creatures. They deserve our support.

Correspondence ID: 12503Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98118
United States of America

Outside Organization: Defenders of Wildlife Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 14:03:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing in support of full restoration of Grizzly Bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem. This is an important location, part of their historic range, with wilderness enough to accommodate them. Now is the time to do this. As climate change brings on increasingly extreme weather events species need ranges and numbers that will enable them to adapt, recover and move- while keeping genetic diversity.

Part of any plan should include educating the public on how to avoid bear interactions and responsibly managing domestic animals- livestock and pets so as to avoid animal-human conflicts. Grizzlies are an iconic and important species in keeping our forests and wilderness intact for future generations.

Please develop a robust plan that fully protects grizzlies and sets them up for success.

Correspondence ID: 12504Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sunnyside, WA 98944
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 14:23:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: November 9, 2023

Don Striker

Superintendent

North Cascades National Park Service Complex

810 State Route 20

Sedro Woolley, WA 98284

Re: Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Environmental Impact Statement, North Cascades Ecosystem

Dear Superintendent Striker:

I write this letter as Representative of Washington's Fourth Congressional District to express my staunch opposition to the proposed Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the North Cascades Ecosystem. It is clear that the National Park Service (NPS) and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) (collectively, the agencies) are moving forward with plans for the introduction of grizzly bears to the NCE, without listening to the concerns of the local communities that will be most impacted by the introduction of these bears. The concurrent release of this draft EIS and 10(j) rule indicates that the agencies have already made their decision and are ignoring the concern of my constituents who are against the idea of an apex predator being released near their backyard.

In both the EIS and 10(j) proposals, the agencies have detailed what they would consider substantive comments, saying "messages that simply say 'do' or 'don't' (i.e. just 'votes') are not considered substantive." Only considering comments that identify additional issues or concerns, other alternatives, or management actions from residents who might not have any knowledge of grizzly management is a good way to ignore the will of the public by putting guardrails on an "open" process. Limiting the scope of a comment during this process amounts to hindering an individual's First Amendment right to petition and speech and I urge you to reconsider this decision.

Furthermore, it is clear that environmental groups' views on the introduction of grizzlies is being prioritized over my constituents' perspectives. If proper order was followed, citizens would have had adequate time to review the EIS and offer input as to what alternative would be best for them and their communities. However, the concurrent release of the preferred alternative "C" as a proposed 10(j) rule has blatantly skipped a critical portion of input from the public. This was why I, along with five of my Congressional colleagues, requested an extension to the public comment period and additional in-person meetings for constituents to be able to have time to process the proposals being put forward. However, the agencies ignored our extension request, and crammed more public meetings into the already short time frame between publication of the EIS and close of the comment period.

For the last eight years, every time an effort has been made to introduce grizzlies into the NCE, hundreds - if not thousands - of my constituents have vocally opposed the effort. From farmers and ranchers, to outfitters and sportsmen, and those who came forward as members of the community- the message has been clear that grizzlies are not welcome in our backyard. Concerns about safety for livestock, crops, and family members are abundant. As seen with the introduction of the wolves, we know that these apex predators know no boundaries and will eventually end up in our communities.

The agencies thus far have refused to assuage citizens of these fears, including - what is the plan for dealing with crop loss and livestock depredation that is inevitable from the introduction of these predators, the timeline for issuing lethal permits, and how much will citizens have to lose before they can defend themselves from this predator in their backyard. My constituents and I urge you to select 'Alternative A' of the EIS and not release grizzly bears into the NCE.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter and please contact my congressional office with any questions and/or response.

Sincerely,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 12505Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America
Outside Organization: retired orchardist Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,09 2023 14:27:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzly bears to the North Cascades. Alternative C is the most likely alternative to be successful. It gives more options for managing the bears. I am happy that we have this opportunity and hope that the decision is made to actively restore grizzly bears to their natural habitat.

Thank you

Correspondence ID: 12507Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Redmond, WA 98052
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,09 2023 14:37:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: There is space and a need for grizzlies in our state.

Correspondence ID: 12508Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Lynnwood, WA 98036
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,09 2023 14:44:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We need our nomadic animals to be returned to their historic lands. This will help keep a balance in nature.

Correspondence ID: 12509Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98107
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,09 2023 14:47:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The majority of people in Washington state support grizzly restoration and are awaiting action by the Biden administration. Humans were responsible for removing grizzlies from the North Cascades and it's our responsibility to bring them back home. If we don't take action now, we risk losing grizzly bears from the North Cascades forever. There are ample examples of coexistence with brown bears and black bears in communities all over the United States. There is plenty of space for all of us and there are solutions for coexistence that work well.

Correspondence ID: 12510Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,09 2023 14:50:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am a long-time resident of north central Washington. I was born and raised in Fairbanks, Alaska. I am very supportive of reintroducing grizzly bears to the North Cascades. They were and should still be here. People have been cohabiting with them for a very long time, and with some awareness and adaptation, there is no reason why we can't still do that.

Correspondence ID: 12514Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,09 2023 15:31:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: If you introduce grizzly bears who will control where they roam?
They have a large area that they cover,as you we'll know.
Who is going to stop them from interacting with hikers on the many trails?
You are asking for a disaster!! What about livestock that free range?
What would keep them from attacking livestock?
We have seen what happens when wild animals contact humans
In Yellowstone..

I am adamantly opposed to this!!!

What is going to keep them from roaming into the rural Foothills where people live and our communities?

Correspondence ID: 12515Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Malott, WA 98829
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 15:35:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please use common sense and do not introduce grizzly bears into the north cascades or anywhere in WA. We have a small population of them already and we do not need to expand on that. Listen to the people that are forced to fund all these outrageous ideas, for once. Please focus on things that actually matter (i.e., increasing mule deer and elk habitat, opening up wolves to an OTC hunting tag, bringing back the spring black bear hunting season, and bringing back the use of dogs for cougar hunting).

Thanks,

██████

Correspondence ID: 12516Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 15:49:55

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am a 17 year resident of the Pacific Northwest, specifically the North Cascade foothills. I enjoy recreation time in the wilderness like so many in our area. I greatly support the reintroduction of grizzly bears into their native habitat in Washington State.

Aside from the benefits of returning an apex predator to the natural environment I would like to comment on the concern many have on living in the proximity of these magnificent creatures. Prior to moving to Washington I lived in Alaska. In the Anchorage Bowl, the urban setting blends with the wilderness. There people live among bears and other animals on a regular basis with very little negative interaction. The key is understanding the environment in which you live and preparing properly. Simple adjustments such as protective trash covers and an appreciation of animal behavior makes for a wonderful life in our modern world.

Please return the grizzly bear to our part of the world.

Correspondence ID: 12517Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Concrete, WA 98237
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 15:54:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Do not re-introduce grizzlies into the North Cascades Ecosystem. This is a dangerous predator, and any human-grizzly interaction has potential for disaster. The ONLY OPTION IS ALTERNATIVE A: DO NOTHING.

You should also give more weight to comments from people affected by this draft proposal. It sounds great from apartments and buildings in Seattle - people there won't have to deal with any consequences of re-introducing this bear.

No one is stopping these bears from entering the N. Cascades Ecosystem from elsewhere. If this ecosystem could support a thriving population of grizzlies, they would already be there, but they're not. The fact is, the grizzly will not find enough food in the N. Cascades Ecosystem. Deer are scarce, so what will the bears eat for their protein source?

At a recent presentation in Mt. Vernon, WA, [REDACTED] spoke to the fact that grizzlies are opportunistic in their food sources. They will eat whatever is easiest to catch. So if there are no deer, what is the easiest to catch? Domestic animals, like cats and dogs, farm animals, like pigs, sheep, goats, cattle, chickens, ducks. And where are these animals? Peoples' yards and porches, farms, and ranches.

And let's not forget humans. These grizzlies will kill humans. No amount of education is going to prevent a grizzly from eating someone!

Why don't you re-introduce grizzlies in Seattle? Or Everett? It's just as likely the grizzly will stay in these cities as it is they will stay in the N. Cascades Ecosystem. And it's also just as likely the grizzly will eat someone in the city as they would in the N. Cascades Ecosystem.

This proposal is not sustainable. It's expensive to manage and it has potential for disaster for all involved. This same proposal has been tried and stopped multiple times in the past. Unfortunately, we need to stop the proposal again. WE NEED TO SAY NO TO RE-INTRODUCING THE GRIZZLY TO THE NORTH CASCADES ECOSYSTEM.

Correspondence ID: 12518Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sedro Woolley, WA 98284
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 16:01:10

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: In reference to management unit 1.

The EIS states the decline of the grizzly bear was because of hunting. This is most likely NOT the case, for the area in the early 1900's was vary remote and not easily accessible by humans. Most likely it was because a change of habitat, which occurred with the construction of dams in the 1930's stopping all fish passage. The remoteness in 1900 would have made it almost impossible to kill all the bear, please remember the North Cascades Highway was not constructed until the 1970's. Very few humans ventured into the North Cascades in the early 1900's, except a few prospectors.. There are a number of other flaws in the EIS, that need to be researched further.

Correspondence ID: 12519Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 16:03:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I don't understand why people complain about our wildlife. This is their home. We are intruding in their area. Bellingham is being ruined by all the building of apartments and such. Money is the object not the environment. Move to some big city so you don't have to complain about our wildlife. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 12523Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Graham, WA 98338
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 16:35:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I oppose any reintroduction of grizzly bears into Washington State. Reintroduction will eventually get someone mauled and or killed. Washington is the second most populated western state and the smallest geographically. We simply have too many people recreating in these areas to not have deadly conflict.

Correspondence ID: 12526Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Snoqualmie Pass, WA 98068
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,09 2023 16:59:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To whom it may concern,

I don't understand this effort. You state that people want to give them their habitat back: I don't, No. Just no.

I know that anything I say will have no impact, the environmental bureaucratic inertia behind this is already decided, but I will still state my opinion even if it is into the wind.

NO.

There is no reason to do this. None. It is a shiny object in the eyes of environmental bureaucrats. It is all downside.

Someone is going to die from this. What will definitely happen is more people will travel the north cascades trails ARMED. After you do this (for I know it is a fait accompli), after you do this, I would only travel if I was heavily armed. Do you want more people out on the trails with a gun?

No, just no.

Hopelessly commenting,
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 12527Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Skykomish, WA 98288
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,09 2023 17:09:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Just writing to say, please bring back the bears. Humanely dispatch the people who are invading their space, not the bears who have been there since time immemorial. Western colonialism culture needs to stop, this includes colonizing the animals.

Free Willy!

Correspondence ID: 12528Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98136
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,09 2023 17:13:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Humans were responsible for removing grizzlies from the North Cascades and it's our responsibility to bring them back home! If we don't take action now, we risk losing grizzly bears from the North Cascades forever.

Correspondence ID: 12529Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,09 2023 17:17:49
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I write from my residence in the Methow Valley to comment on the efficacy of reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades area of Washington. I think it is entirely feasible, based on the documentation prepared by various agencies, and I urge you to finalize the EIS and issue an ROD in favor of Alternative C.

My conclusion derives from my research on the ecology of bears over 40+ years in Montana, BC, Alaska and Kamchatka that considered the role of bears in expansive river and mountain landscapes like the Cascades. The research shows that grizzlies play a key role in mountain ecosystems in a variety of important ways. They churn meadow soils while digging for rodents and nutritious plant tubers, a natural disturbance that promotes plant biodiversity and productivity. Put simply, grizzly bears were functionally important to the ecology of landscapes like the North Cascades and should be restored.

The main concerns against reintroduction are 1) that bears will kill livestock, 2) that there is not enough food in the mountains to keep the bears away from adjacent ranches and population centers, and 3) that they are dangerous to people. All of this is true, but over-blown and entirely manageable. Grizzlies and people live mostly in harmony in mountain landscapes of Canada and Alaska. In Kamchatka, Russia, I worked among the highest density of the big bears in the world for over 10 years without incident. The reintroduction of grizzlies in the Cabinet Mountains of Montana and substantial enhancement of populations in Glacier and Yellowstone have been notably successful and millions of local people and tourists annually enjoy the presence of the big bears in these iconic landscapes.

Why not the North Cascades? Yes, big salmon runs that once were important to grizzlies in the Cascades are largely gone (in spite of massive salmon recovery efforts that have failed miserably owing to lack of attention to science... but that is another matter you need to look into). But the bears do fine in mountain ecosystems without salmon, using alternative food sources that are naturally abundant in the Cascades.

Superintendent Striker, the bears and bear advocates need your support. It's time for grizzlies back in the Cascades. The reintroduction plan is sound and should be adopted.

Correspondence ID: 12530Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Enumclaw, WA 98022
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 17:36:10

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears have no purpose in the Pacific Northwest. For animal conservation, stick to hunting and traditional efforts. The government has no business intervening.

Correspondence ID: 12531Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Enumclaw, WA 98023
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 17:39:45

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: There are already enough grizzly bears in WA. There is no purpose for them or wolves. If I see any grizzly I will kill it, they are an apex predator and kill plenty of humans every year. Get the wolves under control as well because I will kill them too. 12 wolves treed a woman in Winthrop that should be an eye opener. Wolves in wa have not made the eco system better and grizzly's have already made it worse.

Correspondence ID: 12532Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98105
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 17:48:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I fully support restoring grizzly bears to the North Cascades ecosystem. I prefer alternative C - restoring bears with the 10-J rule. Grizzlies had been a part of the North Cascades wilderness for centuries. Humans are the reason they were extirpated. Humans also have the power and responsibility to restore grizzlies so the wilderness of the North Cascades region is whole again. I respect the opinions of those who don't want grizzlies restored. However, I don't agree with their reasons, particularly that grizzlies will attack humans frequently and/or that grizzlies will cause massive damage for farmers and ranchers. Large populations of people and grizzlies have been co-existing safely in other regions of the lower 48 states in the USA, without a 10-J plan for over 30 years. With a 10-J plan in effect, the recovery plan in the North Cascades carries even less risk than other recovery zones and provides wildlife officials and citizens with effective policies to minimize grizzly/human conflicts. The North Cascades will be another region in the grizzly bear recovery plan where people and bears will co-exist safely. I look forward to the grizzly bear recovery plan being approved, and grizzly bears to be released, in the North Cascades ecosystem as soon as possible.

Correspondence ID: 12533Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Everson, WA 98247
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 18:06:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: While it may be historically and ecologically accurate to have this predator in the North Cascades it is idealistic to believe that Grizzlies can exist without negative impact to the human population.

The concept of Grizzlies in the North Cascades is an ecological novelty. It does not benefit the general population of Washington and costs taxpayers. Taxpayers are struggling with basic cost of living and a Grizzly program should not be added to this. Costs of a Grizzly program will increase as the population grows. It will require more compensation to farmers due to livestock lost or stressed, property damage as Grizzlies destroy outbuildings, more calls for Park staff to help with nuisance calls or relocation of bears that get too close to human populations, and the loss of revenue as fewer hunting tags are offered for those species that the bears need as prey (elk and deer).

The hunting opportunities of the Pacific Northwest has reduced year after year with little regard for the culture of its residents who value the tradition and rely on healthy elk and deer populations.

I do not support the introduction of Grizzly Bear into the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 12534Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 18:08:15

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in favor of the reintroduction plan. It is well researched, including consideration of genetic diversity, habitat suitability, potential negative human interactions, and plans for monitoring translocated bears and future population numbers. I thought I had heard there were three proposed actions that we could comment on, but I'm not finding that information now. I'm in favor of adaptive management of the reintroduction process as the years ensue, modifying as required to eventually result in a viable population of genetically diverse bears, while minimizing the potential for bear-human conflicts. I have lived and worked in an area of high density of brown bears in Alaska. We can live compatibly: bears can thrive and people can continue to enjoy wilderness areas.,

Correspondence ID: 12536Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lake Mary, MS 32746
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 18:19:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears are magnificent animals that deserve our protection! There is room on earth still for them to thrive and we need to do everything in our power to make it happen. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 12540Project:112008Document:132104

Address: East Wenatchee, WA 98802
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 18:44:21

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: What is the main reason why they want to introduce grizzly bears to WA State?

Please explain what the benefit would be?

Thank you!

Correspondence ID: 12541Project:112008Document:132104

Address: North Bend, WA 98045
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 18:45:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Alternative A is the best option for reintroducing the grizzly bear population.

I am incredibly grateful that you are allowing the public to comment on this plan, and further humbled that you are taking the time to read my humble opinion. For that, I don't want to spend your time reading my thoughts on the impacts on recreation and human conflict because we don't really know the true impacts. Instead, I'd like to talk about the aspects of what I have the right to have an opinion on, where my money goes.

Using the amount of resources needed for introducing grizzly bears is excessive, with no real reason. We already have black bears in this area that fill the niche that a grizzly would in this ecosystem (though I understand its not exactly the same). I certainly feel bad that humans drove this bear from the habitat but resources should be used to drive up the numbers of animals we already have here. I am an avid outdoor person, spending an average of three days a week in the wilderness a year. I am often surprised at the lack of wildlife I see here compared to the states that border Washington with similar ecosystems. I appreciated that the plan attempts to outline potential income from tourism but there is not a good way to truly analyze the financial impact on tourism in the NCE. Especially because we would need to make enough on tourism to pay for ranchers for their dead livestock.

Again, thank you for taking the time.

██████

Correspondence ID: 12542Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Snoqualmie, WA 98065
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 18:55:48

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We do not need an apex predator in the North Cascades. I want to backpack and camp safely with my family without having to pack heavy guns to protect myself from grizzly bears.

DO NOT introduce grizzly bears to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 12543Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Pullman, WA 99163
United States of America

Outside Organization: Self Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,09 2023 19:00:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have been an avid outdoorsman for years spending many days afield hunting fishing and recreating. I have camped on Kodiak island and mainland Alaska with generally decent levels of safety in bear county. i know the risks and preventive and reactionary measures to insure my safety and have never had to DLP (defense of life and property) a bear to date. Having said that I would not bat an eye to do so and most likely would have the support of the State of Alaska if justified. This is where I have an issue with the reintroduction of Ursa Horribilis to the N Cascades. The way politics influences big game management in this state is absurd and lacks any real genuine scientific input with bear management. Look at the recent change of Spring Black Bear management in the state or lack thereof. The recent loss of the season due to politics and nothing more is absurd and nonsensical. Based 100% on emotions, feelings and yes politics. Couple with what all outdoorsman have witnessed with wolf reintroduction 15 years ago and the continued moving of the goal posts regarding what is considered healthy populations I am very suspect that the same will occur with Grizz reintroduction to the N Cascades. It will happen mark my word. The progressive environmentalists will get their way and the 25 bear will turn into 50 then 100 and so on. Just look at YNP for how this has occurred. Bears are now finding their way into the crop lands to the East, the small towns and cities in Wyoming and of course the human- bear interactions have quadrupled in the past 3 years. ALL due to lack of management. Bears have become charismatic megafauna and city people have zero idea of what this means. If the Feds are so anxious start by dumping 12 breeding pairs in the South Bay Area to Point Ana Nuevo where the greatest concentration of Grizz existed in the 19 century and let's watch that little experiment unfold. Only then will you understand that micromanaging bears is fraught with peril.

Correspondence ID: 12544Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Woodinville, WA 98077
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,09 2023 19:05:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support reintroducing grizzly bears back into the North Cascades. They have been part of the ecosystem for 20,000 years and we don't have a complete eco system in the North Cascades without them. They are vital to balancing our eco system through spreading seeds, fertilizing soil, and keeping other prey species in check.

Correspondence ID: 12545Project:112008Document:132104

Address: New Brighton, MN 55112
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,09 2023 19:19:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please allow the grizzlies back in the park. It was there home and should still be their home. We hikers understand the need for wildlife and restoration of ecosystems.

Correspondence ID: 12547Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America
Outside Organization: None Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,09 2023 19:26:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Howdy

The Forest Service advises that they have now signed on as cooperator. I see nothing on your website about this. The draft eis says they are not a cooperator. If they are a cooperator you should amend the EIS and put out details. This is a material

change that should require a new comment period. A lot of details not in current draft that need disclosed for NEPA compliance.

Thank you

Correspondence ID: 12548Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Corte Madera, CA 94925

United States of America

Outside Organization: Self Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 19:41:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I've been reading a lot about rewilding activities across Africa, South America and the UK. Rewilding is a great tool in fighting climate change and mitigating the Biodiversity Crisis. I think it is high time the United States steps up to do its part and what better way than the reintroduction of grizzly bears.

Correspondence ID: 12552Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kent, CT 06757
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 20:00:24

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Better to locate them in the D.C. suburbs.

Correspondence ID: 12553Project:112008Document:132104

Address: butte, MT 59701
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 20:01:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: we live in south west montana and are in the home range of wild grizzly bears which is about 500 miles, people around here have learned to live and coexist with the bears. i have seen bears out hiking and no this is not yellowstone park. the pioneer, anaconda pintlars tobacco root and highland mountain ranges to name a few are prime grizzly bear habitat. and yes people do ranch hunt and fish around here, and yes tourism is an industry here. so yes bears and people can coexist together. yes grizzly bears should be a part of the northern cascade eco-system. and all the conservative misinformation garbage does not change that. the bears were hunted to near extinction around here to until proper management brought them back.

Correspondence ID: 12554Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Concrete, WA 98237
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 20:08:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not support the reintroduction of grizzly bears as outlined in this draft plan, for the following reasons.

1. I do not believe that North Cascades National Park (NOCA) is prepared to manage a grizzly population or its interactions with the public. While the draft claims that NOCA provides bear-resistant trash cans at its trailheads and campgrounds, in fact, NOCA removed many trash receptacles in 2023 and gave itself the label of "trash-free park." This policy resulted, predictably, in the improper disposal of trash (e.g. on the ground or in vault toilets) by the public, culminating in one

instance in which a vault toilet (at the Cascade Pass trailhead) was too full of trash to be pumped and was flooded with feces in the attempt. Given that NOCA implemented such a ludicrous and irresponsible policy for the disposal of trash, an obvious bear attractant, this very year, I do not trust park management to prepare visitors for grizzly interactions in the future.

2. I do not believe that this project is an appropriate use of money. If I added up the numbers in the table on page C-2 correctly, either of the proposed action alternatives will cost at least \$823,000 per year. This seems a lavish expense for a park that has consistently failed to hire new career scientists (to, say, monitor wildlife) as the older generation has retired. Most park divisions - trail crew, buildings and utility maintenance, native plant restoration, resources, and wilderness rangers - are understaffed at the ground level, where the day-to-day burdens of managing public interaction with grizzly bears will fall. In short, the park can barely staff itself and manage year-to-year operations, so I believe it would be inappropriate to spend this sum on an unnecessary project that it has not demonstrated the ability to manage. The money would, in my opinion, be better spent hiring permanent staff in the resources, maintenance, and wilderness divisions in support of the year-to-year operation of the park.

Correspondence ID: 12556Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Arlington, WA 98223
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 20:12:58

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Reintroducing grizzly bears to the North Cascades is a very bad idea. We have a lot of hikers including our family. We often like to find locations in the North Cascades that are not as well traveled to escape the crowds. We do not want to fear running into a grizzly bear on one of our hikes. You say encounters with humans would be seldom but the truth is it would be likely at some point that a grizzly would kill a hiker. It is inevitable. And when it happens the blood of that hiker will be on your hands. The argument that "we're giving the grizzlies back their home" and "they balance the ecology" are garbage arguments. We spend a ton of time in the North Cascade wilderness and it is perfect the way it is. You are inventing a problem that does not exist. And wasting millions of tax dollars in the process.

Correspondence ID: 12557Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Dallas, OR 97338
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 20:16:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: OK,

/This is the second EIS I have read in my time. There first was the proposal to close the Summit ridge road on the west side of Hells Canyon during hunting seasons.

Like that EIS I find this one also lacking a bit. It seems to minimize the dangers of Grizzlies to humans.

If you put Grizzlies in that area you WILL have people Attacked. Think about it.

Grizzlies clearly are not in danger of extinction in the lower 48. If they were struggling at all you wouldn't be able to remove up to 70 of them from other areas. You wouldn't remove any.

While some people may want to experience Grizzlies, some may not. The problem with this is that those that want to experience grizzlies already have places to go for that experience. Those that don't want the experience will LOSE Wilderness experience. This is NOT a balanced equation.

I couldn't find much about costs other than adding personnel. Our country is some 30 Trillion dollars in debt. We cannot afford to continue spending money on projects that are not REQUIRED. Helicopters, education programs, etc....

When the wolves were reintroduced the other thing that was introduced is conflict.

The same will happen with the Grizzlies. It's just going to cause problems because the Grizzlies can't recognize boundaries.

Please, just stop this project, you've already wasted too much time and money. That money would have been better spent on trail maintenance.

Correspondence ID: 12558Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellevue, WA 98006
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 20:19:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is an evil and ridiculous idea. It is spiteful and designed to cause injury to people and property. I'm aware that professors in academia are behind it and any deaths or injuries resulting from the bears should be laid at the foot of the responsible intellectuals and the universities that employ them. There are too many people near the North Cascades in the Seattle area for grizzlies, which have a huge foraging range, to live without causing disastrous conflicts. The same is true for the ranchers on the other side of the mountains. As Joe Biden says about Iran getting involved in the Israel-Hamas conflict, DON'T.

Correspondence ID: 12559Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Portland, OR 97215
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 20:21:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Our ecosystems need the re-introduction of species that once inhabited them, restoring the balance that existed before our forebears disrupted it.

Correspondence ID: 12560Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Portland, OR 97223
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 20:22:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am opposed to Grizzly Bear reintroduction in Washington. This is a dangerous proposal. Our extended family have been frequent visitors and hikers to the northern Cascades of Washington. We have deep concerns for the residents, visitors, pets, livestock and wildlife, if a grizzly bear population should expand.

Please don't do this.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 12561Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sammamish, WA 98074
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 20:25:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm adding my vote NOT to reintroduce Grizzly bears into the North Cascade mountains of Washington. I don't believe the reasons for reintroducing the bears outweigh the unadulterated delight thousands of hikers/bikers/campers/backpackers/trail runners (like myself) get from these beautiful mountains, where we play and

replenish our spirits and make lasting family memories without the fog of fear tainting (or perhaps ruining) our experiences. If the bears were endangered, I'd feel differently (I value wildlife), but they aren't. Please don't do this. Please listen to us instead of making a decision for us. Please.

Correspondence ID: 12565Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Grayland, WA 98547
United States of America
Outside Organization: BCHW Non-Governmental
Received: Nov,09 2023 20:39:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am writing in favor of not introducing grizzlies at this time to Cascades. I am a member of Back Country Horseman of Washington and use/maintain trails with my horse.

Correspondence ID: 12566Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98108
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,09 2023 20:42:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I have lived my life learning to coexist with bears and other wildlife. It is a possibility to educate others to live with wildlife as well respect their place in the ecosystem.
Bears are a family oriented species that can teach us more about the environment and our place in it.

Correspondence ID: 12567Project:112008Document:132104
Address: yakima, WA 98908
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,09 2023 20:58:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We are unalterably opposed to reintroducing grizzly bears into any public lands, anywhere. After living in Montana for 30 years and always worrying about grizzlies on our backpacking trips, we finally moved to OR and then WA. In OR and WA we have not had to worry about damn grizzlies and we don't want that to change. These bears are stalkers. We have been stalked by one in MT, who followed our foot tracks in the snow 5 miles, from our parked truck into our cabin. It then circled our cabin many times during the night. Thank goodness our cabin had window barricades up for the winter and double, solid wood doors. There are enough grizzlies in MT WY and AK. Let them roam free there, but keep them out of the rest of the USA. We haven't had to carry a 44 mag for years now. We are so sick and tired of bear loving biologists, wanting to expose everyone outdoorsman to grizzlies, to say nothing of ranchers. We don't need dinosaurs and we don't need grizzlies. This is 21st century America and grizzlies don't belong here, not for people and not for other wild animals. Read the book Grizzly, and the encounters therein. What we need is some biologists to be mauled and eaten by grizzlies, not the rest of us outdoor users.
[REDACTED] lifetime hikers, backpackers and grizzly haters.

Correspondence ID: 12568Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Redmond, WA 98053
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,09 2023 21:01:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I have camped, hiked and hunted all over the state of Washington, including wilderness areas for more than 50 years.

The reintroduction of grizzly bears into Washington state will guarantee increased dangerous encounters between humans

and these bears.

That will result in two outcomes.

Injured, mauled and dead humans.

And dead grizzlies.

This is an incredibly stupid idea and plan.

Correspondence ID: 12569Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mill Valley, CA 94941
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 21:15:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the effort to introduce grizzly bears into the North Cascades. They have drastically dwindled in numbers and do not pose a danger to human populations.

Correspondence ID: 12570Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Los Angeles, CA 90065
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 21:23:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Time is running out for so many plants and animals now. We need to learn to live with these animals and not be ruled by fear. Healthy ecosystems need all of their pieces, including predators. Please reintroduce the Grizzly bear wherever its population can be sustained.

Correspondence ID: 12571Project:112008Document:132104

Address: San Antonio, TX 78217
United States of America

Outside Organization: Animal Defense League Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 21:24:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I believe we should do everything we can to help restore this species population. Humans are the number one reason the endangered species list exists. They are beautiful living creatures and deserve to be here more than humans do. We are the invasive species and hearing such ignorance concerning any animals life and future existence as an inconvenience is truly reprehensible.

Correspondence ID: 12572Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Valleyford, WA 99036
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 21:32:10

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am dismayed that reintroduction of grizzly bears would be under serious consideration.

What is the objective? To run people out of bear territory? We already have plenty of black bears. Why do we need grizzly bears?

Here are some of the things people who live in rural areas are expected to do:

"Residents of rural communities throughout Idaho, Montana, Wyoming and Washington state, are being cautioned to remove bear "attractants" from their property. Fruit trees and berry bushes should be eliminated and electric fences installed

around bee hives, chicken coops, and children's play areas. Bird feeders are a big no-no, as well as compost heaps and unfenced garden."

So normal human activities will be subject to ever increasing restrictions in order to avoid conflicts with grizzlies. Or maybe we should just be confined to smart cities and never have any access to natural areas such as the Cascades.

Is that the objective of government reintroduction of grizzlies?

GRIZZLY BEARS are not endangered. But soon rural residents may be if our mountains overflow with these monster bruins.

Correspondence ID: 12574Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Redmond, WA 98052
United States of America

Outside Organization: Citizen Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 21:42:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Our household is against the plan to introduce the grizzly bears. This will pose a danger to many people who visit/move to this area from out of state or other countries to enjoy hiking and other mountain activities. Washington has become a hub for outdoor activities. The ecosystem cannot sustain these animals. With no food to sustain the grizzly, they will feed on the human population.

Correspondence ID: 12575Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: WDFW (Retired Fish Biologist) Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 22:21:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: You have wolves, black bears, and cougars all living in the proposed areas of grizzly bear relocations. All can be predators on deer populations. WDFW has just told us recently that mule deer herds in Okanogan County have been decreasing.

So why would you want to introduce another potential predator on an already fragile prey base. Alternative A is your best choice.

Thanks for letting me comment.

Correspondence ID: 12576Project:112008Document:132104

Address: San Francisco, CA 94110
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 22:27:41

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Yes. We need to reintroduce grizzly bears. They have not caused any problems where they were reintroduced in Montana.

Correspondence ID: 12577Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tigard, OR 97223
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 23:09:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am an avid long-distance hiker and backpacker. I support animals being in their natural habitat. Reintroduction considerations are keeping Grizzlies away from the human populated areas so they have an appropriate sized territory per bear or they won't stand a chance. They are too aggressive if they come into contact with human food.

Correspondence ID: 12578Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Toms River, NJ 08753
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 23:12:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Bring back the grizzly bears!

North Cascade grizzlies must have the same protection under the Endangered Species Act that all populations have. It is unacceptable for the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service to issue a special rule for "a nonessential experimental population." The final Restoration Plan should account for the positive effects grizzly bear reintroduction will have on wildlife in the North Cascades, maximizing their beneficial role in improving the ecological diversity necessary for a thriving ecosystem. The National Park Service should craft the final Restoration Plan to account for the role humans play in minimizing human-grizzly bear interactions. While people are encouraged to enjoy recreational activities in and around the vast, sparsely populated North Cascades, the final Restoration Plan should prohibit hunting and encourage people to use non-lethal means to respond to and to deescalate any human-bear interactions.

The National Park Service should prioritize protections for grizzly bears over livestock grazing. Provisions to accommodate "management" of grizzly bears for the benefit of the livestock industry are not necessary.

"It is paramount that non-lethal methods are required to handle any conflicts between grizzly bears and property or livestock," says Rob Huss, senior attorney for FoA's Wildlife Law Program. "FoA urges the National Park Service to select the path forward that promotes the positive impacts and effects of grizzly bear reintroduction without short-sighted, lethal methods of 'management.'"

Correspondence ID: 12579Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Anchorage, AK 99507
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023 23:15:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the reintroduction of grizzlies into the North Cascades. I am a retired FWS biologist who spent 25 years of my career in Alaska. I also commercial setnet for salmon with my husband in the Kodiak district. I have lived among grizzly and brown bears and had several interactions with them -- none hostile on either side. I spend part of each year in Winthrop, WA so have a keen interest in the reintroduction into an area I spend time in.

I have read the EIS and I think that its major flaw is a scientific calculation of carrying capacity. The historical records seem spotty at best with poor location data. I was not able to access the study that determined that the north Cascades could support 200-400 bears but I am skeptical of the number. There are no longer large numbers of mammals in the high country, when the relocated bears come out of hibernation there will be little for them to eat and I agree with the concerned ranchers and farmers that the bears may move to areas where there are livestock and other sources of food in the valley. Bears can range far and wide and have a strong sense for finding where the food is. I believe if the north Cascades habitat is bear country that some bears would have found their way there from populations further north.

One of my chief concerns that I did not hear voiced at the public meeting in Winthrop concerns expense. I understand the drive to implement recovery plans but I think this is misplaced planning and misplaced funds. 100 bears were killed in one month by Alaska Department of Fish and Game in an attempt to benefit declining caribou herds, the roadless area controversy in the Tongass National Forest threatens brown bear habitat in SE Alaska. Last fall 5 bears were killed in the Yellowstone area when they moved out of protected areas. None of the reports on bears populations already in the lower 48 sound positive. Before a lot of money is spent on reintroducing grizzly bears, we need to take better care of the bears that already exist. FWS has a backlog of refuge problems, threatened species, and other issues where money can be better spent.

I thought that the attention paid to the impact to recreationists, especially hikes on the Pacific Crest trail, was minimally addressed. Climate change and fire probabilities were also not adequately addressed

In conclusion, I support Alternative 1, the no action alternative.

Respectfully submitted,

Correspondence ID: 12580Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,09 2023 23:25:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Superintendent
North Cascades National Park
810 State Route 20
Sedro Woolley, WA 98284
November 9, 2023

RE: Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/Environmental Impact Statement

Thank you in advance for consideration of my thoughts regarding the proposal to re-introduce grizzly bears into the North Cascades ecosystem here in Washington state.

I am FIRMLY OPPOSED TO THE REINTRODUCTION of grizzly bears, as I believe the negatives far outweigh any positives.

1. The National Park Service and Forest Service are, sadly, chronically underfunded. The artificial re-introduction of grizzlies will be a costly affair, not only on the front end, but continuously as issues with the bears will need to be addressed. The money spent on the artificial introduction of grizzly bears, and the inevitable issues that will result, would be much better used to maintain trails, upkeep infrastructure and improve pay for park and forest service staff.
2. I question whether it would actually be a positive for our ecosystem to have grizzly bears present. Is the science truly settled? I think not. I will add that I do have an undergraduate degree in Zoology and studied ecosystems back in my university days, though admittedly not as a career.
3. The Cascade mountain range, as the crow flies, is not very wide and, with the amount of settled areas in the foothills on both sides of the range, human-bear conflicts will inevitably occur, both to the detriment of the bears and to the detriment of humans.
4. Areas with grizzly bears will need to be periodically closed to recreation due to various bear issues. This happens in areas such as Yellowstone. This will limit the public's use of potentially large tracts of wilderness. Why would we wish to do this when our outdoor areas are more and more crowded?
5. The Pacific Crest trail is one of America's premier hiking routes, enjoyed not only by our citizens but by outdoor adventurers from around the globe. Through-hikers travel as light as possible. The presence of grizzlies would necessitate bear proof containers and other cumbersome changes, such as the need to carry bear spray.
6. Solo hiking in areas with grizzly bears is sometimes forbidden, depending on the jurisdiction, and, even in the best circumstances, often unwise. As an experienced backpacker and mountaineer, I have greatly enjoyed the occasional solo trip into the mountains. This would no longer be possible.
7. Grizzly bears ARE dangerous. As a surgeon, I have personally provided follow-up care to survivors of bear attacks. The risk can be cited as "low" but the risk IS very real. When in the mountains, I most certainly do not wish to be continually nervous and looking over my shoulder worried about attacks either on myself, my friends, my children or my grandchildren,

whom I am now introducing to the outdoors.

8. Grizzly bears are common in Canada, yet they have not repopulated here on their own. The areas north and south of our borders is remote territory and I do not think civilized barriers are enough to prevent natural in-migration. I suggest the best approach is a "no action" approach to see if grizzlies will naturally relocate to the Cascades on their own.

9. Aside from the direct cost of bringing in grizzly bears and the ongoing cost of dealing with all the problems which will subsequently follow, the artificial re-introduction of grizzly bears will result in damage to the local economies. The Cascade mountains are NOT Yellowstone where tourists drive the many roads and are thrilled at the chance to see a grizzly . . . from the safety of their car. Access to the Cascades is limited and difficult. It is not an area that can be readily enjoyed from roads or even by short hikes. Thus, having grizzly bears will not induce additional tourism. I believe the opposite would occur. Most users of the Cascades are hikers, trail runners, backpackers and/or climbers, and the presence of grizzly bears will be a deterrent to visit. Also, as stated above, the inevitable need to periodically close off areas to humans will further diminish visitation. Less visitors will cause damages to local economies which depend on those who now adventure in the area.

I am not anti-predator. I fervently wish for the grizzly bears, in locations where they currently live, to thrive and be protected. BUT speaking as someone who has roamed mountain areas all over western US and Canada, in areas both with and without grizzly bears, I am firmly opposed to the artificial re-introduction of grizzlies and thus I vote for NO ACTION - ALTERNATIVE A.

Sincerely,

████████████████████
████████████████████
Wenatchee, WA 98801

████████████████████

Correspondence ID: 12581Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Twisp, WA 98856-9754
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,09 2023 23:43:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hello,

PLEASE do not bring the grizzly bears to our area. I am very sad that they were eradicated many years ago - that should have never have happened. But bringing them in artificially like this is not the correct solution. It is not humane to the bears nor the people (like myself) who live and recreate here.

The deer population is already suffering from pressure from wildfires that are now common here, plus the pressure from hunting. There is not sufficient food sourcing for the grizzlies here - they will end up eating the struggling deer population as well as the cattle that are ranged here. There is not enough fish in the area for them to survive, either.

I am a lover of nature and the wild things. I love seeing the owls, moose, ducks, deer, skunks, black bears and all sorts of critters. But they all live here on their own.

Years ago, the National Park Service decided to import mountain goats into Olympic National Park. Now that the goats have overpopulated and started destroying the landscape there, the NPS is now killing the goats and exporting some of them to other areas where they are native to, like the Lake Chelan area. Why were the goats imported in the first place? Why was it

thought to be a good idea then and how was that any different than thinking it a good idea to import grizzlies into an area that is no longer their native territory?

I vote in many cases in ways that support the natural environment, including protection of endangered species. But if the NPS and USFWS decide to push this agenda in spite of public pressure, my ways of voting may lean in different directions to vote for people who will actually listen to the public instead of forcing their way against the wishes of the public. The Federal government is a wonderful thing, designed to serve the public and I am grateful for this, but if it chooses to ignore the public then the government needs to be changed by the way of the voters.

Please reconsider moving forward with this plan.

Thank you,

Correspondence ID: 12583Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Darrington, WA 98241
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,10 2023
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: NO to Grizzlies

- During low salmon run years the black bears are skinny and are more prone to raid closer to residential areas for food. The Grizzlies would do the same with far more destruction.

- The relocated mountain goats did not stay in areas they were expected to. I would anticipate the Grizzlies doing the same or returning to thier original location.

- Would there be compensation for killed livestock or damaged farm facilities? Past programs did not adequately meet the requirements needed by farmers (elk with fences and damaged crops).

Correspondence ID: 12585Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bainbridge Island, WA 98110
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,10 2023 01:34:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to support alternative A in the proposal to re-introduce grizzly bears to the North Cascades. I strongly oppose options B and C. It is indeed sad that human development and actions have displaced the grizzly bear population from so much of the United States, disrupting the natural balance of wildlife in our ecosystem. But today, tens of thousands of people visit the North Cascades National Park every year, and many more than that recreate in the North Cascades and Pasayten Wilderness areas, hiking, backpacking, hunting and fishing.

The risk of a hiker being attacked by a grizzly bear one day is exceptionally small. However, just knowing that risk exists affects every single day I am in the backcountry. I will no longer be comfortable hiking alone in the quiet with my dog. Now I should hike in a group, carry bear spray or a gun, make plenty of noise, and probably leave my dog at home.

We should absolutely keep and enforce grizzly bear protection laws. Let their numbers grow and they will move our way as they seek new territory. But before we try to unwind time and force their repopulation in our region, please consider how this affects everyone who walks into our mountains to find some solitude and quiet. I go to the wilderness to escape stress, not invite it.

Correspondence ID: 12588Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Port angeles, WA 98363
United States of America

Outside Organization: Occidental holdings Business

Received: Nov,10 2023 03:03:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This Is a horrible idea. Looks good on paper until you read anything at all about these apex predators an how many people survive attacks an what they do to wildlife , livestock , pets, habitat for wildlife , salmon whom are just barely making a comeback . Not to mention how many people living here can afford to buy all the expensive things required to grizzly proof trash , food , an property, land an homes from these huge normally aggressive creatures especially if a sow has cubs. If that happens whomever or whatever is as good as dead . How many children may stumble on them an surprise each other what do you think. Will happen to any children that encounter them ? An I doubt a child would think to carry bear spray at all times . Which by the way does not always work . Many times there have been people attacked an killed that deployed a whole can an still were killed . These arnt cute cuddly teddy bears these are ferocious normally grumpy when disturbed very vetu hungry apex predators whom have a super sense of smell they use to find as much food as possible cuz they need alot of food especially before winter an will kill an break anything to get it . It's very hard to scare them away . Their paws are bigger than a humans head an that's not counting their enormous claws that will Rip open a person's flesh like butter an huge teeth that will crunch an crush thro a person skull like it was an apple . There are enough predators here without purposely putting the top apex predator here an letting it loose. An no they won't stay in designated little spots they are told to . Kinda like the people crossing illegally here they have no clue where they are until murders start happening . No not all but quite a few do . An other crimes . Anyway sorry I couldn't resist that but this is a horrible an irresponsible an dangerous idea for our wildlife for our livestock for our pets an for us an for the habitat . I can't even believe somebody thought this was a good idea much less enough to push this thro an try to make it happen I can't for real see anybody that lives here being for this Assinine horribly scary dangerous plan to make this state a anxiety ridden nightmare where you have to spend alot of money to just try to survive a coukd happen anytime bear encounter an to attempt to protect your family from . No no no pls im begging you do not do this .

Correspondence ID: 12591Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Redway, CA 95560
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,10 2023 04:07:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: These beings have been here a lot longer than humans have and have every right to live . We are NOT the apex being on the planet and have to learn to live with, not against, all other species.

Correspondence ID: 12601Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ferndale, WA 98248
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,10 2023 06:52:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am an avid outdoor person and hiked.vicam frequently in the North Cascades area. Any ecosystem is extremely complicated. We really don't know exactly how species interacted when grizzlies were last in the North Cascades. introducing an apex predator may have consequences that will be totally unexpected and undesirable. Not to mention that the human population and the number of hikers and other outdoor enthusiasts have dramatically increased over the years. Finally there is no fence between Canada and the US. If the grizzly population is under stress from overpopulation in the North, the will eventually migrate south anyway, on their own good time. I am 100% opposed to the reintroduction of grizzlies to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 12603Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,10 2023 07:12:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am in favor of reintroducing grizzlies to the North Cascades. It will enhance the valuable ecosystem here and help insure grizzlies survival in the wild.

Thank you

Correspondence ID: 12604Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Washougal, WA 98671
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,10 2023 07:45:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Reintroduction of grizzly (brown) bears to the North Cascades is an unnecessary and dangerous prospect which impacts human populations negatively. I live in an area where the expansion of predator populations (i.e. cougar) has impacted livestock and decreased my personal safety in my own back yard.

I strongly urge halting plans to introduce brown bears to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 12607Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,10 2023 08:40:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: NO GRIZZLES IN NORTH CASCADES

Correspondence ID: 12608Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,10 2023 09:04:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of Grizzly Bears to the North Cascades. I've lived, hiked, backpacked, and camped around areas with Grizzly populations in Montana for much of my life and have never felt endangered. I know instances of human contact, even attacks, have occurred, but those have been few given the number of people active in grizzly habitat. If one wants to believe the area in which they live is both beautiful and wild, it can't be called such when the wild has been eliminated. Yes to grizzly reintroduction. Let's make our place what we think it is!

Correspondence ID: 12610Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Sedro Woolley, WA 98284
United States of America
Outside Organization: a Cattlemen Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,10 2023 09:09:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: A Skagit Valley Cattlemen
NOT IN FAVOR Of the Re-Introduction Of Grizzlies Bears into the North Cascades
• Latin name of [URSUS ARCTOS HORRIBILIS commonly believed to be derived from "GRISLY"
MEANING "HORRIBLE"; which is resultant from the common meaning of "DREADFUL NORTHERN BEAR"

when it was classified in 1815. They have been around awhile and there known reputation. If you go to Google and type in horrible bear it pops up.

- Westerly reach of the North Cascades proposed area is too close to private landowners and allows for no buffet or small of a buffer to the easterly reach of the Skagit Valley which is in inhabited to an uncontrolled numbers of elk said to number 1800-2200 depending on the study. The Grizzly is an opportunist the elk will be the last thing they choose to act on the easy target. This open population of elk will act like bate and bring the "DREADFUL NORTHERN BEAR" , into our community only to prey upon domestic livestock and rummaging.
- It most cases when the Grizzly encounters with humans, that I have heard of, the Governing regulatory enforcement always blame the fisherman, the hiker, the producer first and not the bad actor, "DREADFUL NORTHERN BEAR" in the chance meeting.
- Radio collar technology did not work as expected when the wolf was introduces and bears are individuals and known NOT to travel in packs or numbers. Just to profess the effect of collar impact is not arguable as all "DREADFUL NORTHERN BEAR". No successful tagging project has been provided for conformation of governing claims.
- The Methow Valley on the Cascade Loop Scenic Byway was the last know area to have "Homestead the Act" which was known to have the "DREADFUL NORTHERN BEAR" in the area. A hay hauler shared with me that the last marauding grizzly bear known in the area was basically eliminated by an all-out effort by the locals amend with pitchfork and weapons that were acting when government efforts promised had failed.

Correspondence ID: 12611Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Fall city, WA 98024
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,10 2023 09:11:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As an avid outdoor enthusiast, i frequently recreate in the north cascades region. My family and i snowmobile in the winter and hike in the summer. I am firmly against this experimental reintroduction of the grizzly in this region. Human-grizzly conflict will result in closures and significantly restrict the recreation we enjoy in this area. We need more recreation opportunities, not less. These are our public lands and this reckless and dangerous plan must be stopped. It will no doubt have fatal consequences for humans and subsequently the grizzly. Please keep me updated with any further updates on this topic.

Sincerely,,

Correspondence ID: 12612Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ephrata, WA 98823
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,10 2023 09:19:24

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am opposed to the introduction of Grizzly's here in Washington State.

Correspondence ID: 12613Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Corona, CA 92883
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,10 2023 09:28:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm just an American citizen. I don't live in the area being discussed here and therefore understand I won't be directly affected. But indirectly we're ALL affected by the myriad of environmental problems we've created. If projects like these aren't implemented, if we humans don't wake up and allow nature to do what she was created to do, we are all

going to suffer. In being afraid to trust nature's process, we will (and actually are already) experience her wrath. The grizzly bears were here long before us. With the intelligence we humans are gifted with, I'm confident we can find a way to coexist.

Correspondence ID: 12614Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,10 2023 09:30:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I favor the 10j option for re-establishment of brown bears in the NCE.

Living on conservation lands adjacent to WA DFW lands outside Winthrop, I adjust my human activities and awareness to live alongside cougar and bear (and the more dangerous human hunters) who appear with seasonal regularity.

Having already spent two decades guiding hikers, skiers and climbers in the extended NCE back country, I am less concerned about the potential impact of limited Grizzly re introduction program than I am far more concerned about the impacts of catastrophic wildfire and the environmental impacts of human activity.

I do want to echo and emphasize that those who have expressed concern for the health of bear food supplies might also best be managed with a (modified by a tongue in cheek) 10j management plan that encourages adjusting bipedal hunting, grazing, watershed and fire-management practices to the benefit of all species who call the NCE home.

Correspondence ID: 12617Project:112008Document:132104
Address: New York, NY 10011
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,10 2023 10:39:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: North Cascade grizzlies must have the same protection under the Endangered Species Act that all populations have. It is unacceptable for the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service to issue a special rule for "a nonessential experimental population."

The final Restoration Plan should account for the positive effects grizzly bear reintroduction will have on wildlife in the North Cascades, maximizing their beneficial role in improving the ecological diversity necessary for a thriving ecosystem. The National Park Service should craft the final Restoration Plan to account for the role humans play in minimizing human-grizzly bear interactions. While people are encouraged to enjoy recreational activities in and around the vast, sparsely populated North Cascades, the final Restoration Plan should prohibit hunting and encourage people to use non-lethal means to respond to and to deescalate any human-bear interactions.

The National Park Service should prioritize protections for grizzly bears over livestock grazing. Provisions to accommodate "management" of grizzly bears for the benefit of the livestock industry are not necessary.

Non-lethal methods must be employed to handle any conflicts between grizzly bears and property or livestock. Please select the path forward that promotes the positive impacts and effects of grizzly bear reintroduction without short-sighted, lethal methods of 'management.'"

Correspondence ID: 12618Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Issaquah, WA 98029
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,10 2023 10:52:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: You are unnecessarily putting lives at risk. Human population in the area continues to increase. Deaths are inevitable if you pursue this path. Unwanted and unneeded.

Correspondence ID: 12619Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Glenview, IL 60025
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,10 2023 11:14:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have back packed in the North Cascades and appreciated how remote it feels after just a few hours of hiking.

I fully support establishing a grizzly bear recovery zone.

I would vote for action alternative B if I had a vote. Thank you so much in your efforts of rewilding in this fashion.

Correspondence ID: 12622Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,10 2023 11:33:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears should not be reintroduced into the North Cascades. If you wanted to implement something like this there should be a vote on it to who it affects the most and not dictated by people that it does not affect.

Correspondence ID: 12623Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Snohomish, WA 98296
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,10 2023 11:36:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in favor of some grizzly reintroduction by means of both relocation as well as natural ingress.

However, I am not in favor of closing large areas of hiking trails and other low-impact recreation in areas of bear sightings.

Please do not go overboard with closing areas with overuse of caution but do enforce good human-bear cohabitation practices; no food, trash, close approaches, etc. You know this stuff better than I, smile.

I can't speak too much regarding livestock and human resource use and development near wilderness areas, other than I don't feel public wilderness lands should be governed too strictly by a minority of people in and near those areas.

Thank you for letting me get a few cents in on this!

Correspondence ID: 12628Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,10 2023 12:04:01

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Don Striker and Supervisor Brad Thompson,

I am in full support of restoring a healthy grizzly bear population to the North Cascades through reintroduction.

I own property within the Mt Baker National Forest and spend a lot of time recreating in the North Cascades. I have also lived for many years in western Montana where grizzlies are a much respected and often celebrated presence in the wilderness. In the minds of many, grizzlies are what make the wild areas of Montana and Alaska "Wild".

Wilderness that has lost its grizzlies feels less wild because it is incomplete.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation - relocating up to 25 non-problem grizzly bears into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade and manage them as an experimental population.

Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities. Furthermore, the 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and sometimes respond to human-bear conflict. I agree that the 10(j) rule, if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape. It has proved very successful in Montana and, I believe, it can be equally successful here.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations, and these are things all Washingtonians - like Montanans - can cherish and take pride in.

Thank you for your dedication to keep our North Cascades wild!

Sincerely,

Correspondence ID: 12629Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sedro Woolley, WA 98284
United States of America

Outside Organization: Skagit County Cattlens Business(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,10 2023 12:19:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Take no action on the North Cascade grizzly bear reintroduction plan. Present Skagit County human population is 74.5 residents per square mile. Way to high to minimize human and bear disasters. The North Cascade ecosystem grizzly bear restoration plan boundary lines go way beyond federal designated areas and include private property, farms and towns in Skagit County. RCW 77.12.035 which in part says "grizzly bears shall not be transplanted or introduced into the state". Allowing grizzly bears into private lands would violated RCW77.12.035. The elk are a burden to farmers and landowners and adding a dangerous predator for Washington State Fish & Wildlife to manage will lead to disastrous results. As all residents in Skagit County know the Washington State Fish & Wildlife Dept.can not even manage elk allowing the elk to damage private property at will and allowing 40% of the elk to become infected with the deadly elk hoof rot disease a death sentence for elk. Fish & Wildlife admits collaring grizzly bears is non-effective because it is not possible to know exact location at any given time. Fish & Wildlife admit there is no way to keep bears collared all the time. If our area was suitable habitat the grizzlies would be here. Putting bears in Skagit County will only disrupt and destroy our county ecosystem. The only option is do nothing.

Thank you

Correspondence ID: 12630Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Marblemount, WA 98267
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,10 2023 12:34:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Comment period for Grizzly Bear EIS.

NCNP Superintendent and other involved with the EIS review.

I am against any projects to do with introducing grizzlies into the North Cascades.

Why? I have worked around them. My first job was with the Forest Service in Alaska. I was hired to do road surveys, mapping and timber cursing. But one of the other skills I listed on my job app was that I was also on a rifle team and we had gotten third place in the nationals. That skill helped me land my first job along with a degree in forestry. So I was the crew's rifleman. I know full well how it feels to have a grizzly look at you like your a Hostess Twinkie. Being looked at like that isn't forgettable(the term Hostess Twinkie was used during the Yellowstone fires to describe firefighters that may become bear food when they slept in the yellow GSA sleeping bags of that time period). Walking a trail or road with bear scat every 15 to 20 feet doesn't help that feeling. The rifle I carried was a 375 HH carbine with a short barrel. Short so that you could swing it quickly in heavy brush when you come up on a grizzly 10 feet or so in front of you. A heavy caliber so hopefully one shot could kill it. Besides the rifle I carried on the crew, everyone also carried either 357 or 44 magnum pistols, one individual carried a Model 1911 45. All heavy calibers also.

I am not opposed to any of the other apex predictors we have in our area, wolves included. But not grizzlies. Later in my career in fire management I went back to Alaska on an Fire Incident Management Team. Part of the firefighting up there involved ordering shooters to keep the crews safe day and night.

I also worked with an individual who had half his face ripped up by a grizzly. Not a pretty sight. I can only imagine the PTSD that poor guy has. I also have friends who live in Montana who live in grizzly country. Their backyard and garden space has a fence that would rival and penitentiary. Just to keep out the grizzlies. So no. I don't want to live on the outskirts of Federal land, living under these conditions. I don't need my home invaded by this apex predator. The black bears are quite enough. Damages done by Grizzlies can be pretty extensive also. A lot more so then that done by black bears. A series of cabins along a nearby river at the district I worked at in Alaska were pretty much destroyed by a grizzly that had an abscised tooth.

This area may have been used by grizzly at one time, but culturally times have change. We now have communities and towns in those areas, my home included. Where do you think the bears are going to go if they run short of forage in the high country. It'll be in the areas that people live now. People's farmlands, gardens, compost bins, river and streams where the salmon run. If people get invaded and threatened you know full well the guns are coming out whether their are restrictions on killing grizzlies or not. It already happens with the regular black bears.

Frankly I am tired of the National Park along with some of the other federal agencies trying to push approval to introduce more into our local area. Year after year it keeps coming up. At least since about 1988 when I first started to get some exposer to it. Pushed by those who have some romantic notion that it would be cool, politically appropriate, or historical. It stops being cool as soon as you become impacted by this apex predator.


Marblemount Resident

Correspondence ID: 12631Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kent, WA 98042
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,10 2023 12:40:21

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in favor of option A (no action), thus allowing the grizzly bear population to naturally, and gradually, reestablish itself in the North Cascades of Washington State. I believe the active reintroduction of grizzlies into a region bordered by such a large human population, many of whom regularly recreate in the NCE, would greatly increase the risk of potentially fatal (for human and/or grizzly) encounters, whereas a natural repopulation would allow more time for humans and bears to adapt to each other's presence.

Correspondence ID: 12632Project:112008Document:132104

Address: LEAVENWORTH, WA 98826
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,10 2023 13:04:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the grizzly reintroduction plan.

I believe the farmers and rancher's concerns are adequately compensated by the state. There is always some loss in farming and ranching from various factors.

My main concern is although the north Cascades has a lot of rugged wilderness, in the summer even the most rugged and remote areas gets hikers and climbers. Washington state has a large population of outdoor enthusiasts, more so than Montana, Idaho, or Wyoming. There will be hiker and grizzly encounters.

Your lessening the number of reintroductions and the radio collaring seems prudent, and allows more time for assessment of impacts.

I'm an outdoor person myself, and ok with sharing the land with mountain lions, wolves and grizzly bears.

Correspondence ID: 12634Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Tonasket, WA 98855
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,10 2023 13:12:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: November 10, 23

Dear Superintendents,

I support working toward a sustainable population of grizzly bears in the North Cascades Ecosystem. As a long time resident of the Okanogan, I have spent portions of many summers hiking in the Pasayten Wilderness, the North Cascades National Park, and other areas of the North Cascades. Admittedly, there is a sense of security knowing that I'm not apt to run into a grizzly in these meanderings. Yet, I am 100% in favor of bringing the bears back. These large, roaming omnivores are an integral part of our American ecosystems and heritage. In any tinkering, we would be wise to listen to Aldo Leopold's legacy of words and "keep every cog and wheel". In this case, our tinkering means bringing back a moth eating, berry picking, deer culling animal to roam what rugged country we have in northern Washington.

I am in favor of ALTERNATIVE C- RESTORATION WITH ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT SECTION 10(j) DESIGNATION, as outlined in the Draft EIS from September. 2023. I am no bear biologist, but it seems that this strategy will lead to a positive outcome for the bear population, and is socially responsive as well. And, with luck, the Alternative may give me a chance to see a grizzly in the North Cascades, preferably from the next ridge over and through binoculars.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 12635Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Pittsburgh, PA 15289
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,10 2023 13:20:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I wholeheartedly approve this plan! I think it's a great way to restore the ecosystems of the American West.

Correspondence ID: 12636Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Duvall, WA 98019
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,10 2023 13:20:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Add my support for reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades. I believe this is a beneficial plan to help restore these animals to their natural habitat. I lived in Montana for quite some time where "the griz" enjoyed the Bob Marshall Wilderness next to my property. I did not feel any danger towards them. It would be vital for their well being to have more preserved land to roam.

Correspondence ID: 12637Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Manson, WA 98831
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,10 2023 13:20:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I live an hour away from proposed site..I do want grizzlies to be a part of our world. Please continue to save space for these animals.

Correspondence ID: 12638Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,10 2023 13:24:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support Grizzly reintroduction. Personally I'm more likely to be trampled over by a moose then getting eaten by a bear.

Correspondence ID: 12639Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Sheridan, WY 82801
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,10 2023 13:33:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am glad that the process has gotten to this point, and I hope that it has the support to truly bring this apex species back in a meaningful way to the North Cascades Ecosystem. What we have seen with the reintroduction of wolves in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem is evidence that the positive impacts are far reaching in the natural world.

It is clear that the experts have weighed in and the evidence is substantial for the need and positive impact to come from bear restoration to sustainable numbers in the Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 12640Project:112008Document:132104
Address: FREELAND, WA 98249
United States of America
Outside Organization: RETIRED NPS Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,10 2023 13:49:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is a fine detailed and constructive document addressing a big ecosystem gap. It is a noble effort. Having spent some time in grizzly country in Alaska, I appreciate the changes this implementation will bring. It is very humbling to realize one is not the apex predator in a wild environment. I like the NEP initiation. A shakedown cruise.

My thoughts, in no particular order:

The helicopter use is underestimated. Is there really such a thing as a 4 minute helicopter flight? There will be more and more flights, adding to the approximately 225 hours of flights annually. My impression is that grizzlies do not like helicopter noise and sudden appearance over a ridge any more than a wilderness backpacker does. Anything that alters a bear's foraging, feeding, resting, and hunting behavior, even briefly, seems like a bad thing.

And the NAVY jets! Little attention is paid to the horrendous noise and disturbance of these roaring monsters rumbling across ridges and valleys as they wish. The Growler is capable of speeds in excess of 1,000 mph. I have experienced these invasive machines flying low over Cascade Pass, and it is offensive to the max. Good luck trying to talk the NAVY into controlling their flight paths in this "Untrammeled Wilderness".

The low success rate of capture and translocation events referred to on p.66 are not encouraging. In my experience, if things can go bad, they often do. 77 fails out of 110 is not a good ratio. Just animal abuse and frustration, and very bad optics in the watching world.

Page 67. More bears, more take? Hmm. As for the 10(j) designation management authority ultimately improving the social tolerance of bears, this seems somewhat fanciful. If there are injury-related conflicts in the 10-year NEP, the social tolerance for bears will drop like a rock.

P.79. Ongoing and planned administrative Trends and Actions read like a dagger in the heart of wild creatures like grizzlies. Hydro project work. Habitat loss from logging and development. Vehicles of all types, everywhere. Ski Area expansion. Road relocation and construction. Trail maintenance. Firefighting. Cattle and sheep grazing. CERCLA mine cleanup. And, of course, the NAVY keeps flying wherever they want, whenever they want. Grizzlies are known to be adaptable. This will certainly test that belief.

P.87 Helicopters again. I see no mention of "Guide to Effects Analysis of Helicopter Use in Grizzly Bear Habitat" (Montana/Northern Idaho Level 1 Terrestrial Biologists Team FINAL-Version September 17, 2009). This is a useful document in the consideration of effects on grizzlies, and would be worth including in the analysis of this project. At Lituya Bay in the 1970's, there was research being conducted along the coast, using helicopters. A sow and two cubs attempted to swim across the entrance of the Bay, resulting in the drowning death of the two cubs. I found the dead cubs. It was my belief that the bears attempted to swim across the Bay entrance to escape the din of the helicopter. Thus my bias toward aircraft noise in grizzly country.

P.88. What elevation are the grassy meadow release sites? And will Karelian bear dogs be in attendance at release sites, for the protection of the release staff?

P.96. Any short-term adverse effects of blasting, on trail projects?

P.100. The NAVY, again. The quest for personal solitude is shelved when the jets are flying.

p108. Closures for public safety? Why? Wilderness is about taking your chances. Being humbled and awed by nature. The Fear will set you Free.

P.138. Why is the Farm Date from 2015 and 2017? Anything more recent? Things change in 6 years in farming....

I wish there had been more regional public meetings, say, in Seattle at REI, or in Bellingham, or Everett. There are a lot of NCE users in these areas, as opposed to Newhalem, where you might get 25 people to show up. It looks like you are trying to avoid the public.

Thanks for opportunity to toss in my thoughts. See you on the trail!

Correspondence ID: 12641Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98501
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,10 2023 14:24:31

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I would love to see grizzlies in Washington, my state. I use to live in Alaska and had the great pleasure to see grizzlies frequently in Denali N. P. These visions of sows with cubs and a huge male running along a river are amongst my life's most treasured memories. Moreover, our North Cascades will benefit from having grizzlies restored to their natural habitat, as Yellowstone has. It is understandable for people to have fear about grizzlies, but those fears are misplaced. People should fear the overpopulation of deer, as their population results in more human death, mostly by car accidents, than any other animal in our state. Bears could help with this overpopulation.

I strongly support action alternative C, but I have issues with some of the 10(j) rule that I will comment on in the appropriate place.

Thank you,

Correspondence ID: 12642Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Des Moines, WA 98198
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,10 2023 14:29:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do a lot of remote hiking & climbing in Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest and occasionally points north. 75% of the time I am traveling off trail on infrequently used "climbers" trails. Myself and others that engage in this type of activity are the most likely type to encounter a Grizzly bear so this is rather concerning for me. While I'd like to see more wildlife (this region is almost completely devoid of any except for Mountain Goats and Owls), I'm not sure Grizzly bears are the answer. While I feel safe being around black bears carrying only bear spray, with this large of a predator I would have to start carrying a firearm. I'm against doing so for various reasons (Mainly having to give money to the gun industry & carrying 3 lbs of additional weight all the time). I get that deadly encounters are rare, however you won't have much of an excuse when this does eventually happen. "We never saw this coming" wouldn't work so the best you could say is "We hoped this wouldn't happen." How about bringing in some less deadly animals instead? If people want to see Grizzly's they can go to Alaska. Its not that far away. Thank you for soliciting and reading public comments on this issue.

Correspondence ID: 12643Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Palm Coast, FL 32137
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,10 2023 14:38:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness. Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next

to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Correspondence ID: 12644Project:112008Document:132104

Address: MANSON, WA 98831
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,10 2023 14:40:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Striker,

As a property owner in Stehekin and recreationist in the North Cascades, I am opposed to the introduction of grizzlies in the North Cascades Complex. I don't believe this was a historical range or that there was ever a population in the Stehekin/Glacier Peak/ Methow areas. My family came to the Stehekin valley in the 1890's as prospectors and there has never been any history of grizzlies in the area. There was no one before that time to eliminate a viable population.

I have backpacked over most of the trails in the area over the past 60 years. I will definitely have misgivings about family or friends encountering a grizzly on a trail. This introduction would certainly have negative impact on the Stehekin residents and visitors. The chance of an encounter with a grizzly is not going to increase visitation. This is not Yellowstone where you can sit in your car and observe the wildlife. We are out on the trails, in the backcountry, recreating.

I feel the National Park Service and US Fish and Wildlife keep pushing for this despite the number of times we have said we don't want it. If it is such great habitat for grizzlies, let it happen with natural recovery.

Thank you for your time and consideration of this comment.

Sincerely,

Correspondence ID: 12646Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: Resident Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,10 2023 14:48:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft environmental impact statement (EIS) for grizzly bear restoration to the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE). I applaud the development of alternatives in the draft EIS and the careful use of the best available science to identify how best to recover bears.

I strongly support reintroducing grizzly bears to the NCE. It seems clear that without moving bears, chances for achieving a viable population of bears in the recovery area are extremely low. Moving expeditiously to restore a top predator to prime habitat in the NCE is important in achieving the goals of the Endangered Species Act (ESA), which include conserving "the ecosystems upon which endangered species and threatened species depend," as well as conserving individual species.

I have reviewed the draft EIS and generally support Alternative C, which proposes to move 3-7 bears a year for 5 to 10 years to achieve an initial population of 25 individuals. Use of the 10(j) will provide management flexibility to address any issues or conflicts with bears. I do have some concerns using that rule if First Nations in British Columbia reintroduces bears in the portion of the NCE north of the border and how those bears might be responded to if they move across the border.

Again, thank you for pursuing recovery of grizzly bears in the NCE and for the opportunity to comment on the alternatives.

Correspondence ID: 12648Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Monroe, WA 98272
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,10 2023 14:49:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: They have been part of the ecosystem for 20,000 years and we don't have a complete eco system in the north cascades without them.

That it has been carefully researched and it will have minimal impact on people.

That grizzlies help to balance an eco system through spreading seeds in poop, fertilize soil, and keep other prey species in check.

Correspondence ID: 12651Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98106
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,10 2023 15:26:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Wonderful plan. Bring back the Grizzly!

Correspondence ID: 12652Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Arlington, WA 98223
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,10 2023 15:28:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: These bears were once here, but please remember that's when people population was low. Because of all the people growth, and with more to come, I really think it would not be safe to have these bears free ranging in polulated areas. They bears have been gone for such a long time, and the eco system is working fine. Please think about the people's safety first.

Correspondence ID: 12653Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Santa Barbara, CA 93101
United States of America
Outside Organization: University of California University/Professional Society
Received: Nov,10 2023 15:39:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am an environmental historian, wildlife ecologist, professor, and founder and facilitator of the California Grizzly Research Network.

Since we will likely be going through a similar process for grizzly bears here in California in the not-too-distant future, and because I have longstanding connections to the North Cascades, having worked there as a NPS ranger as a young man decades ago, I read this EIS (as I did the previous NCE EIS) with great interest. The thing that strikes me about this document is how long it took to accomplish so little. Few of insights contained in it were unknown two decades ago. We've gotten to a point where studying these issues indefinitely is an end unto itself, with little benefit- -and this comes from someone who is dedicating his life to studying these issues!

So what on earth are we waiting for? There is nothing more we need to know. It's time to act. I support recovering bears in the North Cascades. I also support helping in nearby communities adapt by fostering a culture of coexistence that will enable them to live with their old neighbors once again.

I strongly support alternative B, and I call for implementing it yesterday.

Correspondence ID: 12654Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98274
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,10 2023 15:41:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please don't release Grizzly bears in the north cascades

Correspondence ID: 12655Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Vancouver, WA 98683
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,10 2023 15:43:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Restoring a keystone species and predator to this area is a great idea. Help restore the more natural ecosystem!

Correspondence ID: 12656Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Woodinville, WA 98077
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,10 2023 15:48:19
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of Grizzlies to the North Cascades. I believe there will be minimal conflicts with humans and benefits to the ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 12657Project:112008Document:132104
Address: batavia, IL 60510
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,10 2023 15:52:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: North Cascade grizzlies must have the same protection under the Endangered Species Act that all populations have. It is unacceptable for the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service to issue a special rule for "a nonessential experimental population." The final Restoration Plan should account for the positive effects grizzly bear reintroduction will have on wildlife in the North Cascades, maximizing their beneficial role in improving the ecological diversity necessary for a thriving ecosystem.

The National Park Service should craft the final Restoration Plan to account for the role humans play in minimizing human-grizzly bear interactions. While people are encouraged to enjoy recreational activities in and around the vast, sparsely populated North Cascades, the final Restoration Plan should prohibit hunting and encourage people to use non-lethal means to respond to and to deescalate any human-bear interactions.

The National Park Service should prioritize protections for grizzly bears over livestock grazing. Provisions to accommodate "management" of grizzly bears for the benefit of the livestock industry are not necessary.

Thank you.

"The human appetite for animal flesh is a driving force behind virtually every major category of environmental damage

now threatening the human future - deforestation, erosion, fresh water scarcity, air and water pollution, climate change, biodiversity loss, social injustice, the destabilization of communities and the spread of disease." - The World Watch Institute

Correspondence ID: 12658Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Benton City, WA 99320
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,10 2023 15:53:40

Correspondence Type:Web Form

Correspondence: No grizzlies in Washington state

Correspondence ID: 12659Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kent, WA 98031
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,10 2023 16:02:08

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I favor Alternative A, the no-action alternative. The need for grizzly bear recovery in the NEP was not established. We do not need more grizzlies in Washington State. Grizzlies will survive in Wyoming, Montana, Idaho and even northeast Washington without introducing them to the NEP. There is plenty of biodiversity in the NEP without grizzlies. If you want to make wilderness areas more "natural" then you need to reintroduce indigenous hunting in the wilderness areas and national parks along with the grizzlies. But this was not included in your action alternatives.

Introducing grizzlies in the NEP makes no common sense. The NEP is not in rural Montana or Wyoming. Millions of people live just to the west of the NEP. There is too much potential interaction between people and grizzlies once the bears reach a population of 200 or even 280 per your most recent estimate. Even if people follow all the grizzly precautions, people will still die. In Banff National Park this year two people who took all the bear precautions and used bear spray, were killed by a grizzly. Grizzly enthusiasts can travel to Montana or Wyoming to see the bears.

I think natural recovery was too quickly dismissed. With Canada about to reintroduce grizzlies to their part of the NEP, that will gradually cause recovery in the U.S. There was no proof provided showing that grizzlies won't cross the border and stay in the U.S.

Puget Sound suburbs are experiencing more and more problems with black bears. The EIS states that black bear and grizzly bear ranges overlap, but there was no definite analysis showing that grizzlies won't eventually displace black bears more into the suburbs once the grizzly bears reach the 200 to 280 level.

Correspondence ID: 12660Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Encinitas, CA 92024
United States of America

Outside Organization: Whitman College University/Professional Society

Received: Nov,10 2023 16:08:15

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I believe that the benefits associated with restoring grizzly bears to North Cascades National Park present a great opportunity to introduce a keystone species into a formerly native land, while also improving relationships between tribes and the federal government.

Correspondence ID: 12661Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Naperville, IL 60564
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,10 2023 16:14:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the efforts to bring grizzly bears back to the North Cascades. Wolf reintroduction in areas has proven successful to restoring natural habitats and balance. So, it is time to expand the process.

Correspondence ID: 12662Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98105
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,10 2023 16:23:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: This idea will result in loss of life. There are other apex predators in the area. Less aggressive bears should be left with no threat to their well being. This species is too aggressive.

Correspondence ID: 12663Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,10 2023 16:29:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Yes, I think grizzlies should be reintroduced in to the North Cascades. The dangers are overblown and based on irrational fears because every grizzly attack is sensationalized. 99.9% of people who recreate in grizzly areas don't have any encounters. People will learn to coexist as we see in other areas of the West.

Correspondence ID: 12665Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Kennewick, WA 99336
United States of America
Outside Organization: Gentle Treasure Alpacas Business
Received: Nov,10 2023 16:44:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The North Cascades are a pristine portion of our beautiful state and heavily used by folks for week end, vacation and other personal use. In addition, many farm's and ranches who raise animals of many kinds will not agree with the premise that grizzly bears are necessary or acceptable in any way. The proposal is ridiculous so we must join the masses who are against the whole idea. Thank you.
Sincerely,


Correspondence ID: 12667Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Lacey, WA 98503
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,10 2023 16:51:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I prefer no reintroduction of grizzly bears to Washington State however I realize that they will cross over the border from Canada. Therefore I prefer alternative C.

Correspondence ID: 12668Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Ellensburg, WA 98926
United States of America
Outside Organization: Washington Cattlemen's Association Non-Governmental(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,10 2023 16:53:01

Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: November 10, 2023

While the WCA strives to be collaborative, we have grave concerns with the grizzly bear introduction. Bears have the potential to be destructive in ways we aren't prepared to handle, and they pose a risk- -not just to our livestock- -but to human life as well. WCA has raised these concerns with the federal government repeatedly and we urge Washington, D.C. to listen to the needs of Washington state.

Sincerely,

██████████

██████████████████

President
Washington Cattlemen's Association

Correspondence ID: 12669Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Marysville, WA 98270
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,10 2023 16:56:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: After reading the North Cascades Ecosystem Restoration draft, I believe the best course of action would be to do alternative C. Not only do we need to take action to help the ecosystem (which is why I don't like A as an option), option C gives almost a "test-run" to see how we should protect grizzlies & what species are needed to help restore their numbers. Something has to be done, I don't believe it is right to just wait around and hope it they come back!

Correspondence ID: 12670Project:112008Document:132104

Address: ANACORTES, WA 98221
United States of America

Outside Organization: Concerned Citizen Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,10 2023 16:56:48

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I see absolutely no valid reason to re-introduce grizzly bears into the Cascades in Skagit County, WA or anyplace in the proximate area of Skagit county.

This plan to re-introduce them is not only a danger to human life and livestock and crops but is also a costly, needless expense. The grizzly bears are currently doing fine proliferating in other less populated areas of the northwest and Canada.. Leave well enough alone and let nature do the populating at the present time.

Correspondence ID: 12671Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Port Angeles, WA 98363
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,10 2023 17:12:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Yes, they should be reintroduced. They were here long before we were. Our ancestors eradicated them and upset the nature balance of the eco system. We owe it to every creature we have systematically eradicated. Those against re introduction will claim the safety and life of hikers and backpackers is more important. This is a ridiculous

argument: should we ban motor vehicles? There are far more vehicle related injuries and fatalities than injury or death at the laws of a bear.

Correspondence ID: 12672Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Kennewick, WA 99337
United States of America
Outside Organization: Richland Rod and Gun Club Recreational Groups(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,10 2023 17:12:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative. Leave the bears alone and let them repopulate Washington on their own if and when they desire. There are currently more than 2,000 grizzly bears in British Columbia and Alberta and there are minimal barriers to natural relocation to Washington, Idaho, and Montana if the bears decide to expand their territory. There is no need for federal action to reintroduce grizzly bears to Washington. Sportsmen, ranchers, and people living and recreating within proximity of the North Cascades National Park rallied strongly in 2017 against what is referred to as Alternative B in the revised EIS. NPS and USFWS have developed Alternative C for this version of the EIS to hopefully soften the repulsion people felt for the original heavy-handed version offered as Alternative B to this draft plan. The document clearly identifies Alternative C as "nonessential" and "experimental" under ESA section 10(j). Federal reintroduction of grizzly bears to Washington is a violation of state law, a waste of taxpayer money, an increased risk to citizens' safety, property, and animals, and should not be considered or allowed. USFWS and NPS constantly complain about a lack of funding to adequately maintain and operate national wildlife refuges and national parks so why are they wasting millions of dollars on this attempt to forcefully reintroduce a species to an area where it is not needed or wanted? Further, Alternative C attempts to open the door to grizzly bear reintroductions throughout the state by creating three management zones that include the Blue Mountains, southern Cascade Mountains, southwest Washington and nearly the entire state except the Selkirk Ecosystem where there are already grizzly bears. This is totally unacceptable unless the burden of dealing with the cost of any deaths, injuries, or damages caused by grizzly bears will forever be the responsibility of the NPS and USFWS (i.e. the federal government). Do not expect this burden to be borne by the WDFW and citizens of Washington. Alternative A is the only acceptable alternative.

Correspondence ID: 12674Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98273
United States of America
Outside Organization: Skagit Audubon Society Unaffiliated Individual(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,10 2023 17:16:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Superintendent Don Striker
North Cascades National Park Service Complex
810 State Route 20
Sedro-Woolley, WA 9828

Re: North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Environmental Impact Statement

Submitted via National Park Service (PEPC) Planning, Environment & Public Comment website

Dear Superintendent Striker:

We are writing on behalf of Skagit Audubon Society to provide comments on the North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Environmental Impact Statement (Plan/EIS). We are commenting separately to the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service on the proposed establishment of a nonessential experimental population of grizzly bears in the North Cascades Ecosystem and approval of a 10j rule.

Skagit Audubon, the Skagit County-centered chapter of National Audubon, has 481 members living in or near Skagit County, Washington. We share the Audubon mission to conserve and restore natural ecosystems, focusing on birds, other wildlife, and their habitats for the benefit of humanity and the earth's biological diversity.

Consistent with the Audubon mission, we support the decision to restore grizzlies to the North Cascades that was made 32 years ago when the Interagency Grizzly Bear Committee designated the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE) a grizzly bear recovery area. The 1975 listing of the species under the Endangered Species Act established a legal requirement that this species be restored. The large, mostly publicly owned and protected area of the North Cascades Ecosystem is an appropriate place to do that. In calling for national parks and congressionally designated wilderness areas to be maintained in their natural condition, the National Park Service Organic Act of 1916 and the Wilderness Act of 1964 also obligate the land-managing agencies to restore the grizzly bear. We want this keystone species to once again fill the ecological role it had for thousands of years.

We agree with the Purpose and Need and the objectives stated in the Plan/EIS and find the plan to be thorough and well-considered. We offer the following further comments.

1. We support Alternative C with the accompanying 10j designation and rule.

Alternative C with the designation of a nonessential experimental population and a 10j rule should alleviate the concerns expressed by some members of the public. Skagit Audubon's support for Alternative C is bolstered in part by the experience a number of our members have from years of living, working, and recreating in Yellowstone and Glacier National Parks and various parts of Alaska. We support the statement, "(The preferred alternative is the alternative that) would best accomplish the purpose and need of the proposed action while fulfilling the statutory mission and responsibilities of the agencies, giving consideration to economic, environmental, technical, and other factors."

2. Possible effects of helicopter use on Marbled Murrelets and Northern Spotted Owls have been addressed.

We appreciate that the possible adverse effects of helicopter use on Marbled Murrelets and Northern Spotted Owls mentioned in our scoping comments of December 11, 2022, have substantially been addressed. Effects on Marbled Murrelets can be avoided by not using any staging or release areas closer than 55 miles to marine waters. Please make it clear in the Plan/EIS that the potential effects from helicopters should be a consideration both when landing at and departing from both staging areas and release sites.

We appreciate the statement that, "Impacts on ground-nesting birds would be minimized through pre-release site assessments, and areas with active nesting would be avoided." Such assessments should also be done at staging and release areas close in time to the planned helicopter activity for Northern Spotted Owls and, if within 55 miles of the coast, Marbled Murrelets.

3. Please minimize use of helicopters to transport people monitoring grizzly bears.

Within the limits of safety, please minimize use of helicopters over Wilderness to transport staff doing post-release monitoring, retrieving collars, and examining grizzly mortalities. These matters are addressed in the wilderness impacts analysis, but please strengthen the wording about doing by foot what can be done without aircraft.

4. Why is the Glacier Peak Wilderness (GPW) omitted from the Wilderness impacts analysis?

The analysis of the proposed action's effects on wilderness in Plan Appendix E addresses the Stephen Mather Wilderness and the Pasayten Wilderness but not the Glacier Peak Wilderness (GPW). The map in the Plan/EIS showing the release areas depicts the southern release area as including part of the GPW. Is there a reason for the GPW being shown on the map as part of a release area but being omitted from the Wilderness impacts analysis?

We appreciate the opportunity to comment. Thank you to all the staff involved in preparing this thorough plan and E.I.S. Please address any questions about our comments to Skagit Audubon Society, P.O. Box 1101, Mount Vernon, WA 98274 or conservation@skagitaudubon.org.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Skagit Audubon Society Skagit Audubon Society

Correspondence ID: 12675Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Orondo, WA 98843
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,10 2023 17:18:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am opposed to the grizzly restoration in areas not extremely far from my home. To say grizzlies will be "managed" is hard to understand. This is a wild animal, unpredictable, an apex predator - not something you can reason or negotiate with when confronted. There WILL be fatalities - either bear, human, livestock, or other innocent animals. Can your agencies guarantee safety for all? I am concerned for the Washington State park/natural resources employees that will have to contend with the results of your decision. Does our state even have the amount of staff hired and trained that it will need?

The Chelan and Wenatchee Valley areas are full of orchards, vineyards, wineries, agri-tourism businesses, and land owners with livestock. Can you guarantee that eventually a grizzly won't see these areas as food sources?

I have also read that if these bears are in designated protected wilderness areas, it is PROHIBITED to use helicopters and any other motorized vehicles to "manage" them. Also, the bears may be taken from Montana where they are afforded more protection, and placed in our area where the 10j rule allows for potential killing I think there are too many variables to consider to effectively reintroduce a grizzly population here.

This area has seen an increase in the cougar population - even in residential neighborhoods. We do not need another predator here.

Please do not proceed with this plan. Let grizzlies make their way into the North Cascades on their own if that's what nature intends.

Correspondence ID: 12676Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Coulee Dam, WA 99116
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,10 2023 17:26:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No to Grizzly Bears introductions anywhere in Washington. They are apex predators and will kill anything from rodents to humans to eat or fun. The speed is amazing and how quiet and stealthy they are. Their scat can fill a large coffee can in 1 dump. Again no to Grizzly bears in Washington. Having been out on the tundra and woods of Alaska we should not risk the lives and well being of our state. How will you manage and control these Bears. Probably have no idea or concept of the destruction to people cattle, all kinds of wildlife. farms this can cause

Correspondence ID: 12678Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mazama, WA 98833
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,10 2023 17:43:21

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly support the reintroduction of Grizzly bears into the North Cascades. Grizzlies are a keystone species and absolutely should be restored as an integral part of a healthy and natural North Cascades ecosystem. Public fears and the opposition based on them regarding supposed risks of human-bear conflict are unfounded and I hope that the project can also serve to spread legitimate, science based knowledge about the important role Grizzlies play in our environment.

Correspondence ID: 12681Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98145
United States of America

Outside Organization: North Cascades Conservation Council Conservation/Preservation(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,10 2023 17:46:37

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear National Park Service and Fish and Wildlife Service:

North Cascades Conservation Council offers these comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem. Our enthusiastic support for the return of grizzly bears to the Ecosystem is tempered by our concerns over the process proposed to reintroduce bears, and the management of bears post-placement.

The first principle for successful reintroduction of grizzlies is to do no harm to existing bear populations or to wilderness, and to safeguard reintroduced bears. The reintroduction plans contemplated in the DEIS Alternative C appears poised to violate this principle. We cannot support any reintroduction plan that involves intensive use of helicopters in wilderness, and the haphazard killing of reintroduced bears under vague pretenses. The way to get grizzlies flourishing in the North Cascades is to protect wilderness, not desecrate it while killing bears. Therefore, we support implementation of Alternative B.

Reintroduction Targets

We are generally supportive of the target of a local population of 200 bears over the long-term. We generally agree with the process of introducing a small group of bears each year over a period of five to ten years. However, we feel that an initial population of 25 bears may be insufficient to obtain the 200 bear objective when considering the limited breeding stock, limited potential for interbreeding with outlying grizzly populations, and the proposal for lethal means of managing bears. We would favor a firm commitment to reintroduce a minimum of five bears per year over an eight-to-ten-year window.

Reintroduction Process

The EIS should include a review of all previous grizzly reintroductions anywhere in North America to determine the level of, and reasons for mortality that occurred both during the transport of bears, and due to the unsuccessful adaptation of bears within the first 3-6 months post-reintroduction. Every effort should be made to avoid repeating past mistakes, and to reduce, if possible, the shock to bears of being drugged, transported, and placed in an unfamiliar location. The EIS should identify whether and to what degree causes of mortality can be avoided, and whether on balance any given reintroduction plan's value outweighs the deaths of bears it will cause.

Sources from which to Glean Grizzlies

While we recognize that travel distance is a factor in ensuring the safe relocation of grizzlies into the North Cascades, we believe bears should only be gleaned from places where the existing population is stable and flourishing, and would be expected to remain intact even after removal of some bears. We are not presently comfortable with removing bears from anywhere in the lower 48 United States.

Furthermore, bears should not be gleaned from populations whose primary food source differs from the available food sources in the North Cascades. For example, it would seem unwise to reintroduce bears that have adapted to coastal food sources.

Public Education Program

A grizzly recovery effort should be accompanied by a more intensive public education campaign than is proposed. It should of course involve both federal and state government, focusing on communities and popular recreation sites surrounding, and within Zones 1 and 2 to minimize potentially dangerous encounters between grizzlies and humans.

An intensive information campaign would involve how to identify grizzly bears; how to avoid areas where grizzlies are likely to be present at specific times of the year; what to do if encountering a grizzly; how to bear-proof campsites and residences; a requirement to carry bear spray in the backcountry; what brands and/or intensities of bear spray to carry and how to use it; the value of noisemaking devices to scare off bears.

The State of Washington should educate hunters (bear hunters or pursuers of other game animals) on how to distinguish a grizzly from a black bear. Killing a grizzly bear for any reason other than justifiable self-defense should be met with legal consequences under the Endangered Species Act to be enforced by the respective federal and state agencies.

10(j) Designation Under the Endangered Species Act

We are including our position on the designation of the North Cascades grizzlies as an experimental population under Section 10(j) of the ESA in these comments, as this issue is directly related to the overall goal of establishing grizzlies in the North Cascades. This is not a separate issue. It isn't clear why two separate sets of comments are required when the 10(j) rule is proposed in one of the action alternatives (C) and not in the other (Alternative B).

If the objective of establishing a breeding population of grizzlies in the North Cascades, and in suitable habitat outside the Ecosystem (outside of Zone 1) is to be realized, half-measures will not suffice. Assessment of whether the existence of grizzlies is compatible with present land uses and activities has already been made with the decision to pursue reintroduction.

Such determination should consider the fact that grizzlies were extirpated from their traditional range in the Ecosystem due to perceived land use conflicts. Humans killed all grizzly bears in the North Cascades rather than adapting land uses to the ecological necessity of top-tier predators across the landscape. This reverse-logic process should not be repeated.

In consideration of the three management zones, management direction for Zone 2 should not differ from Zone 1. In Zone 3, killing of bears should be limited to cases where a person is in imminent danger of being harmed or killed by a grizzly. It should be an accepted principle that grizzly bears will self-restrict to preferred habitat in wild places where conflicts with humans other than recreation users would be unlikely.

We oppose 10(j) designation for North Cascades grizzlies and instead encourage the implementation of public education measures that reduce human/bear conflicts and preclude the perceived need for lethal means of managing bears, as described further in these comments. Alternative B satisfies most of these concerns. The purpose of reintroduction of grizzlies is to amend the mistakes of the past, so why compromise that principle? The alleged need for a 10(j) designation has been described as a "...larger tool box." When the main tool in the box is a high-powered rifle, the designation is contrary to the purposes of the project.

Human Use Issues

Management of bears that may pose threats to livestock should be more detailed. There should be a distinction between grizzlies threatening livestock on public land open range versus contained livestock on private land. Lethal force should never be used to protect open range livestock: federal land should be considered bear territory. The standard for addressing bear interactions with livestock on private land should stipulate that bears may only be disturbed if they directly threaten livestock (attacking animals) rather than merely their presence in areas where livestock are present.

The first option to address bears that directly threaten contained livestock should be relocation, not killing. The option of supplying ranchers in the wildland urban interface with rifles that discharge tranquilizer darts whereby bears would be disabled to await relocation by federal officials, is preferable to deadly force at the discretion of the livestock operator. In the relocation effort, every bear should be considered an integral part of ecosystem restoration rather than an expendable resource.

We are also concerned that logging operations are listed under direct threats to human uses. We fail to see the need to have any distinction between bears interacting with recreationists in backcountry than with personnel on logging operations. This directive implies that logging companies may arbitrarily kill bears that are in the general vicinity of a logging operation.

Helicopters in Designated Wilderness

We implore the Park Service & FWS to explore and analyze all options to the use of helicopters in designated wilderness, and in roadless areas. Based on available information and common sense, we believe the use of helicopters in designated wilderness for reintroduction of grizzlies is not a necessity but an unnecessary convenience in violation of the

Wilderness Act. No exceptions to the Wilderness Act should be pursued. There are several locations where bears could be successfully placed with wide geographic coverage using ground-based vehicles on existing, open roads, and/or using helicopters without landing in designated wilderness.

Exceptions to the Wilderness Act should be limited to emergency situations where human life is at stake, not the contradictory objective of facilitating the reintroduction of native species that depend on wilderness for survival.

We have identified several locations outside areas of human presence where reintroduction can occur on existing roads with no helicopter use: Slate Peak near Hart's Pass; roads end on the upper Twisp River Road; the end of Eightmile Creek Road south of the Pasayten Wilderness; the road along the Chiwawa River near Trinity; the end of the road at Cascade Pass, the end of Road 11 above Shannon Lake.

Helicopter reintroductions could occur outside of designated wilderness in, but not limited to, the following locations: Golden Horn in the upper Methow Watershed; Burch Mountain at the headwaters of Eightmile Creek; Foggy Pass on upper Canyon Creek; Lamont Lake at the headwaters of Cedar Creek; Easy Pass; Cub Lake at Prince Creek; Evergreen Mountain near Beckler River; Indigo Lake in the Suiattle River Watershed.

All the above locations would allow a wide distribution of grizzlies throughout Zone 1 without using helicopters in designated wilderness, or at all. However deep into backcountry bears are placed, released bears will presumably remain in backcountry, and migrate to the habitats necessary for their survival.

In addition, for management of bears post-release, access to bears in designated wilderness should be by foot or pack animals only- no continued use of helicopters for ground examination should be permitted. The EIS should state more succinctly what human intervention would be deemed necessary (not just "desirable") for bear survival after bears have been released.

Connecting Island Populations

As you know, the 10(j) rule considers a reintroduced species that is geographically isolated from other occupied habitats as experimental. This begs for a solution to creating populations that will remain isolated. Although it may seem outside the scope of the EIS analysis, we highly recommend there be disclosure in the EIS of measures that can be taken in specific areas to facilitate connectivity between grizzly bear populations in the United States and Canada in the future.

Connectivity is essential to facilitate inter-population migration to diversify the grizzly gene pool. Such analysis would include identification of areas where habitat restoration could occur on public land between the North Cascades and federal land in the Idaho panhandle and northwestern Montana, and populations in south and central British Columbia.

The EIS should disclose what measures would be needed in the respective areas for example, road closures and other means of habitat restoration. This consideration would set the stage for the overarching objective of expanding habitat to restore grizzlies to areas of historical existence outside island populations by creating seamless habitat.

This concludes our comments. It is refreshing to comment on a federal proposal that would restore the natural world. We are grateful for the time and effort the National Park Service and Fish and Wildlife Service have invested in the effort to restore native grizzlies to their former habitats.

Sincerely,



North Cascades Conservation Council

Correspondence ID: 12682Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Issaquah, WA 98029
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,10 2023 17:50:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hello,

I am an enthusiastic hiker residing in Issaquah, deeply appreciating the natural beauty of the Pacific Northwest mountains. I frequently embark on hikes with family and friends, prioritizing safety, particularly in bear-populated areas. I always carry 1 or 2 cans of bear spray to safeguard against potential encounters, which typically suffice for deterring black bears.

However, the recent reconsideration of the initiative to reintroduce grizzlies with a troubled history in the North Cascades raises significant concerns for me. Unlike black bears, grizzlies are more challenging to deter, rendering traditional bear sprays less effective. This anxiety stems from my firsthand experience hiking in Glacier National Park a few years ago, where I learned from members of the Blackfeet tribe about their fear of the aggressive grizzlies introduced in the area. They cautioned against venturing into certain zones, such as Medicine Lakes, due to safety concerns.

Adding to these apprehensions is a recent incident in Jasper Provincial Park, Canada, where an aggressive grizzly attacked and killed a couple and their dog despite their use of recommended bear spray and safety gear. This incident prompts contemplation on the effectiveness of these preventive measures in the face of such threats. It raises questions about the practicality of relying solely on bear spray, especially when encountering aggressive grizzlies, and emphasizes the need for nuanced considerations in policymaking, especially by those who may not personally experience the challenges of mountain environments.

Thank you for considering my input,

██████

Correspondence ID: 12684Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,10 2023 18:09:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The purpose and need of this plan are consistent with the mission of the National Park Service (NPS), as defined by the Organic Act of 1916, and are consistent with the mission of the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) to implement the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended.

If the agencies do not move forward this time, I fear that grizzlies will be permanently extirpated from the NCE. Therefore, we must support and encourage NPS and FWS to get this done and we must do that by generating public support for grizzly restoration that extends beyond political party preferences and extends beyond the geographical, cultural, and political boundaries in the state of Washington.

The best available scientific data indicate that the restoration of grizzly bears into the NCE is biologically feasible and would promote the conservation of the species. Numerous studies have shown that the NCE is big enough, wild enough, and contains adequate food and habitat to support a viable population of grizzly bears. Furthermore, the agencies have the expertise and experience required to implement this project. FWS has been successfully moving grizzly bears into the Cabinet Mountains in Montana for decades. They can use the same techniques to move bears into the North Cascades. Restoring grizzlies to the NCE is the right thing to do and we know how to do it, so why has this effort been delayed for 32 years and why are many people who live, work, and recreate in the NCE opposed to restoring grizzlies? The answer - FEAR.

Last week (October 30 - November 3) I attended four public meetings about grizzly bear restoration in Okanogan, Newhalem, Darrington, and Winthrop. Nearly everyone who opposed grizzly restoration did so because they were afraid of getting injured or killed by grizzlies, would lose livestock to grizzly depredation, or would suffer economic loss due to reduced tourism or other business activities.

Here is the catch - most of their fears were not based on facts. Most people did not know that interior grizzly bears get 80%

of their calories from plants and insects. Most people did not know that the risk of getting injured by a grizzly bear is very low. In our everyday lives we face greater risks than we will ever face from a grizzly bear. Ranchers claimed that grizzlies would devastate their cattle and sheep but had not read the statistics that show grizzlies pose little threat to livestock. And most people did not know that the presence of grizzly bears in Yellowstone and Glacier national parks is one of the main reasons people go there.

Chris Servheen, who led grizzly recovery efforts for FWS for 35 years, said "people are afraid of what they do not know or understand. My experience is that once people become familiar with grizzlies most of their fears go away."

So, my first recommendation for NPS and FWS is to implement a comprehensive, well-funded, outreach and education effort that aims to reduce the fear and misunderstanding that many people have about grizzlies. Some of this is currently taking place, but the effort, staffing, training, and funding must be ramped up to be effective.

My second recommendation is that NPS, FWS, and all other partners, must do everything we can to proactively reduce human-bear conflicts.

The good news is that we know how to do this. In recent years several programs have been developed to create Bear Smart Communities that address the root causes of human-bear conflicts and reduce the risk to human safety and private property.

Typically, these initiatives include local organizations, agencies, local jurisdictions, individuals, and businesses that work together to reduce and eliminate garbage and other attractants that so often lead to conflict. Unfortunately the saying, "A fed bear is a dead bear," is too often true.

We have a clean slate in the North Cascades. There are no grizzly bears here now. Before any grizzlies are brought into the North Cascades, we must have a well-organized and well-funded program in place to eliminate attractants that would get grizzly bears into trouble.

The National Park Service and the Forest Service have been putting in bear-resistant trash bins and other infrastructure to manage garbage, but more needs to be done to eliminate attractants throughout the North Cascades Grizzly Recovery area and in nearby areas managed by state agencies.

But we cannot stop there. We must proactively work with the communities around the NCE, including Carlton, Chelan, Cle Elum, Concrete, Darrington, Entiat, Gold Bar, Index, Leavenworth, Marblemount, Mazama, Methow, North Bend, Sedro-Woolley, Stehekin, Twisp, Winthrop, and others to reduce human-bear conflict.

We need to find resources to help these communities become Bear Smart. This will require a major investment in bear-resistant garbage cans, dumpsters, and a detailed plan for pickup and disposal services (including transfer stations). This will require close cooperation with waste management companies to make sure all cans and dumpsters are compatible with the garbage trucks. Scheduling pickup times is critical too, and this is complicated by the fact that there are many short-term rentals in places like Chelan, Leavenworth, and Mazama.

There are existing problems with black bears in these communities which are only going to get worse without a major effort to reduce the problem. If grizzlies are brought into the NCE the need for these communities to become Bear Smart will become a priority and critical to the success of the grizzly restoration effort. We must secure all attractants in and around the NCE from Day 1, so grizzlies never become habituated to human food and other attractants.

Funding such a comprehensive effort will be challenging, but there are already Bear Smart initiatives underway that are using a combination of funds from city resources, state resources, and from NGOs like Defenders of Wildlife. I have also heard from wealthy donors that they are willing to make major contributions to help communities become Bear Smart.

Summary of Recommendations

- NPS and FWS should implement a comprehensive, well-funded, outreach and education effort that aims to reduce the fear and misunderstanding that many people have about grizzlies.
- NPS, FWS, and all other partners, must do everything possible to proactively reduce human-bear conflicts.

- Go forward with Alternative C and get a positive Record of Decision (ROD)

Thank you,

[REDACTED]
Wenatchee, WA

Correspondence ID: 12685Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lenore, ID 83541
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,10 2023 18:32:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am a fourth generation cattle rancher and farmer in Asotin County, Washington. We have farmed & ranched in and around Anatone and Shumaker Grade since my great grandfather's time. We are having a real problem with the wolves that have been reintroduced in the state. We have lost cattle to them as have our neighbors. This is a hard enough way to make living, without bringing in more predators.

If you bring in grizzly bears this is only going to increase the problems we have. Not only will cattle, horses, deer and elk be killed, so will humans. Grizzly bears are a massive animal that can be extremely aggressive. Bringing in the bears will only make things worse. This is definitely something we don't need or want. Move your wolves to the West side of the state along with your bears if you want them so badly.

No to grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 12686Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ellensburg, WA 98926
United States of America

Outside Organization: Back Country Horsemen of Washington Non-Governmental(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,10 2023 18:36:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: BACK COUNTRY HORSEMEN OF WASHINGTON

[REDACTED]
ELLENSBURG, WA 98926
WWW.BCHW.ORG

BACK COUNTRY HORSEMEN OF AMERICA

[REDACTED]
COLUMBIA FALLS, MT 59912

Don Striker

Office of the Superintendent

North Cascades National Park

810 State Route 20

Sedro-Woolley WA 98284 November 10, 2023

Superintendent Striker,

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Environmental Impact Statement for the North Cascades Ecosystem

Back Country Horsemen of Washington (BCHW) is a 501(c)3 organization that is committed to maintaining access to public lands for all pack and saddle stock users. Our mission is to advocate for trail users and to assist the managing agencies of our

public lands in the care and maintenance of those lands. Our members are volunteers who spend countless hours working on trails in Washington State, work that benefits many people who recreate on these lands.

BCHW shares its mission and values with Back Country Horsemen of America (BCHA) as part of the national organization consisting of 32 states.

There are vast areas of the NCE that are accessed by pack and saddle stock users. The Mt Baker Snoqualmie National Forest, the Okanogan Wenatchee National Forest including the Pasayten Wilderness, and the North Cascades National Park are all used by equestrians. BCHW has many established horse camps along the boundary of the NCE.

BCHW is genuinely concerned about how our members and other users will be able to continue to enjoy the North Cascades should a population of heavily protected grizzly bears be translocated into the region where we ride, camp and where we work with the managing agencies to maintain trails.

The DEIS presents three Alternate plans for consideration with A being No Action. Plans B and C would both implement the importation of Grizzly bears into the NCE, with the difference being use of the 10(j) rule in plan C to designate the imported animals as an experimental population, allowing more management tools to use for conflict resolution. Plan B and Plan C are deficient in their analysis of the impact on recreation and lack options for how trails can be maintained open in the presence of protections implemented to reduce human-grizzly interactions. The DEIS fails to disclose the potential impacts of the proposed action and alternatives as they might affect non-motorized recreational uses, such as hiking and horseback riding. The DEIS does speak to "tourism" and to the importance of educating the public to bear behavior and conflict avoidance. It completely lacks a management plan that supports recreation either initially, or in the future as both the human population and the Grizzly population grow. The DEIS should include consideration of how the carrying capacity of the trails, trailheads, and campgrounds will be considered without resulting in long term or permanent closures. Without that there is no way to effectively review this DEIS.

Two National Scenic Trails, The Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail (PCT), and the Pacific Northwest National Scenic Trail (PNT), traverse the identified core habitat of the North Cascades Ecosystem.

The PCT in Washington hosts multitudes of hikers and equestrians each season. These users are both distance users and day or weekend users, making the PCT one of the most populated areas around any bear ecosystem. Public use in the entire NCE likely exceeds a quarter million visits. However, the DEIS indicates that the use is insignificant. Comparing this landscape to Yellowstone National Park seems ingenuous. Back Country Horsemen of Washington has hosted several multi-day trail maintenance work events along the PCT, and regularly encounter a steady stream of users hiking or riding through daily. Use of the trail is significant and will likely result in many human-bear interactions.

The PNT, while not currently fully developed has the potential of seeing the same amount of use as the PCT over time. It also runs through the NCE as well as other bear ecosystems to the east, including the Cabinet-Yaak (CYE). The CYE has a more established population of bears but still has resulted with challenges to the very existence of the trail due to the limited number of bears in the CYE (20-40). Opposition to the National Scenic Trail in the recovering bear population area as well as the connecting landscapes between ecosystems has also been expressed by USFWS staff, the same agency putting forth the NCE proposal through which the same trail will pass.

The NPS and USFWS have pointed out that the Canadian counterparts and First Nations are preparing to release grizzly bears in the northern part of the NCE. The BC government has noted that their Recovery Plan is being developed jointly with the USFWS even though this US EIS only addresses the Washington effort. If the northern Canadian part of the NCE was the only release point, it would move the core recovery/release area away from the more densely human populated areas of Washington State. It also would be in line with Washington State law as well since no bears would be translocated directly into Washington, and there also would be predictability on how many bears are being moved into the entire NCE which overlaps both countries. We cannot support either Action Alternative without knowing more on the joint planning that is occurring with Canadian counterparts.

In closing, Back Country Horsemen of Washington, with the support of Back Country Horsemen of America, sees no alternative other than the agency must select Alternate A- No Action at this time. The current DEIS lacks any analysis of

action alternatives and their potential impact on ongoing and anticipated public recreational uses in the NCE. Impacts to recreation are potentially substantive and the DEIS fails to meaningfully address and disclose these impacts. As such the DEIS fails to take the necessary hard look as required by NEPA.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] BCHW
public_lands@bchw.org legislative@bchw.org
www.bchw.org www.bchw.org

[REDACTED]
Chairman
Back Country Horsemen of America
www.bcha.org

Correspondence ID: 12687Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Spanaway, WA 98387
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,10 2023 18:37:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am opposed to relocating grizzly bears into North Cascades National Park. If grizzly bears migrate into North Cascades National Park from Canada or else where, a natural expansion of the species, they should be left alone.

Correspondence ID: 12689Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98125
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,10 2023 18:57:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: so exciting for the potential to have bears back in washington! any chance to re-introduce animals that should naturally be there has my support!

Correspondence ID: 12690Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Chelan, WA 98816
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,10 2023 19:08:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Continue to make it clear that we do NOT want the restoration of grizzly bears in Washington State. The Biden group is not listening to Washington citizens to honor and respect our opinion.

Correspondence ID: 12691Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Brush Prairie, WA 98606
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,10 2023 19:10:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzly bears should not be re-introduced to the areas in Northern Washington State. My opinion comes from a recreation perspective. National Parks and Wilderness areas are getting increasingly used by the public. This has

been especially noticeable in the last 3-4 years. We are avid backpackers and day hikers and have been on many trips in Montana and Wyoming where grizzly bears are present. Each year, there is at least one attack in these areas. Regular intervention by authorities occurs with problem bears getting into populated areas. Why create this sort of problem in Washington State as well?

Don't do it. It will create more problems than any benefit provided.

Correspondence ID: 12692Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Union Gap, WA 98903
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,10 2023 19:17:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Keep the GRIZZLEY bears OUT of Washington. Biden and the left leaning Americans have no business doing such a stupid service to wildlife. Bears will find their own way of life.

Correspondence ID: 12695Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Yelm, WA 98597
United States of America
Outside Organization: Back Country Horsemen of WA Multiple chapter member Non-Governmental
Received: Nov,10 2023 19:21:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the: Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Environmental Impact Statement for the North Cascades Ecosystem
As a member of Back Country Horsemen of Washington, I am very concerned with the ability to continue to recreate in the North Cascades should a small population of heavily protected grizzly bears be mechanically moved into the region that we recreate in. The DEIS does not sufficiently analyze the impact to recreation or present any options for how trails can be maintained open in the presence of protections implemented to reduce human-grizzly interactions. The Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail runs through the core habitat and has permitted distance hikers of around 10,000. When considering the other trail users in and along the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE) since this is one of the most populated areas around any bear ecosystem, the use likely exceeds a quarter million visits. However, the DEIS indicates that the use is insignificant. It is very significant and will likely result in many human-bear interactions. The Pacific Northwest National Scenic Trail also runs through the NCE as well as other bear ecosystems to the east, including the Cabinet-Yaak (CYE). The CYE has a more established population of bears but still has resulted with challenges to the very existence of the trail due to the limited number of bears in the CYE (20-40). Opposition to the National Scenic Trail in the recovering bear population area as well as the connecting landscapes between ecosystems has also been expressed by USFWS staff, the same agency putting forth the NCE proposal through which the same trail will pass. Without a more detailed analysis of how to retain the carrying capacity of the trails, trailheads, and campgrounds without resulting in long term or permanent closures, there is no way to effectively review this DEIS. Furthermore, the NPS and USFWS have pointed out that the Canadian counterparts and First Nations are preparing to release grizzly bears in the northern part of the NCE. IF that was the only release point, it would move the core recovery/release area north and away from the more densely human populated areas of Washington State. It also would be in line with Washington State law as well since no bears would be translocated directly into Washington, and there also would be predictability on how many bears are being moved into the entire NCE which overlaps both countries. The BC government has noted that their Recovery Plan is being developed jointly with the USFWS even though this US EIS only addresses the Washington effort. As a trail horse rider in the NCE, I ask that the No Action Alternative be selected. The areas we ride in includes the Mt Baker Snoqualmie National Forest, the Okanogan Wenatchee National Forest including the Pasayten Wilderness, and the North Cascades National Park. We have many horse camps along the boundary of the NCE. We cannot support either Action Alternative without more substantive analysis on impacts to recreation as well as knowing more on the joint planning with Canadian counterparts.

Sincerely,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 12697Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98512
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,10 2023 19:24:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think re introducing grizzly bears in Washington is a great idea. I like the idea of restoring the eco system to its original state. We have black bear & cougars and for the most part we have all found our place to coexist in peace as long as we give them the respect they deserve.

Correspondence ID: 12698Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Chelan, WA 98816
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,10 2023 19:29:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I fully support griz reintroduction on the US side of the N.Cascades, and any other suitable, adjacent or surrounding habitat that's available. I fully understand the pros and cons, from my time in the Flathead of MT during the mid-late 1980's, and I firmly believe that most of the opposition is based on fears of very low probability events. You will no doubt catch more grief than the MT biologists did 35 years ago (and in some circles, are still catching it), but very few of the horror stories will ever come to pass, and all those will be exaggerated when they hit the evening news. But ultimately, it's the right thing to do for the ecosystem and for future generations. Good luck!

Correspondence ID: 12699Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Elma, WA 98541
United States of America

Outside Organization: Back Country Horsemen of Washington Non-Governmental

Received: Nov,10 2023 19:36:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My comments on the mattwr are going to be simple and short. Bringing in grizzly will severely limit the areas that I will be riding and camping if that happens. It will also stop where were we go to fish. I will no longer feel safe to go out into our forest and will keep my money that I would have paid for permit for the camping, fishing, and hunting for other things. I am not the only one that feels this way. And I hope you take the safety and the feeling of safety that those that use the forest need.

Thank you

Correspondence ID: 12700Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Colville, WA 99114
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,10 2023 19:40:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have lived in the inland northwest for 43 years. During that time, I have hiked and backpacked extensively in the North Cascades Ecosystem, and more importantly, in ecosystems in eastern Washington/Idaho/Montana, and British Columbia, Canada that are home to grizzly bears. My home is located in a rural forested setting miles from the nearest town. While my game cam has not yet recorded a grizzly, it has recorded black bears, mountain lions, and wolves. Years of living and hiking in grizzly habitat has taught me that with appropriate behavior, and precaution I can coexist with apex predators. I fully support reintroduction of grizzly bears in the North Cascades Ecosystem. Reintroduction will help make whole an ecosystem that has suffered from a reduction in wildlife diversity for many decades. To help manage potential

conflicts, I support the alternative that reintroduces grizzly bears, with the added flexibility to deter or relocate grizzly bears if they venture into neighborhoods.

Correspondence ID: 12701Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Kirkland, WA 98033
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,10 2023 19:46:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I wanted to say I fully support this action, and I specifically hope it gets enacted with alternative B.

Correspondence ID: 12702Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bothell, WA 98011
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,10 2023 19:48:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The reintro of the grizzly bear strikes me as driven by wildlife biologists hoping to reshuffle the deck to restore the range to an earlier time. Grizzlies have been absent from the Cascades since the late 1960's and were few in number at that time. I do not see the need to bring these bears back to the range not only due to the proximity to large population centers and the rapid expansion in backcountry recreation but also there's no viable proof the grizzly would have a positive/negative impact on the Cascades ecologically speaking as compared to say the non-native mountain goats formerly in the Olympics.

I support Alternative A "no action". If a grizzly finds its way into the Cascades and reproduces, fine, but to systematically drop them into all parts of the Cascades is not something I can support at this time.

Correspondence ID: 12703Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Dallas, TX 75219
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,10 2023 19:57:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear NPS,
Thank you for allowing me to comment.

I encourage the agency to reconsider your approach to grizzly recovery in the North Cascades. In particular:

1) I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and that the restoration must be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is good for bears and Wilderness.

2) Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

3) I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

4) Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-

Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

5) A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

6) For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

7) An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

8) The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Thank you again.

Correspondence ID: 12704Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Yakima, WA 98908
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,10 2023 20:17:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'd ask you to consider the 1996 beginnings of the elimination the trapping, baiting & hound hunting of cougars & bears in Washington State as a guide to the pitfalls of laws brought about by ill conceived plans of government when it comes to wildlife. The effects of these decisions have allowed more frequent interactions between dangerous predators and humans as well as livestock within the state. Reliable coonhound operators have left the Northwest never to return due to this decision. Predators do not live and stay within imaginary lines from a map, look no further than the introduction of wolves in the state to see the deviation to livestock in Eastern Washington. The proposal to release grizzly bears into our state is a huge mistake that will endanger the public and their livelihoods.

Correspondence ID: 12705Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98125
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,10 2023 20:34:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The importance of large predators in any ecosystem is paramount so any resistance to the reintroduction of brown bear species is resistance to the ecological stability of the region.

Correspondence ID: 12706Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Poulsbo, WA 98370
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,10 2023 20:34:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support option A: no action at this time

Climate change factors:

Climate change models for the North Cascades suggest longer periods of high temperatures in the summer, greater precipitation in autumn, spring and fall with freezing temperatures occurring at higher than normal elevations that could affect grizzly populations denning later and an earlier end to hibernation affecting cub viability. Both situations increasing likelihood of human encounters as bears seek food for longer periods of time.

Wildfire, insect infestations, increased flooding and landslides could diminish bears preferred foods, such as whitebark pine seeds (already happening) and sambuca berry decrease (already happening). Since bears are adaptable, smart, opportunistic, and omnivores relocated bears from habitats where forbs and berries are their main food source will no doubt add threatened Chinook to their diet. Grizzlies do help turn the soil and spread seeds but they also love caraway an invasive non-native and Canada thistle. While there are climate change model predictions for the NCE we still can not predict what will actually happen to the environment in the decades to come.

Grizzly and black bear incidents have increased this year in British Columbia, and Yellowstone, and Colorado as bears become less afraid of humans, are hungrier and wander urban areas. Aversive deterrents directed by humans have proven ineffective as bears are able to figure out how to avoid being hit by rubber bullets, etc. Electric fencing around entry doors, around gardens, playgrounds, rv parks, does work but then who are now the displaced? Bears in the NCE area in 1975? I can't find any evidence that this is true.

This is a risky endeavor for the bear, other threatened and endangered animals, plants and we humans.

I am in sympathy with conservation groups but not on this issue.

Correspondence ID: 12708Project:112008Document:132104
Address: East Wenatchee, WA 98802
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,10 2023 20:50:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Tuesday, November 28, 2023, 9:00 AM until 10:00 AM Pacific Time (US & Canada) (UTC-08:00)

- Reintroduce wild bears from populations as close to the North Cascades Ecosystem (ECE) as possible and ideally, from habitat types as close to North Cascade as possible. You want bears that are as co-evolved and adapted to the North Cascade ecotypes as possible, otherwise it is a non-native local species introduction and is not as likely to succeed. The transplant bears should be from bears that are as far away from people and towns as possible. You want bears that fear people. Consider epigenetics in bears for transplant. Learned behavior is passed on to young without genetic mutation, so you want bears that are fearful of people. Ideally, avoid bears from known populations (lineage) with a history of interactions with people.
- It would be best to have bears from different age classes to buffer for loss of breeding age animals.

:

- The restoration of grizzly bears will benefit the natural value of wilderness because the native species are functionally extirpated from the NCE. The limited adverse impacts from alternative B would be offset by restoring a native species, a beneficial impact. " DEIS Page vii This is weakly supported, because there has been no analysis of the ecology without bears versus with bears. What are the benefits ?
- A more passive action alternative based on luring bears into the area with pheromones should have been evaluated. Has this been done with other species ? Is it possible to increase the probability of population establishment by bringing potential mating pairs into the NCE with the use of pheromones th? This would be a way to avoid public opposition to "transplanting" bears and a more natural way of encouraging bears to enter the NCE.

* i don't think that a good case has been made for why grizzlies are not coming back on their own in the NCE. Bears go

where there is less competition for food and mates, not concentrate in areas with greater competition. Where is the evidence that numbers in Canada are not sufficient to have enabled bears to move down and establish in the NCE ? What other factors could result in non-establishment of the bears ? What is different now than in times when there were bears present ? Are there studies that show how many grizzlies exist north of the border ? Show that the Fraser River presents a barrier to grizzlies occupying the NCE. I think to treat without knowing and discussing causation for bears not establishing in the NCE is malpractice.* I am for having a healthy population of grizzlies in the NCE, but I am not convinced that this will work when there has been plenty of time for grizzlies to establish on their own and it has not happened.

* I think my pheromone alternative for luring bears into the NCE demands analysis.

Correspondence ID: 12709Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Washougal, WA 98671
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,10 2023 20:51:37

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am against this motion to reintroduce grizzlies to Washington, they are non essential and will only disrupt our tourism which is a lot of income for Washington. But they will disrupt the other wildlife.

Correspondence ID: 12712Project:112008Document:132104

Address: CHEWELAH, WA 99109
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,10 2023 20:59:58

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: after reading your plan to reintroduce Grizzly Bears in Washington state, I firmly request that you DO NOT introduce any grizzly bears in Washington State. The food source for grizzly bears is currently be consumed by the many WOLFS you already planted in the National Forest in this area. The game population is being depleted already. The release of Grizzly Bears will compound an already serious problem with adequate food supply for predator's when including cougars, and wolfs.

Respectfully,


Chewelah Washington
99109

Correspondence ID: 12714Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Philadelphia, PA 19104
United States of America

Outside Organization: Drexel University Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,10 2023 21:16:31

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I urge you to move forward with this plan in reestablishing the Grizzly Bear population in the North Cascades Ecosystem. It will be better for the environment and the animals. The reestablishment of the bears in the ecosystem will help to restore an environmental balance there.

Correspondence ID: 12716Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98125
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,10 2023 21:26:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife

populations.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live in and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

Furthermore, the 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Thank you for taking the time to keep our North Cascades wild!

Correspondence ID: 12718Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Beaverton, OR 97006
United States of America
Outside Organization: Swamp Rose Ecology Business(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,10 2023 21:47:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service,

I am writing to you as an ecologist with a traditional educational background and professional experience in the field. My purpose in writing is to express my support for the restoration of grizzly bears in the North Cascades ecosystem.

As a professional in ecology, I have a deep understanding of the pivotal role that keystone species like the grizzly bear play in maintaining the health and balance of our ecosystems. Grizzly bears contribute significantly to ecological diversity, helping to regulate prey populations and maintain forest health through their activities. Their presence in the North Cascades would not only be a boon to the ecological integrity of the area but also a symbol of our commitment to conserving our natural heritage.

Moreover, the reintroduction of grizzly bears is likely to have positive economic impacts. Based on studies and observations from other regions where large predators have been reintroduced or conserved, there is a strong potential for increased tourism. Nature enthusiasts, wildlife photographers, and outdoor adventurers are often drawn to areas where they can experience such majestic wildlife in their natural habitats. This increase in tourism would not only boost local economies but also generate additional tax revenues, which could be strategically reinvested into further conservation programs and ecological research.

I believe that the restoration of grizzly bears in the North Cascades, particularly through Alternative C, is a step toward a more balanced, diverse, and thriving ecosystem. This action would not only reaffirm our commitment to biodiversity but also demonstrate a forward-thinking approach to wildlife management, where economic benefits align with ecological health.

Thank you for considering my views on this important matter. I look forward to seeing positive steps taken towards the restoration of the grizzly bear population in the North Cascades and am eager to support these efforts in any way I can.

Sincerely,

Correspondence ID: 12719Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Salem, OR 97304
United States of America
Outside Organization: individual Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,10 2023 22:12:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please return the grizzly bear back into its natural habitat and restore natural order to the ecosystem. Human hunted them to extinction in their natural habitat and that needs to be corrected to restore their habitat and natural order to the land. Additionally, they should be reintroduced for cultural, spiritual, and for the return of the ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 12721Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98274
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,10 2023 22:23:19
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My family has hiked, horsebacked, and hunted the cascade mountains and outdoor areas throughout Washington through my grandpa's younger years going back over 50 years. This would dynamically change my ability going forth with my children and their children and safely enjoying what is a relatively stable and safe environment with obviously taking certain precautions. Grizzlies bring a new level in their unfearing nature, even simply sleeping at night with nothing but piece of cloth between you, and it can be unnerving in itself and take the joy out of what has been for so many years . Highly encourage all we can do to stop this life endangering step being forced upon our state mostly by people who have never enjoyed all its benefits and beauty. Keep it local and safe in this decision

Correspondence ID: 12722Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Ephrata, WA 98823
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,10 2023 22:28:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am an avid backpacker and outdoor person. I'm used to being careful in the backcountry, but am very concerned about the introduction of grizzly bears into the Cascade mountains. Grizzlies do not behave like black bears, who are afraid of people. Grizzlies, on the other hand are aggressive and actively go after humans when confronted. They have very large territories. While the area where they are proposed to be released into is sparsely populated, it is well known and used by people like myself. There is extensive trail and forest service use in the proposed area. Grizzlies currently exist in remote areas of Washington state now and are habituated, so why do we need to introduce more? This proposed land for locating the bears butts up against farm lands. Bears of any kind have broad ranges, therefore could encroach on private lands and/or farms. Since grizzlies are protected, the farmers will likely be impacted by the bears attacking their livestock and have no recourse to protect their property.
I am extremely concerned about this proposal.
I grew up in Northern Idaho where grizzlies from Yellowstone were introduced in the 1970's. It caused a lot of problems because the bears were not habituated--it has taken 50 years for them to acclimate to their new territory. That being said, there have been bear attacks and problems ever since. Let's not make the same mistake in Washington.

Correspondence ID: 12724Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,10 2023 22:40:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am so amazed at the idea. 3 generations and we forgot what the past taught us.

A Grizzly bear is a crazy strong and a very MEAN bear. ONLY a very few lucky humans have been able to live and tell

about how they were attacked by one.

They really like to eat your kids FFA and 4-H livestock projects. Please do not do this.

Correspondence ID: 12725Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Trout Lake, WA 98650
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,10 2023 22:49:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: ABSOLUTELY NOT!! On the planting of Grizzly Bear in the North Cascades. Many states, including ours, are already having issues with planted wolves, not to mention normal black bear and cougar populations! We are facing global warming, extreme weather, fires and pollution! This is changing sustaining food sources for wild animals! Elk are enduring rotting feet, deer are enduring severe lice infestations! Then WDFW/NPS complains that these exact predators are eating the babies! Salmon are declining! The only reason I can figure why WDFW/NPS would even think of bringing another predator into a non traditional of recent times area, is to provide hunters with even more opportunities to pursue and murder innocent animals! It's just wrong! The world is on fire!! ALL animals are stressed, including humans! Why cause more problems for everyone? Please reconsider the urge to displace animals from the lands they occupy right now!

Correspondence ID: 12727Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Oregon City, OR 97045
United States of America

Outside Organization: NA Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,10 2023 23:17:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Good Day
reintroductionRestoration

This comment is in response to the Grizzly Bear Plan. Specifically I appose the plan in all portions. The plan is cover for an entirely different objective, the taking of lands from various private and public, and endangers the American citizen through deceit. This under the cover of law.

The United Nations Conventions on Biodiversity was rejected. One of the principle reasons was the insertion of the "Wildlands Project" and the "Global Biodiversity Assessment Report".

The United Nations Environmental Program, calls for removal of humanity in various actions across the United States.
Publication : United Nations Global Biodiversity Assessment Report of 1995

The earliest federal land management statute requiring federal agencies to "coordinate" is the Recreation Coordination Development Act of 1963 (Public Law 88-29, approved May 28, 1963, 77 Stat. 49). This statute declared a Congressional policy that "present and future generations be assured adequate outdoor recreation resources" and that "all levels of government and private interests . . . take prompt and coordinated action . . . to conserve, develop, and utilize such [their] resources for the benefit and enjoyment of the American people."

The first statute wherein Congress began to define the coordination process is the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), 42 U.S.C. 4331, in 1970. Also of importance, NEPA set forth a national intention of reaching a harmonious and productive environment for the entire natural environment...including humans; it required all federal agencies to prepare studies and statements of impacts, including the cumulative impacts of any project studied; and it established the President's Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ), attached to the White House, to provide oversight of implementation by all federal agencies, whether or not there is a NEPA project involved.

Neither the "Wildlands" project, or any subset of the project, holds the human in the regards as stewards of the varying species including the grizzly. The quote is from the Administrative Director of the "Wildlands Project":
Quote # 1:
"[T]he collective needs of non-human species must take precedence over the needs and desires of humans."

- Wildlands Project Co-architect Reed Noss

Quote # 2:

from Editor John Davis - UN Wildlands Project Journal "Wild Earth": "Does ... the Wildlands Project advocate the end of industrial civilization? Most assuredly. Everything civilized must go."

Both the U.S Parks, U.S Forestry and US Fish and Wildlife, are in direct violation of items # 3, # 6 by both definition and action with the introduction of an Apex Predator. Outside the etherial, there is no balance between the violent possibilities of both the Grizzly and grey wolf. This apex threat, is the exact reason the evidence is clear, that the "Wildlands" Project is the tool being used to force peoples, tribes who are being used as dupes (Their words, not mine) in the deceit endeavor, most unfortunately.

CONGRESSIONAL DECLARATION OF NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY

Sec. 101 [42 USC § 4331].

(b) In order to carry out the policy set forth in this Act, it is the continuing responsibility of the Federal Government to use all practicable means, consistent with other essential considerations of national policy, to improve and coordinate Federal plans, functions, programs, and resources to the end that the Nation may --

1. fulfill the responsibilities of each generation as trustee of the environment for succeeding generations;
 2. assure for all Americans safe, healthful, productive, and aesthetically and culturally pleasing surroundings;
 3. attain the widest range of beneficial uses of the environment without degradation, risk to health or safety, or other undesirable and unintended consequences;
 4. preserve important historic, cultural, and natural aspects of our national heritage, and maintain, wherever possible, an environment which supports diversity, and variety of individual choice;
 5. achieve a balance between population and resource use which will permit high standards of living and a wide sharing of life's amenities; and
 6. enhance the quality of renewable resources and approach the maximum attainable recycling of deplete-able resources.
- (c) The Congress recognizes that each person should enjoy a healthful environment and that each person has a responsibility to contribute to the preservation and enhancement of the environment.

The flow of regulation requires "coordination, not consensus, or other manipulations. It is not a requirement of Counties to demand "Coordination although many have, Wallowa County and U.S. Forest Service,

Following are some of the federal statutes requiring coordination:

16 U.S.C. 1604, the National Forest Management Act (NFMA), 1976 (Directs the United States Forest Service)

42 U.S.C. 4331, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), 1970 (Directs Federal plans, functions, programs and resources)

16 U.S.C. 1533, the Endangered Species Act (ESA), 1973 (Directs the United States Fish and Wildlife Service)

16 U.S.C. 1271, the Wild and Scenic River Act (W&SRA), 1968 (Directs the National Park Service)

PL 88-29 (77 Stat. 49), the Recreation Coordination and Development Act, 1963 (Directs the National Park Service)

42 U.S.C. 7401, the Clean Air Act (CAA), 1970 (Directs the Environmental Protection Agency)

43 U.S. C. 1711, the Federal Land Policy Management Act, 1976 (Directs the Bureau of Land Management)

33 U.S. C. 1251, the Clean Water Act (CWA), 1972 (Directs the Environmental Protection Agency)

16 U.S.C. 2003, the Soil and Water Resources Conservation Act (SWRCA), 1977 (Directs the Soil and Water Conservation Service)

16 U.S.C. 1382, the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA), 1972
(Directs the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration)

16 U.S.C. 1431, the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act (MPRS), 1972 (Directs the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration)

16 U.S.C. 1451, the Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA), 1972
(Directs the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration)

16 U.S.C. 1801, the Fishery Conservation and Management Act (FCMA), 1976 (Directs the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration)

Statutes are in "pari material" and thus must be read together and consistently.

Professor Sutherland's definitive work "Statutory Construction," Section 5202, states: "Statutes are considered in "pari material" to pertain to the same subject matter when they relate to the same person or thing, or the same class of persons or things, or have the same purpose and object."

FLPMA and NFMA are statutes in "pari material" because they both relate to management processes, procedures and directives from Congress by which the BLM and USFS must manage the public or federal lands. They even represent enactments by the same session of Congress, and they have the same "purpose and object." And the United States Supreme Court has enunciated this principle on scores of occasions.

The Counties in the path of this violation of Federal Statutes, Benton, Adams, Yakima, Okanogan, and any missed, by volumes of activities is prime facia demand for coordination.

The most troubling part of all of these transgressions, is the fact the malefactors know the deceitful intent of the "Wildlands" project,

and while in pretense of following some edict, put American citizens in harms way, in total contravention of the facts in evidence of Apex predators.

To all who might read this: The actions of Military conflict and the actions of Political conflict are in fact twins. Both entities use deceit to gain ground, and must continue until the objective is obtained.

The objective of this propaganda filled war, is the removal of humanity, by the leaders own words.

The support of the endangered species, depends on stewardship by peoples committed to do so, and bureaucracy is the worst, both in war and politics.

One last item concerning Humanism verse human as a dictionary term. Humanists claim animal species above man. I attach the

United Nations UNESCO philosophy by Sir Julian Huxley:

1945 - The United Nations Charter (Not Treaty) was signed. Here is one of the greatest lies perpetrated on the Global Public. The structural White Papers of the United Nations managed, and generated by 50 CFR members (including the Rockefeller "Lenin Institute" members) previously inserted into the United States Government and Universities in many administrative positions. This in concert with the RIIA of Great Britain. The Dumbarton Oaks, story is only partly true. This action was handled by Alger Hiss of prior note, who was later imprisoned as a Soviet spy and who had been Roosevelt's right hand man. Alger Hiss, Soviet spy, was known to Roosevelt who casually dismissed the notification. Hiss was at both Tehran and Yalta. This begins the current living History, that gets us to today.

UN. Not Known: http://www.slideshare.net/slideshow/embed_code/38199716

1946 - UNESCO Education is instituted. 1946 - 1948: 1948: UNESCO: Its Purpose and Its Philosophy by Sir Julian Huxley (the first director-general of UNESCO, 1946-1948) is published, in which Huxley declares: "The general philosophy of UNESCO should be a scientific world humanism, global in extent and evolutionary in background... Political unification in some sort of world government will be required...Tasks for the media division of UNESCO (will be) to promote the growth of a common outlook shared by all nations and cultures...to help the emergence of a single world culture... Even though it is quite true that any radical eugenic policy will be for many years politically and psychologically impossible, it will be important for UNESCO to see that the eugenic problem is examined with the greatest care, and that the public mind is informed of the issues at stake so that much that now is unthinkable may at least become thinkable." Excerpts from this

volume were reproduced under the title, "A New World Vision" (The Humanist, March/April 1979), and the Fabian Socialist Huxley, who was named 1962 "Humanist of the Year," elsewhere said that humanism's "keynote, the central concept to which all its details are related, is evolution." Also, it was Sir Julian Huxley (brother of Brave New World author Aldous Huxley, and grandson of Thomas Huxley who was known as "Darwin's Bulldog" because of his defense of evolution).

Snippets from Document : Where does Coordination Mandate come From:

Snippets from "Wildlands Project" Given to Bonnaville Co. Idaho, in 1995.

Convention on Biodiversity-Global Biodiversity Assessment Report: UN Publication

United Nations Environmental Program.

For UN anti-human Demands listing see: http://www.slideshare.net/slideshow/embed_code/28345505 - slide # 13.

in Service to Country Via Oath not Party.

SEP

Correspondence ID: 12732Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Montesano, WA 98563
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I strongly support grizzly restoration in the Cascades

Correspondence ID: 12733Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Grandview, WA 98930
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am opposed to Grizzly Bears being introduced to Washington State. They will roam and when hungry enough will end up doing harm to humans. We already have a problem with cougars. This will be no different.

Correspondence ID: 12735Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Kennewick WA, WA 99337
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I would like to express my opposition to the draft to reintroduce grizzly bears to central Washington state. I am unfamiliar with any positive aspects of introducing this apex predator to an area that has been without them for such a long period of time. The negative aspects of creating a new danger for hikers, hunters, and outdoor enthusiasts; possible predation of livestock; and property damage potential from wandering bears all seems to outweigh any positive benefits to reintroduction. Keep them out!

Correspondence ID: 12738Project:112008Document:132104
Address: East Wenatchee, WA 98802
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 01:11:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: NO re-introduction of grizzlies into Washington state, period!!
Additionally, grizzlies may migrate into Washington state territories from Canada, and impact livestock, humans and properties, there NEEDS to be a rapid system to either quickly relocate them, or neutralize them.

Correspondence ID: 12739Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Snohomish, WA 98290
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 01:34:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think grizzly bears should be reintroduced in the North Cascades. Please take the efforts necessary to return these animals to their natural habit.

Correspondence ID: 12740Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Yakima, WA 98901
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 01:45:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The plan to reintroduce the grizzly bear to North Central Washington is, to be frank, foolish. The way you state it in your Restoration Plan sounds so benign: "Provide Pacific Northwest residents and visitors with the opportunity to again experience grizzly bears in their native habitat." The "opportunity to experience" grizzlies would have been gladly forgone by hunter Rudy Noorlander, who had his jaw torn off by a grizzly in Montana in early September 2023. Amie Adamson, the hiker who was killed by a grizzly in July, 2023, would also, I'm sure, been happy to avoid the "opportunity." The grizzly who killed her also broke through a kitchen window of a house in September, so not only will this reintroduction endanger hikers and hunters, but even people inside their own homes. Further, the nice little black line outlining the area you will be putting the bears looks so neat and tidy, but bears don't read maps and understand they are supposed to stay within certain boundaries. Third, the deer and elk populations in Washington are always a concern, and adding grizzlies back in as predators can only put more negative pressure on their populations. Grizzlies are grand creatures, to be sure, but they need and deserve remote areas where they will not be in much contact with humans. Leave them to the remoter areas of the states with less population, and allow Washington to remain a safer area for its larger population. Do not reintroduce the grizzly bear back into North Central Washington State.

Correspondence ID: 12742Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sedro Woolley, WA 98284
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 02:05:52

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I live in the foothills of the North Cascades and recreate in and near the park extensively. I have seen an uptick in both predator (bear, cougar, bobcat, coyote) activity as well as human traffic. I think covid brought people outdoors more than ever. It is great to see so many people experiencing, and subsequently, advocating for these wild spaces. However, more people equals more people and trails and trailheads are packed, even on the less mentioned trails on social media. I mention this because with the uptick of predators and more human traffic in the North Cascades, adding an apex predator to this situation seems shocking and absurd. I try to keep an open mind on most matters and find myself playing Devil's Advocate often and I just can't wrap my head around why this is a good idea overall. Washington state has one of the highest population densities of any western state with, possibly, the least public land in all the west. Grizzly to human interaction will be unavoidable.

There are already grizzlies in Washington. There are no barriers impassable for grizzlies to reach the North Cascades from areas like B.C. and Idaho. If the Grizzlies want to be here, they will grow the population here naturally, giving the prey (and other predator) populations opportunities to naturally grow accustomed to this "new" predator. I don't often believe in doing

nothing is the best course of action, however when it comes to this Grizzly reintroduction, I believe option A (doing nothing) is the best option for Washington and its wildlife.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 12743Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 02:09:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am completely against grizzle bear re introduction. As a mom and hiker, I have no interest in bringing grizzlies back into the area.

You will loose advocates of these woods when people do not feel safe going into them anymore. The woods will become more distant, a dangerous place and then more threaten because people won't care as much anymore when they are not ever in them. I came from the Midwest and the PNW taught me how to fall in love with nature. We have a great connection with people wanting to hike and camp and explore this amazing place. Having grizzlies in the are will stop people from going out. It will stop me and my family and many I have talked to about this. All people who currently hike. So now, this next generation will not be raised with the same forest time and understanding of how important time in nature is. Because even knowing how important forest time in, I will not bring my family into the woods with grizzlies.

This is an animal that bear spray will not help. Just look at the educated and well seasoned couple in Baff

Correspondence ID: 12744Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Redmond, WA 98053
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 02:14:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: If Grizzlies are introduces, there will be some grizzly human deaths and some terrifying near deaths. . So that is the price. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZS-y3yus3Mo>

Correspondence ID: 12758Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bozeman, MT 59718
United States of America
Outside Organization: Gallatin Wildlife Association Conservation/Preservation(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,11 2023 07:51:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: November 11, 2023

Don Striker, Superintendent
North Cascades National Park Service Complex
810 State Route 20
Sedro Woolley, WA 98284

Dear Superintendent Striker:

Back in September of this year, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the National Park Service (NPS) released the Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/Environmental Impact Statement, North Cascades Ecosystem. This plan is a culmination of a multi-year process to evaluate the options for restoring grizzly bears to the North Cascades, an area known

to have historical residency for bears. The public comment period is about to close, and our organization would like to provide comments at this time. The issue of populating grizzly bear recovery zones is indirectly, if not directly related to the issue of grizzly bears here in Montana. More information on that below, but first a little information as to who we are.

The Gallatin Wildlife Association (GWA) is a local, all volunteer wildlife conservation organization dedicated to the preservation and restoration of wildlife, fisheries, habitat and migration corridors in Southwest Montana and the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem, using science-based decision making. We are a nonprofit 501 (c) (3) organization founded in 1976. GWA recognizes the intense pressures on our wildlife from habitat loss and climate change, and we advocate for science-based management of public lands for diverse public values, including but not limited to hunting and angling.

As you very well know, the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE) is one of six recovery zones across the Pacific Northwest and northern Rocky Mountain states that has had landscapes set aside to harbor a population of grizzly bears. These ecosystems were established on landscapes that had the ability to facilitate the Grizzly Bear Recovery Plan. In fact, according to the 2021 Annual Report of the Grizzly Bear Recovery Program (GBRP), the mission is stated thusly.

"The mission of the Grizzly Bear Recovery Program (GBRP) is to recover grizzly bears in the lower-48 States by implementing the Grizzly Bear Recovery Plan (USFWS 1993, 1996, 1997, 2007, 2017, 2018) and coordinating research, management, and recovery efforts. To accomplish this mission, we collaborate with the Interagency Grizzly Bear Committee (IGBC), Federal, State, and Tribal agencies, the provinces of British Columbia (B.C.) and Alberta, as well as non-governmental organizations (NGOs)."

The Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem (GYE) is another one of those six ecosystems. The purpose of the GBRP is to determine lands capable of providing food, shelter, and safety as well as large landscapes where recovery efforts can focus on conflict reduction and reducing human-caused mortality. Another purpose of the GBRP is to facilitate the connectivity of each ecosystem, each with the other, to prevent populations from becoming isolated, stunted, and adversely affecting the health and population of the species. We should also say that of the six grizzly bear recovery ecosystems, only two, the GYE and the Northern Continental Divide Ecosystem (NCDE) have a significant population of grizzly bears.

This in and of itself should be a primary concern. This tells us the goals and mission of the GBRP are not being met and will not be met until all recovery zones have substantial populations of bears. But in addition, there needs to be connectivity from one recovery zone to another. Presently we are far from meeting that goal. That not only hinders the genetic health of grizzly bears within the NCE population, but the overall health of bears overall. One of our primary goals as a wildlife advocacy organization is for connectivity to be reached by large migrating species as this helps ensure genetic health as well as overall health of the entire population of species, including bears, across the Northern Rockies and the Pacific Northwest.

Conditions on the Ground:

This plan then, the Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan, is an attempt to fulfill GBRP's mission, to establish a sustainable population of grizzly bears in the northern Cascades and northern Rockies. GWA supports the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, but it must be done in a way that does not violate the specifics and intentions of the Wilderness Act or the character of wilderness or in a way that hinders the growth and development of the other recovery zones.

On pages i and ii of the draft plan, there is this statement.

"There has been only one confirmed detection of a grizzly bear in the greater NCE in the past 10 years, which occurred in British Columbia (IGBC NCE Subcommittee 2016; Rine et al. 2020). Since there has been no confirmed evidence of grizzly bears within the NCE in the United States since 1996, any remaining bears in the NCE would not meet the accepted definition for a population (i.e., evidence of 2 adult females with cubs or 1 adult female tracked through two litters). Therefore, the FWS considers grizzly bears to be functionally extirpated in the NCE (FWS 2022)."

This is disappointing news and describes the associated problem with many species across the west. Populations of not just grizzly bears, but many species, are no longer prevalent upon the landscape since the time of the westward expansion. The factoid that grizzly bears only occupy 2% of their former range needs to be restated here. Habitat fragmentation, hunting, agricultural interest, and wildlife/human conflicts have driven many species close to extirpation, especially those that are

predators.

According to statements on page v of the draft plan, the goal would be to transport 7-10 grizzlies per year for 5-10 years until a goal of 25 bears are reached, then supplement that population as needed over time until a final goal of 200 grizzlies is reached in the NCE. These bears would be transported from the sources of Wyoming, Montana, or British Columbia. If you have been following conditions in Montana and those of the GYE and the NCDE, actions within our state have become quite political. Perpetuated by state officials, the states of Idaho, Wyoming, and Montana have petitioned the USFWS to delist the grizzly bear. GWA is arguing against this action as it is believed the state is acting upon fallacious reasons, but this move highlights the political atmosphere in the state.

GWA has concerns over the removal of grizzly bears from the state of Montana. Removing bears from the GYE is problematic as according to the Endangered Species Act of 1973, grizzly bears have yet to fully recover. Connectivity has not been reached between the GYE and the NCDE or with any other of the Grizzly Bear Ecosystems. To put it bluntly, our state's grizzly bear population is suffering from the hands of bad behavior, from politicians and some elements of the public. Many fear our grizzly bear population may not be as stable as many officials claim.

Mortality of grizzlies in the state seem to be growing from human/bear conflicts. Whether it be from trigger-happy hunters who seem more willing to pull the trigger on a rifle than a can of bear spray or from vehicle/bear collisions, the mortality of grizzly bears in the state is raising a new level of concern. On top of that, if the state's request to delist grizzly bear is honored by USFWS and delisting occurs, we fear the death rate of grizzly bears will increase greatly due to these hunting and trophy hunting pressures. This most certainly would jeopardize bears from reaching connectivity.

This is the current problem as it exists on the ground. The GYE is an isolated ecosystem in terms of grizzly bear connectivity and has been at the heart of GWA's and other NGO's mission for some time. It is one where the state of Montana is determined, under the current political atmosphere, to continue into the future. Many advocates are just focused on trying to gain connectivity between the GYE and the NCDE and/or the Bitterroot Ecosystem (BE) of eastern central Idaho.

The Alternatives and their Weaknesses:

Pages iii and iv describe the three alternatives being considered under the draft plan. A brief description of each is below.

Alternative A:

"Under alternative A (no action), existing management practices would be followed. Under the no-action alternative, options for grizzly bear restoration would be limited and rely primarily on natural recovery. Current management actions would continue, focused on improved sanitation, motorized access management, outreach, and educational programs to provide information about grizzly bears and grizzly bear recovery to the public, and research and monitoring to determine grizzly bear presence, distribution, habitat, and home ranges."

Alternative B:

"Under alternative B, grizzly bears restored to the NCE would be managed as a threatened species with the special rule (50 CFR 17.40(b)) under section 4(d) of the ESA governing the regulation of grizzly bears in the lower 48 states and NPS regulations in 36 CFR, chapter 1, governing resource management in areas within the NPS's jurisdiction. This rule allows grizzly bears to be taken under specific circumstances, as long as such take is reported promptly to the FWS."

Alternative C:

"Under alternative C, the FWS would designate grizzly bears in the US portion of the NCE and surrounding areas as a nonessential experimental population (NEP) under section 10(j) of the ESA. An experimental population is a group of translocated plants or animals (inclusive of their progeny) that is geographically separate from other nonexperimental populations of the species. In designating populations as experimental, the FWS must determine whether they are "essential" or "nonessential" to the survival of the species as a whole and must consider the relative effects of establishing an experimental population on the species' recovery."

GWA is against these Action Alternatives as currently written. In the further reading of the draft plan, it is stated that each of these action alternatives would be a violation of the Wilderness Act of 1964. Our organization has been down this road before concerning actions into wilderness areas. On page vi of the draft plan, further explanations are provided according to Alternative B. But we also note that Alternative C has a similar intent.

"Under alternative B, the use of helicopters near active wildlife dens or nests during the initial release of grizzly bears into the NCE could disturb denning mammals or nesting birds; however, this disturbance is expected to be limited to approximately 144 flights over a 5-to-10-year period and would be limited to 3 to 7 days per year from June through September."

There are principles behind the intent of these fundamental building blocks of the conservation movement. Whether it be the Wilderness Act, the Endangered Species Act, or the National Environmental Policy Act, or any other exceptions to the law; it is a slippery slope to allow exceptions. We understand the desire to make exceptions and to rationalize those exceptions for the greater good, but there must be work-arounds in those scenarios. Every time there is an exception, it weakens the intent and implementation of the law. We must not allow the practice of adhering to one environmental building block necessitating the violation of another.

Another problem with the alternatives, particularly that of Alternative C is that it proposes the use of the 10(j) rule, a rule that would allow grizzlies of Montana to lose their protection under the ESA, if they were to be transported to the North Cascades. Essentially, the individual animals would be reclassified as "nonessential experimental population", a phrase used to describe these bears on page iv of the draft plan. This change in classification opens the door to a whole range of threat exposure to individual bears, a scenario harmful to their individual existence.

As much as we are in favor of developing a population of grizzly bears in the NCE, the removal of bears from Montana seems problematic since the bears in the state of Montana have not been fully recovered. Questions remain. We question the large plan which should be on the table. Where is it or what is it? What is the overall plan of the GBRP? How was it visioned that the GBRP was to be successful, via bear relocation?

GWA does not believe all alternatives have been explored. Aggressive transport or relocation of species (population augmentation as it is called) are not flawless in their effectiveness or result. The rights of individual bears or individuals of any species are just as important for consideration in a project's implementation. Man-made relocation of species poses risks, perhaps risks that are too great for a species that is not fully recovered.

GWA asks another question? What are the chances of a natural repopulation? We understand the draft plan believes this option is not viable. On page v, the draft plan makes this statement.

"As a result, it is unlikely grizzly bears would move into the NCE from existing populations. Few confirmed sightings of grizzly bears have been made in recent decades in the NCE on either side of the international border. The most recent confirmed observation within the US portion of the NCE was in 1996, south of Glacier Peak. There has been no verified evidence of grizzly reproduction in the NCE for at least 30 years."

But again, this raises more questions for GWA. Even though this chance may be poor, natural recovery should still be incorporated into an overall plan. Natural recovery would lessen the need of augmentation, saving dollars, diminishing mortality risks during transport, and help protect populations of recovery zones that were to lose bears. GWA does not have a good understanding to the degree of discussion between U.S. and Canadian officials nor should we, but what is the level of cooperation between the two entities? Having said all of this, we understand that population augmentation will most likely need to be part of an overall package. GWA encourages communications begin with all officials responsible for managing grizzly bears in each of the six recovery zones, including those officials in Canada to develop an overall systematic plan to facilitate bear recovery.

In the meantime, there needs to be an approach to educate and inform the public about coexisting with grizzlies and all bears. There is no reason why this should not be part of any alternative, let alone a program or plan going forth.

Conclusion:

GWA wants to be clear, we do support the concept and plan to restore grizzly bears to the NCE. But we do not support the implementation of the alternatives as they currently exist.

- We do not believe there needs to be violations of the Wilderness Act in order to release and monitor grizzly bears. Exceptions to law should not be rationalized in order to carry out the implementation of another. This only weakens the laws as written.
- GWA does not believe that population augmentation is the only method to restore populations to the NCE. We do believe that augmentation will most likely be part of the process, but we prefer to minimize that action if and all possible. It poses risks to the individuals, and we do not want to see bears lose their protection status here in Montana just because they are going to be reclassified as nonessential and experimental in Washington.
- GWA believes that natural repopulation should be explored and incorporated into all alternatives as well as the final plan.
- The Bear Smart program needs to be part of any final decision. There is no reason to eliminate the process of informing and educating the public from any scenario.
- GWA believes the removal of bears as stated under Alternative B may be too aggressive in terms of timing and number of bears removed from the GYE or NCDE. GWA would like to see an overall implementation plan of how it plans to repopulate bears in the other recovery zones rather than have a piecemeal approach.
- GWA does believe that the NCE has the resources and landscape size to recover grizzly bears and that this restoration is vital in the overall recovery of the bear into their historic range.
- Grizzly bears would improve ecological health and increase biodiversity.

These bullet points summarize the viewpoint of Gallatin Wildlife Association. Our organization wants to see success in grizzly bears repopulating the NCE, but not at the expense of harm to Montana's grizzlies or to the violation of the Wilderness Act. We think it is safe to say, we would like to see more thought and more alternatives explored to minimize the safety of ongoing grizzly bear populations.

We sincerely hope that these comments will be taken seriously and thoughtfully in order to implement action that will hopefully be done in a judicious and in a scientific sound manner.

Sincerely,


Gallatin Wildlife Association

Correspondence ID: 12760Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98121
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 08:02:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Bring grizzlies to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 12761Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Shoreline, WA 98155
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 08:24:10

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello,

I would like to say that I am in favor of re-introducing grizzlies to the North Cascades, and giving them the space they need to thrive.

Thank you for the opportunity.

Best Regards,

Correspondence ID: 12763Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellevue, WA 98004
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 08:49:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please proceed with the reintroduction of grizzly bears in the North Cascades. I am a longtime backcountry hiker and camper who welcomes this animal to the forest and wetland ecosystem of the area.

Correspondence ID: 12765Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Glacier, WA 98244
United States of America

Outside Organization: Na Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 09:05:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Thank you for giving us a chance to comment. While the recovery of grizzlies in the north cascades is possible, the number of individuals in the target population is so small that its effect on the habitat, like aerating the soil and spreading seeds would be small, and is already being performed by black bears. I see no substantive reason to reintroduce grizzlies in the north cascades. They exist elsewhere and are not extinct. According to your documents they are apex predators, however you stated their diet is primarily vegetation. So they will not have a meaningful impact on controlling game animals.

Additionally, the services seem to blow off the potential risk to humans. Saying the chances would be 2m to 1, like in yellow stone. I think you should ask the families of the two hikers that were killed this year in Montana what they think, Any human death or mauling by bears is not something that can be shrugged off. They aren't here now, and let's just keep it that way.

I strongly object - The no action alternative should be selected.

Thank you

Correspondence ID: 12766Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Silverdale, WA 98383
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 09:06:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in support of reintroducing grizzly bears to the North Cascade Ecosystem. First there are my my personal beliefs that they are beautiful, natural creatures that belong there and humans should make room. They were part of that ecosystem long before we came along and deserve a place.

Then there are the more logical arguments that they are a part of they natural ecosystem, part of a healthy ecosystem and as stewards of the environment it is our responsibility to ensure that they have a safe place to succeed. The fears that they will pose a risk are just fears that only need education to correct them. People live in grizzly country in many other parts of the US and they live safely sice grizzly bears do not prey on humans. The risk to livestock is minimal, especially when natural prey is bountiful. Hikers already need to be cognizant of their surroundings in the area of the release due to black bears and cougars, so it does not need to change their hiking behavior

Grizzlies avoid human contact whenever possible. Grizzlies do not pose a risk to salmon populations and as part of a healthy ecosystem and can help stabilize them. Humans are the biggest threat to salmon.

Correspondence ID: 12767Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Manchester, WA 98353
United States of America
Outside Organization: NA Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 09:07:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I approve of the draft plan to restore grizzly bears in Washington State.

Correspondence ID: 12768Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Louisville, KY 40245
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 09:19:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The reintroduction of Grizzlies into the North Cascades is a terrible idea. As one who is an avid outdoor woman, the thought of have more alpha predators roaming the mountains is not something I look forward to dealing with. Nor is there any scientific data that can prevent these animals from dropping out of assigned ranges and into ranches and backyards of current residents. There is zero benefit from spending money pursuing a plan for reestablishing grizzlies.

Though I do not currently reside in WA, I grew up there and still have family in the state.

Correspondence ID: 12769Project:112008Document:132104
Address: richland, WA 00352
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 09:20:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I fully support the re-introduction of grizzly bears in the restoration area.

Correspondence ID: 12770Project:112008Document:132104
Address: renton, WA 98059
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 09:21:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Stupid idea. One of the stated objectives in the EIS is:
Provide Pacific Northwest residents and visitors with the opportunity to again experience grizzly bears in their native habitat.

The last thing you want is to experience a grizzly in its native habitat.

When the first fatality attributable to a grizzly in this area occurs, the bureaucrats who signed off on this should be charged with accessory to murder.

Correspondence ID: 12771Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 09:23:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is a bad idea. My family has been hiking in the Cascade mountains for over 50 years. Black bears are scary but Grizzly bears are deadly. Save money and save human lives by leaving the Grizzly bears alone where they currently reside.

Correspondence ID: 12772Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Fall City, WA 98024
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 09:26:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My family and I strongly believe in reestablishing grizzly bears to the Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 12776Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Oakville, WA 98568
United States of America
Outside Organization: Five Star Farm Business(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,11 2023 09:32:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The idea of introducing Grizzly Bears into where they used to roam...so many years ago seems to be much like the introducing of the wolves in Eastern WA. That project has not been popular with the area it was introduced.

That project created a shift in the wild animals that had adapted to NOT having the predictor wolves...

We already have a good number of bears in the North Cascades. And if I remember correctly those have sometimes caused trouble with hikers and livestock. Adding Grizzly bears would change the environment that has mostly been doing just fine.

It just does not seem like a good thing, it likely would end up like the wolves project.

Thank you for the opportunity to give comments.

Correspondence ID: 12777Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98116
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 09:35:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am opposed to re-introducing grizzly bears into the North Cascades. My family routinely hikes and goes on remote pack trips in the high backcountry. This action presents a risk to our safety and the current ecosystem is not under threat or suffering as a result of no grizzly bears.

Correspondence ID: 12778Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, UN 98115
Mexico
Outside Organization: Private Idividual Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 09:44:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Too dangerous, please do not reintroduce grizzlies to any part of WA State.

Correspondence ID: 12779Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98107
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 09:45:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I would love brown/grizzly bears to be reintroduced to North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 12781Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98105
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 09:48:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I've backpacked in the North Cascades National Park on many occasions. As noted in the Seattle Times, "North Cascades National Park has no plans to install bear wires for hanging food or to make any changes to existing frontcountry or backcountry campsites, according to U.S. Fish & Wildlife spokesperson Andrew LaValle."

Why not? Yellowstone backcountry sites have bear wires for hanging food. It's not always possible to find the perfect tree. After a few grizzly-human incidents, will the park require bear canisters in the backcountry? This is a worse option since some will ignore the rule--increasing the likelihood of an encounter.

If the park isn't going to bother protecting its visitors, then I am against introducing grizzlies into the park. Sooner or later, a deadly encounter will happen and the park service will close whole sections of the park and impose onerous requirements on its visitors. The national park system must remain open to the people of the United States and not become a closed-off wildlife preserve.

Correspondence ID: 12782Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98125
United States of America
Outside Organization: None Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 09:50:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not te introduce grizzly bears to the north cascades. It would be tooooo dangerous for anyone in the area to hike/ bike/ camp etc. see what is happening in Montana w all the injuries. I will need to either stop being in the woods or bring a gun Please reconsider

Thank you
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 12783Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Glacier, WA 98244
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 09:53:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The grizzly bear, on this continent, is the one animal capable of reminding the most arrogant species on Earth its true place in the world,"

Correspondence ID: 12784Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 09:59:58

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Greetings, I am a hunter, I have been a hunter my entire life, I was raised in Alaska and hunting and fishing was a necessity.

For the last forty or so years, I have lived in central Washington. I spend a lot of my time in the woods, hiking, hunting and in winter, snowmobiling. My current hunting activity is focused primarily on Black Bear hunting. I see between 5-10 Bears a year, I am selective on the bear I harvest. Many years I do not take a bear, however I spend a lot of time monitoring bear activity and behavior. I may be more knowledgeable than most when it comes to bears.

Introduction of Grizzly Bears to the PNW is simply ridiculous! These are Apex predators. This move will eventually result in the death of humans. When hiking or hunting, I meet numerous hikers, who are oblivious to the dangers of Bears, Cougars and large animals. I notice most do not even carry Bear spray or a firearm, and many are in the forest with small children in tow.

The last black bear I harvested was about 50 yards away when It charged towards me. I shot three times, each time striking the bear with a .338 federal caliber round. I reload my own ammunition, and this is a powerful medium range caliber. The bear dropped about 15 feet from me. This was a medium size black Bear. Had this been a Grizzly, I don't think I would have fared well.

Please reconsider this fool hardy plan that will result in human death. Grizzly bears will have human encounters. Grizzly bears are not needed or wanted in the PNW. Don't allow a social experiment by misguided environmentalists to proceed, a project that WILL result in the death and mauling of humans.

Correspondence ID: 12785Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Snoqualmie, WA 98065
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 10:10:45

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No!

We don't need another apex predator. Grizzly bears are a dangerous predator and should not be reintroduced.

Correspondence ID: 12786Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98501
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 10:11:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This seems utterly dangerous and foolish. Utterly dangerous. NO

Correspondence ID: 12787Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Black Diamond, WA 98010
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 10:12:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am not in support of reintroducing the grizzly to Washington state. our state is no longer predator friendly, as evidenced by wolf reintroduction. It would only be a very short time before grizzlies would start preying on livestock and then the answer is always to cave to the rancher and exterminate the guilt predator. If grizzlies migrate to Washington from Canada there doesn't seem to be much to prevent that, but I fear the same no win situation would apply. It breaks my heart to see what's happening with the wolf population and I do not wish that upon the grizzly.

Correspondence ID: 12789Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tahuya, WA 98588
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 10:20:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have hiked in many parts of North Cascades National Park and I have reviewed the Grizzly Restoration Plan. I am impressed the most by information regarding the very large territory individual bears range as habitat. Bears will not, as many maintain, self-isolate in remote areas but will go where food sources are most available. That makes it almost certain that bears and humans will cross paths as those places are areas of easiest travel. This type of interaction can have bad results for humans.

The Grizzly is not a species in danger of extinction under current land use planning. Given the danger that they would pose to human use in our North Cascades National Park artificial introduction there should not be undertaken.

Correspondence ID: 12790Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Colville, WA 99114
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 10:25:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please allow nature to take it's course, if grizzlies are meant to be in the cascades they will migrate from British Columbia, look at the bear attacks happening in the rocky mountain region, it's a serious mistake to be transplanting apex carnivores so close to large human population centers, this will result in many people being put in harms way!

Correspondence ID: 12791Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lynnwood, WA 98036
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 10:25:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The NPS continued efforts to reintroduce Grizzlies to the North Cascade after several previous failed attempts is abominable. Grizzlies should not be reintroduced to the 2nd most populated western state. Bears have been known to travel down from BC but do not stay because the habitat is not to their liking. The North Cascades Elk herd is well below management objective and there would be a lack of food and concerns about what these bears impacts would be on neonate survival, especially as populations adjust to the recently arrived Gray wolf. As for the Ecosystem benefits, there is no benefit that grizzlies provide that are not also provided by the Black Bear, something we have numerous of in WA.

This is yet another attempt at misguided 'conservation' and should not happen. As bears increase in BC due to their ban on hunting, they will naturally disperse to the North Cascades if the bears themselves decide it is suitable habit.

Like the Gray wolf, Grizzlies should not be listed under the federal ESA. These are species that are thriving where they already occur. The notion that they need to exist across their historic range lacks understanding of human needs and tolerances. It is a shame to see the Parks service fall victim to this environmentalist sham.

Correspondence ID: 12792Project:112008Document:132104

Address: SHELTON, WA 98584
United States of America
Outside Organization: retired Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 10:30:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent,
North Cascades National Park
SEDRO WOOLEY, WA

IN REFERENCE: Draft EIS Introduction of Grizzly Bears to NOCA

I have reviewed the referenced Environmental Impact Statement the U.S. F & W S and the NPS have presented in the matter of re-introduction of Grizzly bears to North Cascades National Park. As a park user I am AGAINST the idea that Grizzly bears be introduced to the area in North Cascades NP and to, more generally, the State of Washington.

These animals are known to be vicious. While I am a native Washingtonian, I resided elsewhere in this country while working for, of all things, the National Park Service. Years ago we took our then grown kids to North Cascades National Park, where we enjoyed day hikes. Before that as a youngster I went on "The Skagit Tours" run by Seattle City Light, in the Newhalem area. Were this variety of bears reintroduced as planned, I would NOT VISIT NOCA.

Also I have, on a couple of occasions, visited the Stehekin vicinity. If the Grizzlies are introduced to the park I would not go there ANYMORE either, certainly not visiting with out-of-town friends or relatives if U.S.F.W.S. brings this variety of bear in to our state.

Also previous to my National Park Service employment, in college I worked on the Wenatchee National Forest for five seasons; I, in my time "off," hiked all over the U.S.F.S. lands on its' trails which border "the now" North Cascades National Park.

I was - fifty years ago, - part of the Holden Village volunteer staff one summer. I hiked many trails in the Lucerne and Holden area, but would this species of bear be brought in, no longer want to (even if I could still do this) do that. I have walked the "hike" between the Lady of the Lake Lucerne dock and the road to Holden Village by myself in each direction. This would not be a possibly anymore due to the very dangerous variety of bear the Park plans to bring in.

Please Do Not Bring Grizzly Bears Into North Cascades National Park.

Respectfully submitted,

Correspondence ID: 12793Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spokane, WA 99203
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 10:35:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm writing to share my support for the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem. Having hiked and backpacked in, not only the North Cascades, but in Canada, Montana, Idaho and Wyoming, where grizzly bears live, I am fully aware of being "bear aware" in remote places. Reintroduction is an important part of stabilizing these important ecosystems. I understand there is always a possibility of bear/human encounters and should those occur near residential areas, I support the humane removal of the problem bear. I expect these occurrences to be rare and believe the reintroduction outweighs the risks. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 12794Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98112
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 10:36:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: NO. Just don't do it. Do not introduce grizzly bears to the North Cascades. I have been hiking in the Cascade Mountains in Washington, including frequently in the North Cascades for 45 years. I have also been twice to Banff and Jasper parks in Canada. I do not want to see signs at all of our trailheads: "Parties of 6 or more required" "All hikers must carry bear spray". That's Canada, don't even think about backpacking with your children. Those

signs are there for a reason. I do not want to have to always hike with 5 other people, or to be afraid of backpacking, sleeping in a flimsy tent, hiking around a bend in the trail at the end of the day, tired and sore and near to where I plan to camp, and then there is a grizzly. Why should women have to plan hiking around their menstrual period, because yes, women have been attacked by grizzlies, while menstruating, in Glacier National Park, do not pretend that it's not a problem. You also cannot ignore the recent grizzly attacks in Montana. "Grizzlies are no more dangerous than black bears" is not really true and you know it. In Alaska and Canada people frequently carry rifles and portable electric fences for camping in grizzly territory, I spent a summer in the Canadian Arctic, doing research in polar bear territory, we carried rifles at all times. I don't think we are prepared to do that here in Washington.

Also, as our climate changes, the park will change, and the mix of animals in it will change. The apex predators will become stressed and therefore more aggressive toward humans, it's inevitable. Why introduce another apex predator to become stressed? It won't be more than a few years and we will see the parks working to maintain some kind of stable ecosystem, but one that won't look like the existing ecosystem. I think you should begin to look at that task, instead of this dangerous idea to re-introduce the grizzly. Canada can keep the grizzlies; they are not endangered there.

In addition to the problems presented by climate change, the mountains in Washington state have seen a large increase in the number of hikers, especially since 2020. Is not part of your job to provide recreational activities in the National Park? Why introduce another safety problem. I am a hiker, I'm not some armchair "save the bears" person. I have hiked around many bears, please listen to me.

Correspondence ID: 12795Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mountlake Terrace, WA 9043
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 10:37:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: If possible please withhold my personal identity information. Thank you.

I am writing in support of the reintroduction of the Grizzly to the North Cascades. I believe the more our ecosystems can be restored the stronger they will be. We need the wild in our wilderness. I know the Grizzly is a dramatic animal because of its size and reputation but it too has a right to life. And it fills a space in nature.

It does not bother me if some human activities must be curtailed or areas restricted. Humans do not all the areas to recreate. Our lives are enriched by a thriving environment.

Correspondence ID: 12796Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Yelm, WA 98597
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 10:37:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support this 100%. Please restore brown bears to this ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 12797Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98112
United States of America
Outside Organization: Na Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 10:38:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Opposed to introduction of grizzlies into North Cascades. Bad idea. Grizzlies kill people.

Correspondence ID: 12798Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lake Forest Park, WA 98155-5536
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 10:38:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of grizzlies in the Cascades. I believe humans should learn to coexist with wildlife and support healthy ecosystems. I look to Canada where people have learned to live alongside grizzly bears and think we can do it here too, given some education around how to be safe in bear country.

Correspondence ID: 12800Project:112008Document:132104
Address: RENTON, WA 98057
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 10:40:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: This plan will keep those who do not currently enjoy the wilderness out of it for generations. Also, depending on the disability, this could endanger people who are covered under the ADA.

I specifically request that you see how your plan effects people covered by the Americans With Disabilities Act, and if you are putting them in more danger than those who are not covered.

I request a reply to this.

Correspondence ID: 12801Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98102
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 10:42:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As an avid user of this backcountry area, I support the plan to re-introduce grizzlies into the North Cascades to restore Moore fully the natural habitat and ecosystem of this beautiful area.

Correspondence ID: 12802Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America
Outside Organization: On The Mark Closets Business
Received: Nov,11 2023 10:52:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: This is an awful idea that I do not support. As someone who spends time in the North Cascades, with kids, I do not want to need to worry about Grizzlies in our forests.
We already have to worry about tweakers because Washington State Government won't deal with mental health problems. And you want to add Grizzlies!?

What happened to if it saves just one life? This will cost lives.

Correspondence ID: 12803Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Aurora, CO 80014
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 10:54:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Superintendent Striker spoke of the likelihood of grizzly bears naturally migrating from Canada to the North Cascade ecosystem. This would allow a natural reintroduction of grizzlies without having to literally "manhandle" their reintroduction process using noisy helicopters and other man invasive tools: all extra expenditures to boot. There are many roads that bisect the reintroduction area if indeed there becomes a need to translocate the grizzlies. However, Montana really doesn't have the "extra" grizzlies to lose based on they are not really yet recovered there.

Please reevaluate the two action alternatives to stay within wilderness character. Both alternatives violate the Wilderness Act. An alternative that combines a natural recovery with necessary population augmentation under full ESA protections should be analyzed.

Also the "no action" alternative has many good Bear Smart components that should be included in all the offered alternatives.

Correspondence ID: 12804Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Deming, WA 98244
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 10:57:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Yes, of course. Bring them back. And we live in the foothills of the Cascades, potential grizzly territory, but we'll manage if the grizzly can be allowed to manage. We already have black bear on our land fairly often. We'll just watch our dogs and be respectful. If we don't take steps to support the original ecosystem I fear that we will lose it forever. Bring them back.

Correspondence ID: 12805Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Clinton, WA 98236
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 10:59:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We have hiked in Canada where grizzly bears are located. Canada has signs on trail heads that hikers must be in groups of 5 or face a fine. In addition, rangers with shotguns are in constant patrols on the trails. If the US followed similar rules, it would greatly affect recreational hiking, as individual hikers or couples would not be free to roam the forest. In addition, you would not want bears near population centers like Bellingham or near heavily hiked areas on Mt. Baker.

Since the bears are near the US border in Canada already and/or will be relocated there by Canadian tribes, they will eventually make their way down into Washington. There is no need to accelerate the process on the US side of the border.

Correspondence ID: 12806Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Cle Elum, WA 98922
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 11:02:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzlies will kill livestock. Owners will kill grizzlies. Keep the grizzlies in Yellowstone

Correspondence ID: 12807Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Shoreline, WA 98177
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 11:02:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As an avid hiker and backpacker, I am strongly opposed to intentionally re-introducing grizzlies to the North Cascades. There are two reasons for my opposition to this plan.

First, grizzlies are aggressive and in areas with a large grizzly population, humans are regularly killed in unprovoked attacks. Therefore, intentionally re-introducing this species increases the risk to humans engaged in wilderness recreation and may require hikers and/or backpackers to avoid using some areas in the North Cascades, further increasing crowding and pressure on an already limited resource of recreational wilderness.

Second, because re-introducing this species may limit opportunities for safe wilderness recreation, it is likely to have a long term effect of reducing public support for national parks and wilderness if gives the impression that the National Park Service is essentially choosing to reduce rather than support people recreating in the back-country.

Correspondence ID: 12808Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 11:07:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a Washington-state resident, who actively using the outdoors and who owns a second, country home in Lyle, WA, at the foot of the Cascades, I whole heartedly support the re-introduction of grizzlies to their natural habitat in the Cascades.

I believe and know from reading articles on the subject that mankind (aka ranchers) and grizzlies can co-exist. I also know that the eco-system benefits from having an apex predator in the system.

To support their re-introduction, I would suggest that the NPS coordinate with WSDOT and the FHA to build more land-bridges over the highway system to encourage migration of animals across the Cascades.

Lastly, I would like to thank you for doing this!

Correspondence ID: 12809Project:112008Document:132104

Address: King County, WA 98072
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 11:11:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is an absurd proposal with no merit or vision for the future impact to our residents and parks. Please do not proceed with this reckless misuse of resources.

Correspondence ID: 12810Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bothell, WA 98021
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 11:21:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I would like to see the grizzly bear reintroduced in the north cascades. My family and I regularly enjoy the north cascades with skiing and hiking at Baker Mtn. I think the limited and gradual introduction that you are proposing will allow all sides and participants to adjust as needed to the new dynamics involved. We have adult sons who have families

living in rural Whatcom Cty. They would like to see this proposal move forward. We also have relatives who have lived in the Glacier area of Montana for many years. They are careful and respectful with the grizzly population but feel that the environment is profoundly richer because of them.

Correspondence ID: 12811Project:112008Document:132104
Address: KENMORE, WA 98028
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 11:23:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: ABSOLUTELY DO NOT RESTORE GRIZZLY BEARS TO THE NORTH CASCADES!

Correspondence ID: 12812Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Spokane, WA 99223
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 11:24:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am requesting the NPS take "No Action" regarding the proposal to reintroduce Grizzly Bear to the Northern Cascades region. This is a horrific proposal and would clearly endanger the lives of both humans and bears. As a government agency, the NPS primary concern ought to be PUBLIC SAFETY! Do not forget it's the National Park 'SERVICE', and remember who the agency is providing the service for: The Public, not the bears.

Correspondence ID: 12813Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98144
United States of America
Outside Organization: N/A Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 11:24:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am writing to encourage the adoption of the Preferred Alternative C for grizzly bear restoration in the North Cascade National Park. I have followed the plan to restore grizzly bears since it was first introduced in the 1970s and while I support the concept, there has been a significant increase in human activity in the park and surrounding area in the intervening years. For example, my daughter and her family now own recreational property along the Cascade River and I personally witnessed several hundred people on a day hike to Cascade Pass. Therefore, I believe that designating the grizzly bear restoration as an experimental population under Section 10 of the Endangered Species Act is the appropriate approach to allow maximum management flexibility to make changes or possibly halt the program if necessary.

Correspondence ID: 12814Project:112008Document:132104
Address: twisp, WA 98856
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 11:30:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I lived for a long time in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem, where grizzlies have made a comeback from their low population numbers. I am a boater, backpacker and hiker -- in other words, a frequent traveler in possible grizzly terrain -- and I am in favor of restoring grizzlies to the North Cascades. I favor alternative C.

Correspondence ID: 12815Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Edmonds, WA 98026
United States of America
Outside Organization: Mule Deer Foundation Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 11:33:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support Alternative A. I am in and using North Cascades National Park an average of 3 times a month, year round. I also use the neighboring National Forest lands frequently.

The plan to transplant these apex predators into the Northern Cascades is unwise and contrary to the North American Wildlife Conservation Model. Grizzlies haven't been hunted in several decades and there are grizzly bears to the north in BC. Why haven't they repopulated on their own with no hunting pressure? Because the habitat will no longer support them. Your proposal not only endangers the animals you seek to "protect", but prioritizes these predators over other wildlife AND human beings in the area. If there were a void, nature would fill it. Stop playing God and return to practicing sound scientific wildlife management. Do not transplant grizzlies into the Northern Cascades.

Let this one go. Why are you pushing it so hard?

Reintroduce Wolves in Washington, D.C.

Reintroduce Cougars in New York City.

Reintroduce Bears in Chicago.

Reintroduce the plain and simple idea to stop Human meddling in Nature's affairs. There was an old fable about this, starts small and then they ended up sending in the Elephants. But what will crop the Elephants?

Stick your nose back into your own backyard and feed some squirrels if that's what will help you sleep better at night. We have plenty of Black Bears in the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 12816Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Olympia, WA 98512
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 11:34:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzlies have been able to co-exist with humans in BC, the Yukon and Alaska with relatively few attacks against humans. If reintroduced to the North Cascades odds are very low that most people would never see one, even at a distance. Science shows they are very beneficial to the ecosystem in which they live and are considered a keystone species. Please do not let fear and ignorance about these beautiful animals guide your decision making process. I for one would be thrilled to have an opportunity to see a grizzly while hiking or camping in the North Cascades. As it is I travel to Yellowstone at least every other year in hopes of seeing these majestic creatures and the wolf packs living in the park. Please bring the bear back to it's rightful place place in our state.

Correspondence ID: 12817Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 11:35:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I oppose reintroduction.

Correspondence ID: 12818Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98199
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 11:35:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I strongly support the reintroduction of Grizzly Bears into their former territory of North Cascades National Park.

We have the responsibility to do everything possible to help the population grow, as it continues to remain on the Endangered Species List.

Many experienced hikers that go backcountry already know how to adjust their awareness when they hike in Glacier or Yellowstone National Parks.

The concern of private livestock owners should not dictate the the need for improving the range for the bears, as it is our responsibility to help improve bear populations, we must accommodate the bears and coexist.

I support Alternative Plan B.

Correspondence ID: 12819Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Hillsboro, OR 97124
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 11:40:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I'm all for Grizzly Bear Restoration . I do fear poaching though and I know logging and clear cutting could be a factor in the Grizzly Bear success . I would hate to see these magnificent animals introduced to the area only to have them Illegally hunted or laws passed to allow logging in a few years in the areas the Grizzly are reintroduced.

Correspondence ID: 12820Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 11:42:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Bears!!!

Correspondence ID: 12821Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Kirkland, WA 98034
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 11:45:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I understand that there are environmental impacts to not having the grizzly bear in the north cascades, but I also understand that they were eliminated for a region. They are not black bears, and we do hear stories from glacier and Yellowstone of people being mauled to death by grizzly bears. I prefer to be able to hike with my family in the north cascades without having to worry about these dangerous animals. Please consider the impact to people's safety when making this decision. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 12822Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellevue, WA 98006
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 11:47:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: It is quite unclear what the intended goal for the reintroduction of the grizzly into the North Cascades. This seems to me a complete misunderstanding of the balance of nature, and an attempt to steer the natural process, just for the satisfaction of the few.

Who benefits from this restoration? I think it is grizzly, rather than other wild lives in the region including many humans. If NPS is really looking for the restoration of the nature to many centuries ago, NPS should also look into restoration of grey wolf and lynx at the same time rather than the grizzly alone. (NPS may also want to fund to mature genetical engineering to restore mammoth population around this region.)

I thus oppose the forced restoration of grizzly into the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 12823Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bainbridge island, WA 98110
United States of America
Outside Organization: Citizen Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 11:50:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am in favor of option B introduce 25 bears, keep endangered species protection in place.

Correspondence ID: 12824Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98146
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 11:53:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hell no. That'd be the same as introducing deranged axe murderers in the North Cascades. You normally wouldn't see them and if you did you may or may not be killed or maimed. Just imagine how outraged people would be with turning that national park into a sanctuary for crazies. That'd be exactly the same thing as introducing grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 12825Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98133
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 11:53:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: An extremely well thought out and detailed plan! I have no idea whether you're hearing from people who are opposed to the plan, but I did want to add my voice in support.

My concern is about climate change, which is somewhat addressed in the draft plan, but mostly from the perspective of whether re-introduction of grizzlies will impact the climate. My concern is how climate change will impact the ****grizzlies**** environment, causing them to perhaps need to expand their territories in order to find sufficient food/water/shelter - and how the human-managed areas nearby will react. Another concern is the impact climate change will have on those nearby human-managed areas which would then lead to humans claiming the need to encroach on protected habitat

My preference, and suggestion, is that the NPS make it clear that re-introducing grizzlies in and of itself RESTORES the habitat, and should therefore remain the higher priority.

NPS needs also to be clear that maintaining and protecting sufficient wilderness to support a grizzly population is a higher priority than accommodating human expansion into grizzly habitat when climate change degrades land that humans occupy and use (whether for habitation, agriculture, or recreation). To put it simply, when climate change makes it harder to grow certain crops or hunt certain animals, the humans can change what they eat, or even relocate. Grizzlies cannot (not without becoming prey in non-protected areas).

The NPS can't say this, but I can: There is no shortage of humans, humans are not endangered, humans will not die out. Grizzlies, on the other hand, are vulnerable to climate change in ways humans are not; therefore, grizzlies should take priority. (I would and do make the same arguments for any non-human species whose habitat, food supply, and general well being are at risk for degradation or elimination due to human pressures.)

Climate change is humans' fault. Not the fault of the wild creatures. Changes to agricultural, hunting/fishing, and wilderness harvesting in general caused by climate change SHOULD NOT result in a further penetration of wilderness by humans, a further degradation of wilderness by humans, or a further elimination of wild species by humans.

I think it would be prudent if the NPS could say so in its plan, albeit much more diplomatically than I have.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 12826Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Blakely Island, WA 98222
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 11:53:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am adamantly opposed to the introduction of Ursus Horribilus to the North Cascades in WA. I've had close encounters with grizzly bears while in MT and they are a very dangerous animal with a completely different attitude towards humans than black bears. Most people in WA that live or recreate in the proposed new grizzly range are only used to black bears that generally run away immediately when they see a human. Not so for grizzlies, they size you up and are not intimidated at all by humans. The people that will encounter grizzlies if introduced are ill prepared for an encounter with an extremely dangerous predator like grizzlies, there will be people killed and injured, that's a given based on anywhere grizzlies live. There was a good reason grizzlies were killed on sight (I don't agree with this at all) because they are so dangerous to man and livestock.

Correspondence ID: 12827Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Redmond, WA 98053
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 11:56:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the north Cascades mountains. They are an important part of the ecosystem that should be restored.

Correspondence ID: 12828Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 11:57:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I reside in the Methow valley and have hiked and backpacked in the North Cascades and Pasayten wilderness for many years. I am opposed to the reintroduction of Grizzly bears in our region. The threat to human life with Grizzly encounters cannot be denied. As recent as last summer and fall there were several fatal bear attacks reported in Montana, Canada, and Alaska. Among the victims were experienced hikers and campers and took all the recommended bearwise precautions. In one instance an empty can of bear spray was found at the site, presumably discharged without

success. Grizzly's in Washington? No thanks! Afraid? You bet! I can't imagine sleeping in a tent again knowing these apex predators are possibly near.

Correspondence ID: 12829Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Olympia, WA 98516
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 11:58:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I have hiked and backpacked in the Cascades for many years. I would be extremely uncomfortable continuing this activity if Grizzly bears were introduced into the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 12830Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98146
United States of America
Outside Organization: Psms, WTA, Mountaineers Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 11:59:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do not reintroduce grizzly bears into the North Cascades fir safety reasons (real and perceived). Outdoor recreational trails are already crowded during the season and reintroduction of bears would force more hikers into already crowded hikes in other regions.

Correspondence ID: 12831Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bremerton, WA 98310
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 12:06:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: hello
I am against the grizzly bear being reintroduced into the cascade mountains. I have lived around them in montana. My knowledge of the grizzly, they are not afraid of humans and they also attack people and livestock for easy kill. Washington state has so many people that use the cascade mountains for recreation. I have seen how the wolf migration has work out in washington state. The state has not done there job controlling the wolf population like they said they would do. I feel the grizzly bears being reintroduced into the cascade mountains, we will see the same problems that we have seen with the wolves in washington state. Don't bring grizzly bears to washington state.

Correspondence ID: 12832Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98144
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 12:07:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: No grizzlies in the North Cascades please.

Correspondence ID: 12834Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bothell, WA 98011
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 12:14:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: It has not been described how the ecosystem would fail without the reintroduction of Grizzly Bears to an area they have already been eradicated from. Does anybody advocating for this want to accept responsibility for a bear they took part in placing in an area leaving that area and killing somebody's child? Lastly, people live and visit the PNW for the outdoor experiences; do you really want to jeopardize that by inserting a violent and unreasonable predator to potential camp grounds and hiking trails?

Correspondence ID: 12835Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Lummi Island, WA 98262
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 12:23:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am against reintroduction Grizzly bears to Washington State mountains and forests and plains.

Correspondence ID: 12836Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Arlington, WA 98223
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 12:24:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I've lived in the Pacific Northwest my entire life, and fully support the re-introduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades. I believe they're essential to the balance of our beautiful environment.

Correspondence ID: 12837Project:112008Document:132104
Address: LUMMI ISLAND, WA 98262
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 12:24:49
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I vote NO on Grizzly bears in Washington State.

It would be terrifying to have them back. I do not want to go hiking and feel like I need someone with a rifle with me.

I certainly do not want them to be so close that they could swim to where I live. There is a reason they were wiped out of the area in the past. They are huge animals with long claws and teeth, are extremely dangerous, and can kill with no problem. They can easily attack not only people on foot, but can break into someone's home or car with no problem.

Correspondence ID: 12838Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellevue, WA 98006
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 12:24:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Yes!

I'm an avid hiker and backpacker. I love the North Cascades, my favorite place on the planet. Completely in favor of reintroducing grizzlies to the NC.

Correspondence ID: 12839Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Olympia, WA 98502
United States of America

Outside Organization: Department of Natural Resources Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 12:24:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please let grizzly bears come back to the North Cascades. It would be a beautiful and historic moment, to reintroduce such an iconic species back into their native environment. It would undoubtedly benefit the ecosystem, possibly even tourism, and it's just the right thing to do. Please do the right thing.

Correspondence ID: 12840Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98136
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 12:27:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I'm an outdoor backpacker and climber who frequently recreates in the North Cascades. Grizzly bears should not be deliberately introduced back into the North Cascades unless there is an absolute ecological imperative to do so. These bears have been gone for a long time now and there are more and more hikers every year. Our healthy black bear population is increasingly in contact with humans in more populated mountain areas (walking around town in Leavenworth, for example). Grizzlies are highly aggressive apex predators, known for charging and attacking without reservation. Our trails and backwoods are heavily used and more so all the time. The plan to reintroduce sounds to me like a very expensive recipe for disaster.

Correspondence ID: 12841Project:112008Document:132104
Address: snohomish, WA 98290
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 12:28:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: First let me give you some background about me, I worked in Alaska from 1983 until I retired in 2011, 17 years of that time was in Valdez, where the bears, both Brown bears & Black bears are common during the summer fish runs. I am very familiar with identification of Brown bears, mainly by the shape of their ears. Last year in September while driving up Highway 2, I watched a Brown bear cross the highway at the first chain up area as I was driving East. I and two other cars had to stop for the bear to casually walk across the road from North to South and disappear into the trees. The time of day was early morning, it was light but not sunup yet. The point is that the Brown bears are already here, or at least one bear is here.

Correspondence ID: 12842Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Othello, WA 99344
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 12:28:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We the citizens of Washton do not want Grizzle bears reintroduce in the state. Please listen to the people who live here not the people who are pushing for this. If they want them so bad then put them in their back yard! They will change their minds quickly.

Correspondence ID: 12843Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Lake Stevens, WA 98258
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 12:32:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am definitely opposed to the introduction of Grizzly Bears to the North Cascades. We have put into place so many protections for salmon in our state. This would be a huge step back. And Livestock would be at risk. But most importantly it would be a risk for humans.

People in this area are not used to Grizzly Bear precautions when enjoying hikes or camping. It would take a long time for people to learn the skills of awareness, keeping food away, and carrying Bear Spray. And the learning would come at a steep price of human safety and life. Expecting a population not used to this kind of predator to understand the risks and prevention techniques is not reasonable.

And my last objection has to do with climate change. We are seeing more interactions with wildlife in general due to habitats changing, not to mention development and growth for housing. What would assure us the Grizzlies would stay in 'their' area and not migrate to more urban areas? There is already a risk of the bears migrating from Canada. Why do we need to add more to an eco system that has not had them in decades.

The simple argument that they once lived here is a weak one at best. The grizzly bear is only a "threatened" species. I think if we want to protect them, do conservation and other measures in areas where they already exists. Do not bring them to new places that are not used to dealing with them. Even one human death is not worth that.

Sincerely, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 12844Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 12:33:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is an excellent opportunity to bring grizzly bears back to where they once lived. I highly support option C.

Correspondence ID: 12845Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lopez Island, WA 98261
United States of America

Outside Organization: Private Citizen Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 12:36:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I Support option C. Grizzly bears are an integral and essential component of our natural ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 12846Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98122
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 12:46:37

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am an avid hiker and camper all over the Washington area. I have attended meetings about reintroduction of grizzly bears in the North Cascades over the years. I am also a veterinarian who has studied animal welfare and ecosystems. I am fully in favor of reintroducing grizzly bears in the North Cascades. They are essential to a healthy ecosystem and we have a possibility to improve this ecosystem in our state for generations to come. I believe the experts who have sound data and experience in grizzly bear reintroduction. The bears can be effectively and safely reintroduced. I understand there are ways to protect livestock and hikers from bear attacks. Public outreach and education on living with grizzly bears will make for a successful reintroduction.

Correspondence ID: 12847Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bothell, WA 98011
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 12:47:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a parent of avid hikers, I have definite concerns regarding safety along these Steheken trail ways (or any of the WA trails) if brown bears are reintroduced. Not sure how you can minimize the people/bear interactions.

Correspondence ID: 12848Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98107
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 12:47:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I would oppose reintroduction of grizzlies to the North Cascades. As a person who enjoyed hiking and other

recreation, I would be afraid if you introduced them. We need our outside activities in the Seattle winters.

Please do not bring Grizzlies back to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 12849Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98118
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 12:57:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Reintroduction is a bad idea. Those are dangerous animals and becoming more so out in Montana. I'm not persuaded by all those who minimize the odds of interaction. Recreation in the North Cascades will be growing rapidly, unless of course news of grizzly encounters keeps people out of the woods.

Correspondence ID: 12850Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98199
United States of America
Outside Organization: Washington Bikes Non-Governmental
Received: Nov,11 2023 13:03:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Do not reintroduce Grizzlies in north Cascades. Just in the past six months there have been 4 grizzly attacks fatal to the humans in North America, more than wolves, cougars and black bears combined. The danger is real.

In Yellowstone there are very expensive efforts every year to kill dozens of "problem" grizzlies. But the park has so many visitors, there are resources to pay for grizzly control, unlike the north Cascades. Statistics showing attacks at less than 1 in a million visitors in Yellowstone are misleading, because Yellowstone attracts most of its visitors who just drive and stay in lodges and hotels in towns such as West Yellowstone or in the park. The statistics for hikers that stay overnight in the forest are closer to one attack per 50,000, more than that of cougars and wolves combined. The north Cascades has far more population and attracts far more hikers and fewer hotel-based visitors. It is the terminus of the Pacific Crest Trail. Thousands of thru-hikers pass through this area with their food laden packs in September, with no room for the extra weight of a gun or supplies of bear spray.

There is no evidence of any ecological benefit of grizzlies here. There are already wolves, cougars and black bears.

Correspondence ID: 12852Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Poulsbo, WA 98370
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 13:05:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in support of reintroducing grizzly bears to the North Cascades ecosystem. I teach high school biology, and we focus on the importance of keystone species. We have studied the degradation of ecosystems when those species are removed due to human action, such as removing sea otters from our coastal ecosystem and wolves from Yellowstone. As a keystone species, the grizzly bear needs to be back in the North Cascades as an apex predator controlling elk and other prey, and spreading seeds. The ecosystem evolved with grizzlies playing a critical role.

Additionally, grizzly bears are meaningful to local tribes, and my understanding is they are in support of the reintroduction. I stand with them.

We need to repair the damage Western expansion has caused as we recklessly removed creatures we found inconvenient to our own interests. We need to realize we are PART of the ecosystem, not lords over it.

I am a backpacker, and frankly, I am not at all excited about a possible grizzly encounter, but I can't let my own fear be the reason for the continued degradation of the natural ecosystem.

Sincerely,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 12853Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tonasket, WA 98855
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 13:06:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I can understand that some people like the idea of restoring local wildlife that may have been here in the past. In theory this sounds nice. Many of the people who are pushing for this live in urban areas and their lives will not be practically affected. The people who live in rural areas will be affected more. There are also some people in rural areas who don't have livestock or children who are for it. This is also because they are less likely to be affected.

People can say that "there have hardly been any grizzly bear deaths". However, it is not only about deaths of people. It is also the threats to livestock and it is also the potential threat and how that affects people's everyday lives who live in these areas.

For example, if there was a serial killer living somewhere in the Seattle area, then people would know this and have to take daily precautions. They will be on edge every day even though the chance is very small that they would be personally affected.

This is the main problem with the grizzly bear introduction. They can and have maimed and killed people so people going in the woods or doing anything outside have to be aware of this at all times in case they run into one. Everyone with livestock has to be on edge and people going into the wilderness have to be prepared to deal with a lethal threat. People with children have to take extra precautions with having them in the woods etc.

All the other animals in the woods in these areas are in general afraid of humans and don't really pose a threat but grizzly bears can be very aggressive.

So, this will change the every day lives and peace of those who live here. There is no reason that these large aggressive animals cannot be kept far away from civilization and livestock and left in the areas where they have over time naturally migrated to.

Thank you for taking into account the lives of the locals who whose every day lives would be affected by this.

-Rural Resident

Correspondence ID: 12855Project:112008Document:132104

Address: DUVALL, WA 98019
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 13:12:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not support the reintroduction of Grizzly bears into the North Cascades. Humans reintroducing animals does not work. We have seen wolves decimate the deer population in areas where they have been reintroduced. Grizzly bears will only make matters worse. It creates problems for farmers as well. Grizzly bears may have been a part of the ecosystem at one point But that was before the area was so populated. It no longer works. There is no magic way to turn the switch back on and return the ecosystem backward. It will only cause damage to the environment.

Correspondence ID: 12856Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 13:18:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am strongly in support of the proactive reintroduction of Grizzly Bears into the North Cascades Ecosystem. To provide grizzlies and communities with the best chance for coexistence, I support Alternative C, which provides greater flexibility and adaptive management.

I have lived in the Methow Valley for nearly 20 years and have recreated in North Cascades National Park and surrounding national forests since I was a child. Although I recognize the living and recreating amongst grizzly bears will require some changes to my lifestyle, I also recognize that grizzlies are a keystone species and belong here. As a resident near the best habitat for grizzly bear restoration, I know that I have options for where I live in this large and diverse country whereas these bears do not. Our communities value the wildlands just outside our doors. This privilege of living so close to wildlands also comes with the responsibility of allowing wildland to continue to be prime habitat for a wide range of plant and wildlife habitats, including those of species that were hunted to the point of extinction and deserve a place back in their native range.

Correspondence ID: 12857Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Covington, WA 98042
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 13:19:10

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not reintroduce dangerous grizzly bears to WA again. This puts people, pets and livestock at grave risk. Populations of grazing animals can be controlled by the predators that are already present and by hunting. Putting grizzly bears back in WA will end up getting people hurt and killed. Many people enjoy hiking in the beautiful wild areas that WA has to offer, don't make it less safe for people to live and recreate.

Correspondence ID: 12858Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Buckley, WA 98321
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 13:30:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No to the reintroduction of Grizzly Bears.

Correspondence ID: 12859Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellevue, WA 98006
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 13:32:12

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am deeply concerned about grizzly bear introduction into northern Washington. As an avid outdoor enthusiast, I enjoy hiking, camping and hunting. When being in the wilderness or camping in the north cascades, there is always the concern that wildlife will be encountered. Black bears and mountain lions are the animals that I would be most concerned encountering. Having to worry about encountering a grizzly bear is an entirely new type of concern. The size difference and temperament difference between black bears and grizzly bears is hardly comparable. I feel confident deterring and surviving a black bear encounter if it were to happen. Having to worry and plan for grizzly bear encounters is not something I or any other campers or hikers would like to have to be prepared for. Having to worry if a grizzly bear may come into your camp or tent at night, is much more likely to end poorly than would the same encounter with a black bear. I believe this introduction of grizzly bears will affect all inhabitants of northern Washington and should be avoided. There will be a grizzly bear attack at some point and someone will lose their life.

Trying to monitor the grizzly bears also will be very time consuming and will require constant funding and human resources to constantly monitor. Having to monitor and track the bears is not a natural part of living with bears. The fact that they will constantly have to be monitored and tracked demonstrates that they do not belong being placed in the same areas as humans. There is a reason that many parts of this country don't have grizzly bears, since human to grizzly conflict is not tolerable, and will result in attacks. Black bears, again, are much smaller and less aggressive in nature, and conflicts can much more easily be avoided or have positive outcomes.

The introduced grizzly bears also will still be wild animals and may not stay in the areas we place them or behave in the ways we hope they will. They may move to areas that are too close to residences and towns. Once in these areas, will we then be unable to move them out since they have such a protected status? All of this becomes a burden financially and socially on the residents of northern Washington.

Although it would be nice to think that grizzlies and humans can live peacefully together, that is not the case. Do not introduce grizzly bears into Washington.

Correspondence ID: 12860Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Covington, WA 98042
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 13:40:31

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: These bears have not been here since the 90's. They were eradicated due to their aggressive and violent nature. They kill people. This state is an amazing place for hikers and camping and it is enough to contend with the current bears we have. There is no need to introduce a violent predator back into our state. This is beyond ludicrous to consider.

Correspondence ID: 12861Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98116
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 13:41:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of grizzlies to the park.

Correspondence ID: 12862Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98105
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 13:45:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am not excited for this idea because while I hike and backpack with bear spray, I think I would be very scared and couldn't enjoy the experience as much. It would be nice if the NPS were willing to put more bear wires and bear compartments at Backcountry camping areas though. They said there are no plans to, but why though? There seems no good reason not to.

Correspondence ID: 12863Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sammamish, WA 98074
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 13:53:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: They belong here. We humans should accommodate them, rather than vice-versa. The root of the word "wilderness" is "wild." Let's let it be that way.

Correspondence ID: 12864Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Port orchard, WA 98367
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 13:57:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a resident of this state, I support hiking, camping and enjoying the wonderful outdoors, I do NOT support the reintroduction of Grizzly Bears into this state. Please refrain from proceeding with this action.

Correspondence ID: 12865Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olga, WA 98279
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 14:05:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Bring back the grizzlies

Correspondence ID: 12867Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Maple Valley, WA 98038
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 14:21:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. The proposal would bring up to 25 non-problem grizzly bears into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade and manage them as an experimental population.

Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

I am a hiker/backpacker married to a fly-angler. I have hiked numerous trails in the Cabinet-Yaaks over several years and

simply followed common sense precautions. I realize that coastal bears are different, but would also add that my spouse has for years done wilderness trips in AK and one in Kamchatka where "grizzly" bears are common. I backpack each season in the Pasayten where they are reputed to occasionally wander in -- same as in northern parts of Wind Rivers. I have done a little hiking in Denali and Glacier and seen grizzlies--but again, no issues. Neither of us has had dangerous encounters --I recognize it is possible-- but likelihood not high enough to prevent us from recreating in those places. I feel the same about N Cascades-- I would still go but would take more precautions than currently do with black bears (bear spray, etc). I am listing all this not because I am any expert -- and not to suggest complacency---but because I know there is fear out there--I belong to an outdoor rec org and lead trips sometimes--also I volunteer regularly in one of our national parks--so I can tell you people I encounter are irrationally afraid of wild animals, especially bears-- much education needed.

The 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Thank you

Correspondence ID: 12868Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bothell, WA 98012
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 14:23:21

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I hike in the beautiful North Cascades and, although it is at least a 90-minute drive for me, I visit as often as I can. Whenever I hike in bear country (black or otherwise) I carry bear spray. I have seen a few enormous black bears near Cascade Pass and Sahale Arm and they definitely get one's attention.

Having said all that, I do support the restoration of grizzlies into the North Cascades. They used to be a key component of a very complex ecosystem. They should be again.

I can understand local residents with animals who are rightly concerned about possible predation. I am not sure how to address their concerns but I do feel that we need to be able to live with the grizzlies, as do the people who live in what is still grizzly territory.

Correspondence ID: 12869Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 14:28:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of grizzlies into the North Cascades. Grizzlies were native to this area prior to being brought to near extinction by humans. They are an important keystone species that will positively impact the North Cascade region's ecosystem, wildlife, and vegetation. Grizzlies help aerate the soil, disperse seeds, and regulate prey species. They also carry great cultural significance for local tribes where they are featured in art and stories.

The North Cascades comprise almost 10,000 square miles of wilderness which has been deemed appropriate for grizzly habitat. Grizzlies coexist with humans elsewhere in the West, and management programs can lessen potential conflicts with surrounding communities, such as farms and ranches. Cooperative efforts between public agencies, local communities, tribes, conservation and outdoor groups can bring about a successful reintroduction.

I commend the NPS for pursuing this restoration plan.

Correspondence ID: 12870Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 14:29:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please reintroduce the grizzlies to the Cascades. They belong there. People need to learn proper respect of them and follow the rules about safe hiking and camping in their territory.

Correspondence ID: 12871Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Port Townsend, WA 98368
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 14:36:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live in and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

Furthermore, the 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Thank you for taking the time to keep our North Cascades wild!

Correspondence ID: 12872Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mukilteo, WA 98275
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 14:39:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Having the possibility of a grizzly bear encounter go from 0% to a non zero percent is a terrible idea. The psychological suffering of always having to be "on guard" for an aggressive bear isn't what any hiker wants.

"Awareness, to Servheen, means not wearing headphones, oblivious to the world, but rather staying in tune with your surroundings." I want to be relaxed hiking. Not constantly afraid.

Also important to note, inland grizzlies are more aggressive than coastal grizzlies. Are we masochist? Don't reintroduce.

Correspondence ID: 12873Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Arlington, WA 98223-8562
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 14:41:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hello,

I support the "no action" option. I do not support the reintroduction of grizzlies into the north Cascades. I do not believe our local entities will properly manage this population, given that other predator populations are not being properly managed, like cougars. We already see the negative impacts of the improperly managed predator population when looking at the decreased deer population and increased human conflicts. Introducing grizzlies is not a good use of public resources, this money would be better spent managing the wildlife we currently have.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 12874Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Burien, WA 98166
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 14:44:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm generally very pro environment and pro animal habitat. But I'm very opposed to deliberately reintroducing grizzlies in Washington state. People will be killed, not to mention stock. Hikers eventually will feel shut out of some areas. It just seems crazy. Let grizzlies thrive elsewhere, like Alaska -- where people hike with guns for bear protection. I don't think we need to encourage hikers here to carry guns -- or be bear food.

Correspondence ID: 12880Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98136
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 14:49:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not support the proposal to reintroduce grizzlies to Washington. As someone who lives and hikes in Washington, introduction of grizzlies poses needless risks and will deter people from being able to enjoy the wilderness in this state. Statistics about risk to humans are being misrepresented - you cannot compare the type of use of land in Yellowstone to how people recreate in the North Cascades. The risk to human life will be much higher. There are thousands of people who recreate in the back country in Washington State, in large part due to the fact that you do not have to carry guns on you in order to feel safe while hiking. If implemented, this proposal would discourage back country recreation and would negatively impact quality of life for Washington residents.

Correspondence ID: 12882Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America
Outside Organization: Methow Cycle & Sport Business(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,11 2023 14:54:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm writing in support of the reintroduction of grizzly bears in the North Cascades. I'm a small business owner in Winthrop, WA and an avid hiker, biker and skier. I believe that Alternative C and the proposed Section 10(j) Rule is the best choice because it meets both the ecological needs of the bears and the social needs of our residents and visitors. I have spent over 30 years traveling and recreating in grizzly bear habitat in Alaska, Canada, Montana and Wyoming. I believe,

and it has been my experience, that with adequate education and support humans can coexist well with bears. Thanks for your consideration of my comments.

Correspondence ID: 12884Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Port Townsend, WA 98368
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 15:01:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I lived in Montana for 40 years. Thirty of those years were spent in Bozeman.

My wife and I backpacked in Yellowstone National Park very frequently, Glacier National Park less often and some mountain ranges outside the National Park system that were known to be grizzly habitat.

We always carried bear spray. We made noise if we saw signs of bear or were hiking on trails in brush.

We always hoisted our food and scented items (eg. toothpaste) on Park Service constructed bear poles provided at the campsites.

We never pitched our tent near our "kitchen" or the bear poles.

We never cooked heavily scented food (eg. bacon).

We saw grizzlies, often at a safe distance, and never had a near- dangerous encounter.

It's just that simple.

We had a wonderful 30 years.

I fully support the maximum reintroduction of Grizzly Bear to the North Cascade National Park.

Correspondence ID: 12885Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Snohomish, WA 98290
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 15:03:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am in complete agreement with the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, where I have hiked and backpacked each summer for four decades and intend to continue doing so in years to come. The presence of the apex species like wolves and grizzly bears is what makes the wilderness such a special place. They keep the ecosystem healthy and they tolerate and share with us unless we pose a threat or are careless with our food management. Please bring them back.

Correspondence ID: 12886Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98107
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 15:05:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please introduce grizzlies back to the North Cascade ecosystem! These majestic creatures deserve to live and thrive in the wild and they support a healthy balance of the ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 12887Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Port Townsend, WA 98368
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 15:08:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I lived in Bozeman, Montana for 25 years.

My husband and I backpacked in Yellowstone National Park very frequently, Glacier National Park less often and some mountain ranges outside the National Park system that were known to be grizzly habitat.

We always carried bear spray. We made noise if we saw signs of bear or were hiking on trails in brush.

We always hoisted our food and scented items (eg. toothpaste) on Park Service constructed bear poles provided at the campsites.

We never pitched our tent near our "kitchen" or the bear poles.

We never cooked heavily scented food (eg. bacon).

We saw grizzlies, often at a safe distance, and never had a near- dangerous encounter.

It's just that simple.

We had a wonderful 30 years.

I fully support the maximum reintroduction of Grizzly Bear to the North Cascade National Park.

Correspondence ID: 12890Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellevue, WA 98004
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 15:08:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: What? Are you crazy? If one person is killed by a Grizzly or if someone is mauled by one, you all should be charged with murder or attempted murder. There WILL be encounters and these are fearless bears. Whoever is behind this is basically taking away the Parks from the people and handing them over to the Grizzlies. Camping, hiking, and outdoor activities are taken away from the people of Washington State. The parks and wilderness areas will be unsafe and greatly impacted. Whether you are hunting, fishing, hiking, camping, rock climbing, mountain biking, etc., you will always be looking over your shoulder, with very little to protect yourself. Bear spray is not effective in stopping a Mama Grizzly or a hungry Grizzly Bear. A gun probably wouldn't stop them either. This idea is insanity. Keep them in unpopulated distant areas. The black bears are more docile, and I honestly worry more about the mountain lions while hiking.

I love wildlife, but this is like swimming with the Great Whites with chum. The black bears are already moving into the eastside communities, looking for easy prey like pet food, pets, or garbage cans. Their populations grow fast and they spread out because of the competition, endangering the public. They don't have any predators except for a hunter.

I have had a Grizzly encounter in Alaska. My stupid Dad got out of the tour bus to get a picture of a Grizzly Bear. Luckily, he made it back in the bus in time. These bears are huge, fast, determined, and like a out-of-control freight train. A real lesson on how agile, and fast these bears are. You are not going to stop a freight train with bear spray.

There is a reason that this concept was abandoned before. Look at the fatal encounters in Glacier, Yellowstone and Colorado. These bears belong in the Canadian and Alaskan wilderness, away from people. Too late to reintroduce them to Washington

State. Too populated. Whoever is pushing this should move to Canada or Alaska and hang out with the Grizzlies there.

The problem with common sense is that is is not so common.

Correspondence ID: 12891Project:112008Document:132104
Address: KIRKLAND, WA 98033-3953
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 15:10:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzly bears should be reintroduced into WA state as they currently live across the border in Canada. Bears can't read border signs so it makes sense they should be able to expand their territory into Washington State.

Correspondence ID: 12892Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Maple Valley, WA 98038
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 15:15:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hello, I am opposed to the reintroduction of grizzly bears in the NCE. Thousands of people recreate in the backcountry every day of the week. Many trailheads are a short drive from Seattle. Introducing these bears into this environment is irresponsible. I do a lot of solo hike and backcountry trips, a lot of which is off-trail. I consider myself at high risk to meeting one of these bears. As a result, I will likely no longer do these activities. I am not confident in the ability of bear spray to stop one of these bears. Please support Alternative A, no action.

Correspondence ID: 12893Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Roosevelt, Wa, WA 99356
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 15:15:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: NO!!!! it would have a devastating Negative impact on the wildlife and ranchers.

Correspondence ID: 12894Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America
Outside Organization: Mt. baker hiking club Recreational Groups
Received: Nov,11 2023 15:27:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hello
I am a grandma to 3 boys (5,8,10) and they are already great hikers. I usually hike all summer into fall with the boys alone. With this introduction of grizzly bears in these beautiful mountains I won't be able to do this depriving my grandkids of becoming responsible hikers and helpers in the future. So please be aware of doing such a process.
I also hike in Central BRitish Columbia and there I only hike on only very busy hikes such as Emeralkblake , lake Louise. And there often the people working to keep it safe often have warnings for the public. So please don't allow these grizzly bears in our neighborhood. They have plenty of room up in Alaska whee my son is a fisherman . Thanks

Correspondence ID: 12896Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98119
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 15:33:19
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My family and I support the reintroduction of brown bear because humans have destroyed most mega fauna in the past thousand years and the cascades can be one more sanctuary to protect the species. In addition, we love the outdoors and want to see God's creations walking the earth at peace in nature.

The [REDACTED] family

Correspondence ID: 12897Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 15:40:47
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am commenting on the Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan EIS, North Cascade Ecosystem.

I wholeheartedly endorse the reintroduction of Grizzly Bears to the North Cascades. In other ecosystems, the reintroduction of top predators resulted in a much healthier, diverse, and resilient ecosystem. Washington State has been without Grizzly Bears for too long, and, given the climate breakdown we are experiencing, their reintroduction would prepare our forests and watersheds for the changes that lie ahead.

I would make two (2) comments on the EIS.

1) ALTERNATIVE B SHOULD BE PREFERRED

Alternative B would classify Grizzly Bears as a threatened species with the existing special rule (50 CFR 17.40(b)) under section 4(d) of the Endangered Species Act (ESA). Alternative C would designate grizzly bears in the US portion of the NCE and surrounding areas as a 10(j) nonessential experimental population. I understand that Alternative C would allow more flexibility in managing the bear populations including lethal removal for predation. However, our experience with wolf recovery, where lethal removal has been proven to be ineffective and, in fact, damaging to the overall recovery effort, tells us that lethal removal - especially in response to livestock predation - is a poor response. It would be more effective to get ranchers to manage their cattle than to manage the grizzlies with lethal removal. I would therefore prefer that Alternative B be the Preferred Alternative.

2) CLIMATE RESILIENCE

The EIS mentions the impacts that climate change might have on Grizzly Bear recovery. But it says nothing about the benefits that the reintroduction of Grizzly Bears would bring to the North Cascade Ecosystem with respect to climate change. Reintroducing top predators to an ecosystem changes the behavior of ungulates and other prey animals. In general, they are less likely to concentrate in easy to reach, resource rich areas and denude the landscape. They tend to disperse. In addition, bears have been shown to be transporters for seeds, spores, and nutrients to higher and more remote reaches of the landscape. I'm sure a biologist could develop a more comprehensive list of the benefits that Grizzly Bears would bring to our forests and watersheds. These benefits result in ecosystem resiliency in the face of climate breakdown, and you should take that into account.

In short, I fully support your plan to reintroduce Grizzly Bears to the North Cascades. I believe it would be a more effective plan if Alternative B were the preferred alternative.

Correspondence ID: 12899Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Port Townsend, WA 98368
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 15:43:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We split our time between our primary residence in Port Townsend and a "grandma home" in Snoqualmie, and highly endorse the plan to restore Grizzlies to the North Cascades Ecosystem. There are numerous ways that humans and wildlife can safely share habitats, and it's more than time for us to yield back space to these magnificent animals that are a key element in the natural habitat.

Correspondence ID: 12902Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Port Townsend, WA 98368
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 15:48:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please don't. They kill people. You don't want to be responsible for that.

Correspondence ID: 12903Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Stehekin, WA 98852
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 15:49:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The only realistic and reasonable alternative is No Action.

I oppose experimental and assisted migration of grizzlies in any numbers into the North Cascades. Grizzly bears are not endangered where their populations are expanding in other states and British Columbia across the border from the North Cascades.

Grizzly bears are not an essential top predator in the present North Cascades ecosystems .

Grizzly bears are not necessary for spreading seeds of plants and trees. Black bears and a multitude of other creatures do this within the present territory.

Grizzly bears, if successfully imported, would artificially and unnaturally upset the present balance as it is evolving and changing without them.

Grizzly bears migrating into the North Cascades on their own, expanding their range, adding to the diversity naturally is the most acceptable choice. "NO ACTION"

Sincerely,

Correspondence ID: 12905Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Arlington, WA 98223
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 15:51:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I take my two small boys hiking and fishing in the north cascades. Grizzly bears would add more risk than I would be willing to accept exposing my boys to. I would no longer be able to take them into that area of forest and they would grow up not knowing it's beauty. Please, DO NOT reintroduce grizzly bears into the north cascades. They were hunted for a reason - because they are dangerous to humans!

Correspondence ID: 12908Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kent, WA 98042
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 15:58:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am a hiker and a camper who takes wise, non-lethal precautions when recreating in predator territory. Bringing back grizzlies is an important aspect of conservation efforts, and I strongly support increasing bear presence in the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 12909Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 16:05:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a person who hikes, scrambles, and backpacks in the Cascades regularly I have appreciated the reduced risk of not having grizzly bears to contend with and would rather they not be re-introduced due to the additional precautions that would be necessary.

Correspondence ID: 12910Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Yakima, WA 98908
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 16:08:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Respectfully,

I do not support the reintroduction of Grizzly Bears into the NCE at this time. I'd like to voice my support for "Option A" at this time.

The State of Washington and the WDFW have shown that they are unable to manage our current predator populations well enough to balance the ungulate predation that they are responsible for. While I do support maintaining historic ecosystems NATURALLY, I don't support taking established, native bears from somewhere else in order to achieve a seemingly arbitrary goal of 25 bears or 200 in 60-100 years. Without detailed discussion of how current and future populations would be managed these plans are incomplete and dangerous.

Thank you for your consideration,

-Concerned lifelong Resident and Outdoorsman

Correspondence ID: 12911Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 16:10:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support Alternative C so that grizzly bears can be reintroduced to the North Cascades with the most flexible management plan.

Correspondence ID: 12914Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Redmond, WA 98052
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 16:24:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please, please, I beg you guys, DO NOT bring grizzly bears into North Cascade, where tons of people enjoy the outdoor of camping and hiking.

WA state, especially along cascade on both sides, has tons of population. People, of all background and outdoor experience level, should and would go to the mountains to hike and camp. Introducing grizzly here would cause lots of potential harm to people.

We should encourage city people, especially inner city kids, who generally are in poor social-economic condition, to go out hiking, camping, to enjoy nature to help their growth. As those kids are less likely to have experienced guidance, less likely to obtain the proper knowledge for outdoor, or affordability to the right equipment, any introduction to unnecessary danger is a deterrence for the effort to bring those kids out.

I don't believe people intending to bring grizzly bear back to North Cascade have the intention to discriminate minority/disadvantaged kids, but the net effect would be make less fortunate group people less likely to go out to enjoy nature; and their kids less opportunity to grow into a healthy and nature-loving adults.

Thanks for listening.

Correspondence ID: 12916Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Woodinville, WA 98072
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 16:28:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I go backpacking camping and fishing in the North Cascades. I'd like to take my daughter there when she is old enough. I don't want to have to worry about Grizzlies and carry protection.

Correspondence ID: 12918Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98227
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 16:36:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Please choose a real no action alternative on this issue.

I have previously written to you on this issue and will only summarize those comments and concerns here.

I was born, grew up, lived and worked in and around the area being considered for importation of grizzly bears for 7 decades. I can confidently say that I have spent far more time in the heart of this area than anyone currently on the team working on this proposal. There is no solid scientific basis to conclude that there ever has been a year around grizzly bear population in the North Cascades and specifically in the proposed plan area. It's a speculative theory only and one that is almost certainly incorrect. Its speculation, not science as should be required for a decision of this magnitude.

To the extent that the bears existed in the area, they lived in the areas occupied by people now and likely occasionally roamed into the high county. We should not be conducting biological experiments in our Wilderness Areas by bringing in these bears.

Well-maintained, sustainable outdoor facilities have a much lower environmental footprint than unsustainable & poorly

maintained facilities. This plan has and will make that maintenance more expensive and the backlog larger by drawing needed funds away thereby increasing the overall environmental impact of existing infrastructure. Outdoor recreation on federal lands has seen explosive growth and become a key driver for the economies of cities and towns surrounding the North Cascades. It needs to be improved to sustainably handle the demand. Community health of the region will be improved if more people get out and enjoy the outdoors. There is a significant negative impact of spending scarce recreation management dollars on a misguided Griz import effort.

Please choose a real no action alternative in this EIS. It would be delightful to see the bears establish a population naturally on their own.

Respectfully submitted

Correspondence ID: 12919Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98125
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 16:38:47
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Superintendent
North Cascades National Park Service Complex
810 State Route 20
Sedro Woolley, WA 98284 November 11, 2023

Dear Sir,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on The North Cascades Grizzly DEIS. I have lived in Washington State for fifty years. During that time, I have frequently visited the Methow valley and surrounding areas especially for hiking, back packing and cross-country skiing. The North Cascades is very important to me. I have been particularly concerned with maintaining a healthy ecosystem for resilient populations of plants and wildlife. The one thing missing from this equation is the grizzly bear. The ecosystem has been out of balance since the 1960's with the extirpation of Grizzly bears from the North Cascades. I support Alternative C in the current DEIS and the use of the 10(j) rule. I also support an essential designation under the 10(j) rule.

With the initial listing of the grizzly bear as threatened in 1975, the species loss continued to decline resulting in an endangered listing five years later. The current situation with the last know sighting of a grizzly bear in 1996 is now over a quarter of a century ago. The only way for the grizzly bear to return to the North Cascades is for active intervention. The current isolation from other grizzly habitat in southern British Columbia and the current very low reproductive rate for grizzly bears makes it highly unlikely for recovery to happen if no action is taken. Indeed since 1982 when the National Recovery plan was approved till the present day there has been de-facto "No Action" towards the recovery of grizzly bears to the North Cascade Ecosystem and we have evidence that there has been no increase in the grizzly bear population. Alternative A is unacceptable.

The North Cascades Ecosystem, with its 9500 square miles, is 97% in public ownership and 3% in private ownership. This Ecosystem provides a truly unique opportunity for successful grizzly bear recovery with a minimum of human conflict. Grizzly bears are primarily omnivores with 90% of their diet coming from vegetable and insect matter. The remaining 10% coming from scavenging and occasionally preying on game animals. The North Cascades Ecosystem provides 100 of the 124 plants species they forage on. The Ecosystem has not had the same resilience with the loss of the grizzly bears. The reintroduction of 3-7 bears per year over a 5 -10 years is very reasonable, as is the goal of an initial population of 25 bears. It is important to have management flexibility in order to achieve a sustaining population of grizzly bears. It is also important for the community be involved in conflict mitigation. There is one caveat, I do not support the issuance of conditional lethal take authorizations to private land owners. These conflicts must be managed with contributions form all parties, but the actual

decision for lethal removal (and the actual removal of the problem bear) must be made by the Federal agencies charged with the recovery efforts not by the private land owner.

As humans we have had a huge impact on the environment. The most recent example is Climate change. We need strong resilient ecosystems more than ever. Grizzly bears have been a part of the North Cascade Ecosystem for thousands of years and must be again. It is through our depredations that they are no longer part of the Ecosystem. They are a necessary component and they deserve to once again be a part of it. Their reintroduction to the Ecosystem would assist in regaining both balance and resilience. For example, the grizzly bears help to spread seeds and aerate alpine meadows. We must actively work at their recovery now or risk losing them forever. I want to visit as well as pass down a landscape to the next generation that includes the grizzly bear, and all native species. In the lower 48 states, the North Cascades Ecosystem is one of the few places left where the grizzly bears can exist. Additionally, we have a responsibility to bring them back as we are culpable in their absence from the ecosystem. Finally, grizzly bears are culturally important to both Washingtonians and tribal people. It is important to me to have grizzly bears return to the North Cascades.

Sincerely

██████████
██████████
██████████
Seattle, WA 98125

Correspondence ID: 12921Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America
Outside Organization: None Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 16:57:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Howdy

I believe you are causing yourself a lot of problems with the proposed South Unit Release area. It appears from your map that the boundary of this proposed release area is only a few miles from several potential food sources that will attract the bears and create potential human conflict.

The private property Stehekin Valley ranch appears to be only 5-6 miles from the release area and has seasonal horse stable, garden, fruit trees, and in some years chickens and hogs. It seems to me that the released bears are likely to find this food source and have lunch.

In addition, the South Unit Release area is only a couple of miles from the Stehekin River which has late summer/fall kokanee spawning with many of these salmon family carcasses littering the stream bank. It is a much used tourist area with quite a few folks visiting the area. Visitors at that time of year are almost assured of seeing the black bears eating the dead spawned fish early morning and early evening along the river. The grizzly will easily find this food source in my opinion.

Also when I was up there the first week of October, the amount of traffic on the Pacific Crest Trail was still high. On one short day-hike along the trail I saw more than a dozen long distance hikers (all but one couple were single hikers), about 8 day hikers going 2-5 miles and about 15 folks hiking less than a mile or wandering around High Bridge. Since the PCT in this area is only a couple miles from the Release area, I would suggest you are asking for problems with your proposal.

Reply requested

Thank you

██████████
██████████

Correspondence ID: 12922Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olga, WA 98279
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 16:59:45

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please restore the grizzly bear population! The return of grizzly bears to a portion of their historic range will improve the health of the North Cascade ecosystem and bear populations alike. Cascade range Grizzlies north of the Canadian boarder are critically endangered and unlikely to naturally recover without conservation intervention. Please help restore this iconic, historically and culturally significant species to its home.

Correspondence ID: 12924Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kent, WA 98031
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 17:05:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please bring back the bears! It sounds like the right thing to do for the park, ecosystem, and ultimately humanity.

Correspondence ID: 12928Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tacoma, WA 98408
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 17:13:48

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please adopt at least Alternative C or, failing that, Alternative B. Either of C or B could be improved by moving the timeline of completed restoration to an earlier date without endangering grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 12929Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98102
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 17:15:10

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am 69 and over the decades have done considerable Hiking, both backpacking and day hiking, throughout the northwest, and into BC and Alberta. I appreciate protecting and preserving endangered species, and I admire black, brown and grizzly bears. However, since grizzly bears, no longer roam in the Northwest and Cascades I would prefer NOT to re-introduce them to our area and rather focus on preserving and maintaining habitat where grizzlies currently exist. I don't believe the cost and effort are justified, especially in light of the added risks - however, small - of Grizzly Bear encounters that are more dangerous than encounters with other bear species. Thanks for considering. Bob Strong.

Correspondence ID: 12930Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Walla Walla, WA 99362
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 17:17:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a life long resident of Washington state, I feel that the reintroduction of these bears is dangerous and will put the safety of people and livestock in jeopardy.

These animals roam and to think that they will stay in a particular region is short sighted, they will travel a long ways to get food. This creates a dangerous situation for humans, their pets and livestock throughout the region..

I am against this reintroduction of grizzly bears into Washington state.

Correspondence ID: 12933Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Snoqualmie, WA 98065
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 17:28:55

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: It is imperative to reintroduce the Grizzly to the North Cascades and beyond. As an apex predator, the Grizzly has a specific role to play in the environment, and for too long, humans have interfered in the complex food web. While this reintroduction may cause some human - grizzly conflict, generally the humans are at fault due to poor behavior - this is not the Grizzly's fault. Greater Grizzly and human behavior education and compensation for ranchers who may lose stock are important elements that also need to be considered as part of the greater Grizzly reintroduction process.

Thank you

Correspondence ID: 12939Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tacoma, WA 98499
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 17:34:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: ABSOLUTELY not! No Grizzly bears! I am an avid hiker and I have concerns for my safety and the safety of others. Do not do this! No!

Correspondence ID: 12948Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Washington, DC 20001
United States of America

Outside Organization: Sierra Club Unaffiliated Individual(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,11 2023 17:48:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: November 11, 2023

Superintendent Don Striker

North Cascades National Park Service Complex

810 State Route 20

Sedro-Woolley, WA 98284

Director Martha Williams

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

1849 C Street, NW

Washington, DC 20240

Re: Request for public comments on proposed Establishment of a Nonessential Experimental Population of Grizzly Bear in the North Cascades Ecosystem, Washington State, 10(j) rule for Take Prohibitions and Exceptions, and Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Submitted via <https://www.regulations.gov> Docket No. FWS-R1-ES-2023-0074; and

<https://parkplanning.nps.gov/commentForm.cfm?documentID=132104>

Dear Superintendent Striker and Director Williams,

Sierra Club fully supports recovery efforts to restore a grizzly bear population in the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE). Sierra Club has a strong national interest in full recovery of grizzly bears in the lower 48 states, and appreciates the time and effort spent on restoration, and the Biden Administration's willingness to re-establish grizzlies in the North Cascades. The restoration of grizzly bears in the NCE is a key element of the national strategy for grizzly bear recovery, as part of the broader grizzly bear entity that was listed in 1975 under the Endangered Species Act. The federal government must undertake and complete all aspects of this national recovery plan in order to meet its legal obligations for grizzly bear recovery. This overdue and critical effort on the part of NPS and FWS is a step in the right direction in restoring grizzly bears to their rightful place in the NCE.

Sierra Club submits these comments to raise its concerns regarding the lack of adequate take protection provided by the proposed 10(j) rule. Sierra Club strongly supports reintroduction of grizzly bears into the North Cascades Ecosystem, but urges the Fish and Wildlife Service to provide the reintroduced population with take protections and exceptions that will promote, rather than undermine, the conservation of the species, as required by the Endangered Species Act.

The Sierra Club was founded in 1892 and is the nation's oldest grassroots environmental organization. The Sierra Club is incorporated in California, and has more than 3.5 million members and supporters nationwide, with approximately 100,000 members and supporters in Washington state. The organization is dedicated to the protection and preservation of the environment. The Sierra Club's mission is to explore, enjoy and protect the wild places of the earth; to practice and promote the responsible use of the earth's ecosystems and resources; and to educate and enlist humanity to protect and restore the quality of the natural and human environments. The Sierra Club has long worked to ensure that imperiled species such as grizzly bears receive the much-needed protections afforded to them under the Endangered Species Act.

Sierra Club members actively use our public lands in Washington State including the North Cascades National Park Service Complex, the Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest and the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest for wildlife watching, recreation and other pursuits. Sierra Club has a long history of work and engagement in the North Cascades. Sierra Club was integrally involved in the establishment of the North Cascades National Park and all of the wilderness area designations that post-date creation of the park.

Sierra Club has worked for decades to recover grizzly bears in the Rocky Mountains, including working with communities and organizations from Jackson, Wyoming to Polebridge, Montana (adjacent to Glacier National Park) to initiate and implement "bear smart" programs to prevent conflicts between grizzly bears and people and to foster coexistence. Sierra Club financially supported range riders and other methods of preventing conflicts between livestock and grizzly bears, and has long advocated for protection of important grizzly bear habitat to facilitate connectivity between isolated grizzly bear populations in the Northern Rockies, from Yellowstone to the Northern Continental Divide ecosystem. Based on firsthand knowledge, the Club recognizes that recreationists, ranchers, ungulate hunters and others can successfully coexist with grizzly bears on the landscape when the proper tools, regulations, human behavioral changes, and attitudes are in place. Sierra Club urges the NPS and FWS to undertake a restoration effort with this foremost in mind and to ensure that a significant, sustained effort is devoted to public outreach, education and proactive conflict prevention measures as part of the reintroduction effort, and to collaborate with non-governmental organizations and others in those endeavors.

Grizzly bears once roamed the NCE in significant numbers, but a confirmed sighting has not occurred since 1996, indicating the species is likely functionally extirpated from the region. As a result, the NCE is no longer as wild as it once was, and the key ecological functions that grizzly bears provided in the past as a keystone species have been lost. As demonstrated in public comment in the last round of the public process to reintroduce grizzly bears to the NCE, the vast majority of people are seeking renewed connections to the great bear and believe that grizzly bears belong in the North Cascades once again. The persecution of grizzly bears to the point of extirpation in the NCE, and to near extinction throughout the lower 48, is a sad chapter in this country's history. This restoration effort can begin to right that wrong in the NCE.

There should absolutely be a strong and vibrant grizzly bear population in the NCE. At 9,800 square miles, the NCE grizzly bear recovery area is larger than even the Yellowstone recovery area, home to an estimated 1,000 grizzly bears. Public lands comprise 93 percent of the NCE recovery area, of which approximately 85% are federal lands. More than two million acres

of designated wilderness on the Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie and Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forests surround the North Cascades National Park Service Complex. As such, this is a vast and still wild area, and grizzly bears belong there as an important native keystone species.

However, every effort must be made by the FWS to ensure that bears taken from their native ecosystems for the NCE restoration effort will be protected to the greatest extent. As described in the Draft EIS, bears considered for this restoration effort will be healthy, young, primarily female bears, likely from the NCDE population in Montana, with no history of conflicts. As such, the FWS must not set these relocated bears, and their offspring, up for failure and mortality, through weak sideboards in a 10(j) Rule.

As currently written, the proposed 10(j) rule is far too permissible in allowing grizzly bears to be injured and/or killed. The proposed 10(j) rule must be significantly revised to assure adequate protection for grizzly bears and to encourage property owners and others to adopt proactive conflict prevention measures. Specifically, the proposed 10(j) rule should be revised as follows:

- Lethal removal of a grizzly bear should only be considered where there is a demonstrable threat to human safety, and, for non-immediate threats to human safety, only after non-lethal management options, including concerted use of conflict prevention methods, have been exhausted.
- Any authorization of incidental taking should apply only to taking that is the result of non-negligent acts, which should be defined to require the exercise of due care to avoid the taking, as well as due care in the act more broadly.
- Deterrence should be limited to noninjurious hazing that does not result in any bodily injury or physical injury to the bear.
- No grizzly bears should be hazed or relocated as a result of conflict with livestock unless demonstrable, repeated efforts have been made by the livestock producer to prevent such conflicts, using commonly-available techniques.
- No grizzly bears should be killed on public lands as a result of livestock depredation.
- Landowners/private citizens should not be given a permit, or otherwise authorized, to kill a grizzly bear.
- No grizzly bear should be preemptively relocated if the bear is not a threat to human safety, particularly if the bear has not become habituated or food-conditioned, or when nonnatural foods/attractants have not been properly secured and made inaccessible to bears. Doing so acts as a disincentive for communities to employ conflict prevention measures, and increases the risk to the bear of injury or death from capture and relocation.
- Baited foot snares should not be used to capture bears intended for reintroduction to the NCE.

Further, as detailed below, the proposed 10(j) rule management provisions and supporting draft EIS fail to meet requirements imposed by the Endangered Species Act, National Environmental Policy Act, and Administrative Procedure Act.

Legal Background

Endangered Species Act ("ESA") Requirements

Prior to designating an experimental population, the Secretary must make two specific findings, *United States v. McKittrick*, 142 F.3d 1170, 1176 (9th Cir. 1998), the first of which is that an experimental population may only be released if the Secretary finds the release will "further the conservation of [the] species." 16 U.S.C. § 1539(j)(2)(A). Factors that must be considered by the Secretary in making this finding include:

- (1) Any possible adverse effects on extant populations of a species as a result of removal of individuals, eggs, or propagules for introduction elsewhere;
- (2) The likelihood that any such experimental population will become established and survive in the foreseeable future;
- (3) The relative effects that establishment of an experimental population will have on the recovery of the species; and
- (4) The extent to which the introduced population may be affected by existing or anticipated Federal or State actions or private activities within or adjacent to the experimental population area.

50 C.F.R. § 17.81(b). The Secretary is required to make this determination using the best scientific and commercial data available. *Id.* The requirement to use the best available scientific and commercial data available "is to ensure that the ESA not be implemented haphazardly, on the basis of speculation or surmise." *Bennett v. Spear*, 520 U.S. 154, 176 (1997) (discussing requirement in context of section 7(a)(2) consultation). While the Service "can draw conclusions based on less than conclusive scientific evidence, it cannot base its conclusions on no evidence." *Pac. Coast Fed'n of Fishermen's Associations v. U.S. Bureau of Reclamation*, 426 F.3d 1082, 1094-95 (9th Cir. 2005) (citing *Nat'l Ass'n. of Home Builders v. Norton*, 340 F.3d 835, 847 (9th Cir. 2003).

"Conservation," also referred to as "recovery," is at the heart of the ESA. Conservation is defined as "the use of all methods and procedures which are necessary to bring any endangered species or threatened species to the point at which the measures provided [by the ESA] are no longer necessary." *Sierra Club v. United States Fish & Wildlife Serv.*, 245 F.3d at 438 (citing 16 U.S.C. § 1532(3)). It is the "process that stops or reverses the decline of a species and neutralizes threats to its existence." *Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. Kempthorne*, 607 F. Supp. 2d 1078, 1088 (D. Ariz. 2009) (quoting *Defenders of Wildlife v. Babbitt*, 130 F. Supp. 2d 121, 131 (D.D.C. 2001)). The ESA's conservation purpose "is reflected not only in the stated policies of the Act, but in literally every section of the statute." *Babbitt v. Sweet Home Chapter of Cmities. for a Great Or.*, 515 U.S. 687, 699 (1995) (quoting *Hill*, 437 U.S. at 184); see also *Red Wolf Coal. v. United States Fish & Wildlife Serv.*, 210 F. Supp. 3d 796, 803 (E.D.N.C. 2016).

As with the other provisions of the ESA, conservation and recovery are at the heart of Section 10(j). *Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. Jewell*, No. CV-16-00094-TUC-JGZ, 2018 WL 1586651, at *5 (D. Ariz. Mar. 31, 2018). Congress enacted Section 10(j) in 1982 as a means of giving greater administrative flexibility to the Secretary in managing reintroduced species. Congress believed that this flexibility would facilitate the reintroduction effort and enhance recovery efforts. See H.R. Rep. No. 97-567, at 33 (1982), reprinted in 1982 U.S.C.C.A.N. 2807, 2833; 49 Fed. Reg. at 33,887-88; *McKittrick*, 142 F.3d at 1174 (management flexibility afforded under Section 10(j) "allows the Secretary to better conserve and recover endangered species"). The use of Section 10(j) was accordingly limited to "those instances where the involved parties are reluctant to accept the reintroduction of an endangered or threatened species without the opportunity to exercise greater management flexibility on the introduced population." 49 Fed. Reg. at 33,888-89. "Even in such cases, the experimental designation would only be applied when 'necessitated by the conservation and recovery needs of a listed species,' and an experimental designation based on nonconservation purposes would not be supported." *Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. Jewell*, No. CV-16-00094-TUC-JGZ, 2018 WL 1586651, at *5 (D. Ariz. Mar. 31, 2018) (quoting at 49 Fed. Reg. at 33,889).

"There is no indication that the management flexibility afforded to the agency under Section 10(j) was intended to displace the ESA's broader conservation purpose, or that it overrides the duty to use the best available science. On the contrary, it is clear from the legislative history that the management flexibility afforded under Section 10(j) 'allows the Secretary to better conserve and recover endangered species.'" *Id.* at *16 (quoting *McKittrick*, 142 F.3d at 1174.). "[A]ny effort to make the recovery effort more effective must be accomplished without undermining the scientific integrity of the agency's findings and without subverting the statutory mandate to further recovery." *Id.*

National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA") Requirements

NEPA requires agencies to take a "hard look" at the effects of the proposed action. *Bark v. United States Forest Serv.*, 958 F.3d 865, 868 (9th Cir. 2020). An agency takes a "hard look" and properly considers impacts by including some "quantified or detailed information." *Ctr. for Cmty. Action & Env't Just. v. FAA*, 61 F.4th 633, 644 (9th Cir. 2023) (quoting *Bark v. U.S. Forest Serv.*, 958 F.3d at 872). "General statements about possible effects and some risk do not constitute a hard look absent a justification regarding why more definitive information could not be provided." *Bark*, 958 F.3d at 872; *Or. Natural Res. Council Fund v. Brong*, 492 F.3d 1120, 1133 (9th Cir.2007). A "'hard look' should involve a discussion of adverse impacts that does not improperly minimize negative side effects." *N. Alaska Envtl. Ctr. v. Kempthorne*, 457 F.3d 969, 975 (9th Cir.2006) (internal quotation marks and citations omitted).

NEPA requires consideration of all effects or impacts, which are "changes to the human environment from the proposed action or alternatives that are reasonably foreseeable and include...direct effects, which are caused by the action and occur at the same time and place...indirect effects, which are caused by the action and are later in time or farther removed in distance, but are still reasonably foreseeable...and cumulative effects, which are effects on the environment that result from the incremental effects of the action when added to the effects of other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions regardless of what agency (Federal or non-Federal) or person undertakes such other actions." 40 C.F.R § 1508.1(g) (effective May 20, 2022) (emphasis added). "Indirect effects may include growth inducing effects and other effects related to induced changes in the pattern of land use, population density or growth rate, and related effects on air and water and other natural systems, including ecosystems." *Id.* §1508.1(g)(2). "Cumulative effects can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time." *Id.* §1508.1(g)(3). "Effects include ecological (such as the effects on natural resources and on the components, structures, and functioning of affected ecosystems), aesthetic, historic, cultural, economic, social, or health, whether direct, indirect, or cumulative. Effects may also include those resulting from actions which may have both beneficial and detrimental effects, even if on

balance the agency believes that the effects will be beneficial." Id. § 1508.1(g)(4).

"[T]he alternatives analysis section is the heart of the environmental impact statement." Ilio'ulaokalani Coal. v. Rumsfeld, 464 F.3d 1083, 1095 (9th Cir. 2006) (quoting Friends of Se.'s Future v. Morrison, 153 F.3d 1059, 1065 (9th Cir. 1998)). The failure to meaningfully compare alternatives is itself a significant error. Se. Alaska Conservation Council v. United States Forest Serv., 468 F. Supp. 3d 1148, 1152 (D. Alaska 2020).

Administrative Procedure Act

Judicial review of agency actions under the Endangered Species Act and the National Environmental Policy Act is governed by the Administrative Procedure Act (APA). Native Ecosystems Council v. Dombeck, 304 F.3d 886, 891 (9th Cir. 2002). Under APA Section 706(2), the court may set aside agency action where it is found to be arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion or otherwise not in accordance with applicable law. 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A). "Normally, an agency rule would be arbitrary and capricious if the agency has relied on factors which Congress has not intended it to consider, entirely failed to consider an important aspect of the problem, offered an explanation for its decision that runs counter to the evidence before the agency, or is so implausible that it could not be ascribed to a difference in view or the product of agency expertise." Motor Vehicle Mfrs. Ass'n of United States, Inc. v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co., 463 U.S. 29, 43 (1983).

I. Neither the Preamble to the Proposed 10(j) Rule Nor the Draft Environmental Impact Statement Provide a Meaningful Analysis of How Much More Lethal Take Will Result Under the 10(j) Take Provisions Compared to the 4(d) Rule

The draft EIS fails to take a hard look at how much lethal take of grizzly bears will occur under the proposed 10(j) rule provisions (Alternative C) compared to management under the 4(d) rule (Alternative B). The draft EIS provides only cursory and conclusory statements unsupported by any citation or facts. The only apparent analysis of this important question occurs on page 72, where the draft EIS states:

To foster additional social tolerance for restoration, the 10(j) designation allows for management of grizzly bears not allowed under alternative B. These management tools include conditioned lethal take in management zones 2 and 3. Additional grizzly bear mortality is anticipated under alternative C compared to alternative B in these management zones; however, the amount of additional mortality is difficult to quantify because it is likely that some conflict situations under alternative B would eventually escalate to the point that lethal take would be necessary and implemented by agency personnel. Escalation of conflict situations without the management tools to adequately address grizzly bears involved in conflict is likely to erode social tolerance for grizzly bear restoration among some groups. Therefore, despite allowing lethal take in limited circumstances, the 10(j) designation are expected to improve social tolerance of grizzly bears and, in turn, improve the chances of establishing and maintaining a grizzly bear population in NCE.

Thus, the draft EIS concedes that "additional grizzly bear mortality" is anticipated under the proposed 10(j) rule's provisions, but then rather than estimating the extent of that additional mortality, asserts that the amount is "difficult to quantify" because some lethal take could occur under the 4(d) provisions if situations "escalate" and that allowing more lethal take under the 10(j) provisions would improve "social tolerance"--ostensibly because the lethal take will occur before any "escalation" that would "erode" social tolerance. The draft EIS then offers the conclusory assertion that the improved "social tolerance" will somehow improve the success of the population, without any examination of whether the amount of additional lethal take will outpace any purported benefits from "social tolerance." Those conclusions in the draft EIS are devoid of any factual support or citation to scientific or commercial data whatsoever. The implication seems to be that allowing more legal killing will deter illegal killing, but there is no factual support offered for that implicit assumption. The preamble to the proposed 10(j) rule is also devoid of any such facts or analysis.

The draft EIS also misrepresents the differences between the 10(j) rule provisions and the 4(d) rule by describing the 4(d) rule inaccurately. Specifically, the draft EIS states that under the 4(d) rule: "A grizzly bear constituting a demonstrable threat to human safety or to lawfully present livestock, guard dogs, crops, beehives, or other personal property, may be taken, up to and including lethal removal[.]" DEIS at 34. But the actual text of the 4(d) makes clear that with regard to situations where there is no threat to human safety, lethal take is only authorized under a much narrower scope of circumstances, where there is: "significant depredations to lawfully present livestock, crops, or beehives." 50 C.F.R. § 17.40(b)(i)(C) (emphasis). Thus, it is not just any threat to livestock, as the draft EIS states, but rather only "significant depredations" of livestock. Further, the draft EIS incorrectly states that lethal take may occur where there is any threat to "other property," but the actual text of the grizzly 4(d) rule does not include any such broad category, and is expressly limited to "significant" depredations of only three narrow types of property

“livestock, crops, or beehives.” See *id.* Consequently, the draft EIS improperly skews the comparison of alternatives by misrepresenting the 4(d) rule provisions as being less protective than they actually are, thereby diminishing the contrast with the proposed 10(j) provisions, which, *inter alia*, allow a bear to be killed to protect essentially any property--including compost--from a threat that is not even significant. See 88 Fed. Reg. at 67,210.

The draft EIS also inaccurately describes the proposed 10(j) rule in ways that misleadingly make it sound more protective than the actual proposed text of the rule. Specifically, the draft EIS states that unintentional incidental take is not prohibited “provided such take is non-negligent and incidental to an otherwise lawful activity, the take is promptly reported to the FWS, and if the take occurs on national forest lands, that the USFS has maintained its “no net loss of core” approach and implemented food storage restrictions throughout management zone 1.” DEIS at 38. But the actual text of the proposed 10(j) rule does not impose any such broad limitation to ensure that only “non-negligent” unintentional incidental take is allowed. See 88 Fed. Reg. at 67220-21 (proposed rule 50 C.F.R. § 17.84(y)(3)(iii)). Instead, the proposed rule only contains a limitation specific to hunting. Thus, the text of the draft EIS describes a more protective rule that would make incidental take lawful only where the take was caused by a non-negligent act (i.e., where due care had been exercised to avoid the take, and where due care has been exercised more generally in the act causing the take), while the actual text of the proposed rule does not provide any such broad protection. Again, the effect is to unlawfully skew the comparison of alternatives by misleadingly making it seem like the difference between the 10(j) provisions and the 4(d) protections is narrower than it actually is based on the text of the respective rules.

In sum, the draft EIS violates NEPA by failing to take a hard look at the amount of additional killing of grizzlies that will occur under the 10(j) rule compared to the 4(d) rule, thereby failing to take a hard look at the negative consequences of the preferred alternative, and also violates NEPA by skewing the comparison of alternatives by misleadingly describing the 10(j) and 4(d) rules in ways that unlawfully minimize the actual gap in protection between the two.

This error is serious because, as described below, in making the required findings for the proposed 10(j) rule, the Service irrationally and baselessly assumes that the reintroduced population will exhibit the same success as other grizzly populations, without considering that those other populations benefit from much more protective take prohibitions under the 4(d) rule compared to the 10(j) rule proposed for the NCE population.

II. The Service's Determination that the Reintroduction Will Further the Conservation of the Species Arbitrarily Relies on the Success of Populations Benefiting from More Stringent Protections than Proposed for the NCE Experimental Population

In making the determinations required pursuant to 16 U.S.C. § 1539(j)(2)(A) and 50 C.F.R. § 17.81(b), the Service relies on the success of other grizzly populations to conclude that the proposed NCE experimental population will similarly succeed. Problematically, in doing so, the Service totally fails to consider that those other grizzly populations long benefited from take protections more stringent than those proposed for the NCE population, particularly with regard to conflict-related and incidental take.

With regard to the findings required pursuant to 16 U.S.C. § 1539(j)(2)(A) and 50 C.F.R. § 17.81(b)(4), the Service rests its conclusion that livestock allotments will not limit the reintroduced population in Management Zone 1 on the assertion that similar practices in GYE and NCDE “are not limiting grizzly bear populations” in those regions. 88 Fed. Reg. at 67207. The Service similarly asserts, “As described in Management Zone 1, these activities pose some risk to grizzly bears, but will not likely preclude grizzly bear presence in Management Zone 2.” *Id.* For Management Zone 3, the Service states: “Grizzly bears may still occupy portions of Management Zone 3, but human activities will limit their presence.” *Id.*

These findings are arbitrary and capricious because the Service has failed to consider that even for Management Zone 1, the proposed 10(j) regulation will provide far less protection to the NCE population than the GYE and NCDE populations have received for many years under the 4(d) rule. Under the proposed 10(j), even in Zone 1, seemingly any “depredation to lawfully present livestock” can result in lethal removal. See 88 Fed. Reg. 67, 219 (proposed definition of “Grizzly bear involved in conflict”); *id.* at 67,221 (proposed 50 C.F.R. § 17.84(y)(3)(vi) (providing for up to lethal removal in Zone 1 for “grizzly bears involved in conflict”). In contrast, under the 4(d) rule, only a “significant” depredation of livestock can precipitate a removal. 50 C.F.R. § 17.40(b)(i)(C). Furthermore, the 4(d) rule broadly protects the GYE and NCDE bears from incidental taking, whereas the proposed 10(j) will provide only extremely limited protection from incidental taking. And the proposed 10(j) provision will allow bears to be subjected to vaguely defined bodily injury in the course of deterrence, whereas the 4(d) rule does not allow for hazing that includes injury; although the deterrence provision bars injury causing death, as detailed below, it plainly creates a risk of death and survival impairment that the Service has failed to evaluate. Moreover, the Service utterly fails to consider that the even more limited

take protection in Zones 2 and 3 will affect the persistence of the population within Zone 1. Many areas within Zone 1 are permeated by areas that are designated as Zone 3. See 88 Fed. Reg. 67,702, Figure 2. Thus, as a practical matter, bears in Zone 1 will be extremely vulnerable to lethal removal when they cross through those patches of Zone 3. The Service's findings thus arbitrarily rely on the GYE and NCDE populations to conclude that the NCE population similarly will not be "limited" by livestock allotments and other land management, without rationally examining the impact of the much less protective take provisions proposed for the NCE population. As discussed above, the Service cannot rationally or lawfully rely on the draft EIS for analysis to assert that the populations will fare similarly despite the different protection provided by the proposed 10(j) rule compared to the 4(d) rule. The discussion in the draft EIS is based purely on speculation and surmise and fails to offer any evidence to support its conjecture. See DEIS at 72. Consequently, it cannot provide the basis in fact required by the requirement to utilize the best available scientific and commercial information. 50 C.F.R. § 17.81(b).

Similarly, in making the findings required pursuant to 16 U.S.C. § 1539(j)(2)(A) and 50 C.F.R. § 17.81(b)(2), the Service arbitrarily concludes that because "in the GYE, NCDE, CYE, and Selkirk Ecosystem, grizzly bear population trends in these ecosystems are stable or increasing, and range extent has continued to expand... we can expect human-caused mortality and direct and indirect effects of human activity for the [experimental population] to be reduced to a level such that these threats would not prevent population growth and stability." 88 Fed. Reg. at 67,205. Again, the Service reaches this conclusion without any meaningful consideration of the reality that the populations in the GYE, NCDE, CYE, and Selkirk Ecosystem benefitted from take protections under the 4(d) rule that are far more protective than the proposed 10(j) rule provisions, particularly with regard to conflict-related and incidental take. For the same reasons discussed above, the Service cannot cure this defect with information from the draft EIS, and the Service has consequently failed to make its findings based on the best available scientific and commercial information. It is plain that the greater amount of lethal removal allowed under the proposed 10(j) rule compared to the 4(d) rule may affect population growth and stability, but the Service has failed to provide any meaningful analysis or evidence regarding this critically important consideration.

As a result of these errors, the proposed 10(j) rule is not supported by findings that lawfully comport with the requirements of 16 U.S.C. § 1539(j)(2)(A) and 50 C.F.R. § 17.81(b).

III. The Preamble Misrepresents the Proposed Rule with Regard to the Scope of Incidental Take Allowed Under the Proposed 10(j) Rule and the Effect of Negligence

In describing the management provisions under the proposed 10(j) rule, the preamble states that "incidental take" must be unintentional and not due to negligent conduct." 88 Fed. Reg. at 67,209. However, as detailed above, the actual text of the proposed 10(j) rule does not impose any such broad limitation to ensure that only non-negligent unintentional incidental take is allowed. See 88 Fed. Reg. at 67,220-21 (proposed rule 50 C.F.R. § 17.84(y)(3)(iii)). Instead, the proposed rule only contains a limitation specific to hunting. Thus, the preamble misleadingly describes a more protective rule that would make incidental take lawful only where the taking was "not due to negligent conduct"--i.e., where due care had been exercised to avoid the take, and where due care has been exercised more generally in the act causing the take--while the actual text of the proposed rule does not provide any such broad protection. The effect is to arbitrarily mislead the public into believing the proposed 10(j) rule is much more protective than it actually is. This error violates the requirements of the APA by undermining the ability of the public to comment on the proposed rule. It also indicates that the Service's decision-making is arbitrary and capricious, in violation of the APA, because the Service is making its decision based on an inaccurate description of the proposed rule.

IV. The Service's Failure to Impose a Prohibition on Incidental Take Resulting from a Lack of Due Care (Negligence) is Arbitrary and Capricious and Inconsistent with the Conservation Purposes of Section 10(j) and the ESA More Broadly

As described above, although the preamble to the 10(j) rule states that incidental take will only be allowed under the 10(j) when it is not the result of negligent conduct, the actual proposed regulation text is devoid of such a requirement. The failure to include such a limitation stands in stark contrast with the regulations that the Service finalized in the 10(j) rule for the Bitterroot experimental population, which allowed incidental taking only where "due care" had been exercised to avoid the taking. 50 C.F.R. § 17.84(l)(5). There is no rational basis to allow incidental take for activities that are being accomplished negligently, without due care to avoid the taking, or without due care more generally--particularly when the Service has recognized the need to limit incidental taking to non-negligent actions.

V. The Proposal to Allow Deterrence Causing Bodily Injury Is Vaguely Defined, Arbitrary, Creates a Risk of Death, and Inconsistent with the Conservation Purposes of Section 10(j) and the ESA More Broadly

The proposed rules authorize deterrence that causes “bodily injury” as long as the injury is not “lasting” and does not “cause...death.” See 88 Fed. Reg. at 67,219-20 (proposed 50 C.F.R. § 17.84(y)(1) (definition of “deterrence”); proposed 50 C.F.R. § 17.84(y)(3)(ii) (allowing deterrence)). The rules fail to define what “lasting bodily injury” means, and ostensibly this might be interpreted to include even an extremely severe injury as long as that injury could heal without permanently maiming the bear. By failing to prohibit bodily injury, or to define “bodily injury” in a manner that makes clear that what is permissible, the proposed rule needlessly creates danger that the public will believe it is broadly permissible to injure bears as long as the injury is not maiming or clearly intended to be fatal, and therefore will be more likely to inflict injuries on bears that may actually impair survival. This failure is arbitrary and capricious and inconsistent with the conservation purposes of the ESA.

Moreover, in the past, with regard to the 10(j) rule for the Bitterroot experimental population, the Service has recognized the need to limit authorized deterrence only to noninjurious harassment that does not cause any bodily injury. See 50 C.F.R. § 17.84(l)(5)(iv); see also 50 CFR 17.84(l) (defining “opportunistic, noninjurious harassment” to exclude any “bodily injury”).

The Service provides no rationale for allowing the public to inflict bodily injury on bears here, and its proposal to do so is arbitrary and capricious, and inconsistent with the conservation purposes of the ESA.

Additionally, the 5-day window for the Service's notification requirement following deterrence that causes injury, see 88 Fed. Reg. 67,221 (proposed 50 C.F.R. § 17.84 (y)(6)(ii)), is arbitrary and capricious, and inconsistent with the conservation purposes of the ESA. The proposed rules required that notice regarding death of a bear be provided within 24 hours, but give five days instead to report an injury. Allowing five days rather than 24 hours to report an injury, when it is highly likely that the public may not be able to distinguish a lethal or survival-impairing injury from an injury causing no “lasting” injury, plainly and needlessly increases the likelihood that an injured bear will die before the Service or other authorities are notified, and could otherwise provide care to prevent death. Notably, in contrast, the 10(j) rules for the Bitterroot experimental population required notification of hazing of a bear within 24 hours, even though the only hazing allowed was “noninjurious.” 50 C.F.R. § 17.84(l)(5)(iv).

VI. The Proposal to Allow Lethal Taking by the Public Is Arbitrary and Inconsistent with the Conservation Purposes of the ESA

In contrast to the protections of the 4(d) rule, which allows lethal taking in response to conflict only where the killing is accomplished by officials, the proposed 10(j) rule would allow the Service to permit members of the public to kill bears based on conflict with livestock or property. Neither the preamble to the proposed rule nor the draft EIS provide any scientific support to demonstrate that this serves any conservation purpose. As detailed above, the Service has failed to provide scientific support for its conclusory assertions regarding “social tolerance.”

Moreover, the Service has failed to provide any explanation of how it will ensure that members of the public, as opposed to officials, accomplish lethal taking in a manner that is actually humane. Although the proposed rules state that the lethal taking must be accomplished “in a humane manner,” there is no mechanism provided in the rules to ensure that members of the public who receive such permits have the proper training to kill the bears in a humane manner. 88 Fed. Reg. at 67,221 (proposed 50 C.F.R. §§ 17.84 (y)(4)(ii)(C) and (5)(ii)(C)).

VII. Allowing Lethal Taking on Public Lands Is Inconsistent with the Conservation Purposes of the ESA

The Service has failed to provide any analysis to explain how lethal take of bears on federal public lands to protect livestock grazing on public lands serves a conservation purpose. The preamble to the proposed rule and draft EIS lack adequate consideration of alternative mechanisms for federal lands that would better take into account the authority that federal land managers have to protect the reintroduced population, better fulfill the conservation purpose of section 10(j), and better align with the duty imposed on such agencies under ESA section 7(a)(1) to further conservation of the species.

VIII. The Proposal to Give the 10(j) Rule Effect Regardless of Whether the Reintroduction Has Occurred Is Unlawful

The Service's proposal to make the 10(j) rule's management provisions effective regardless of whether any reintroduction into

the NCE has occurred yet is inconsistent with ESA section 10(j), and therefore unlawful. Adopting this proposal would also violate the requirements of NEPA because the draft EIS does not evaluate such an alternative. The proposed rule states that even if no reintroduction occurs yet, the 10(j) regulations here would remain in place, and would apply to any bears that migrate into the area, such as bears associated with reintroduction activities undertaken by the Canadian government in British Columbia: "In other words, if we determine to reintroduce bears to the US portion of the NCE with a final 10(j) rule, but we are not able to implement that reintroduction before grizzly bears are reintroduced in the Canadian portion of the NCE and travel into the NEP area any grizzly bears entering the NEP from Canada would still be managed pursuant to the 10(j) rule[.]" 88 Fed. Reg. at 67,208.

Implementation of the management provisions under ESA section 10(j) is premised on the reintroduction of an experimental population. Putting those provisions into effect prior to, and regardless of whether any such reintroduction has occurred yet is inconsistent with ESA section 10(j), which allows take to be regulated under those measures, rather than under the 4(d) rule, only for the purposes of facilitating the reintroduction, and thereby furthering the conservation purposes of the ESA. See, e.g., *Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. Jewell*, No. CV-16-00094-TUC-JGZ, 2018 WL 1586651, at *5 (D. Ariz. Mar. 31, 2018) (citing 49 Fed. Reg. at 33,888-89 to explain that use of 10(j) rule only appropriate to further conservation via reintroduction, not for non-conservation purposes). Cf. DEIS at 49 (acknowledging that use of 10(j) designation improper where no bears would be translocated into the area).

Moreover, the Service cannot lawfully adopt its proposal to put the management provisions into effect with regard to whether any reintroduction has yet occurred because it has not analyzed that alternative in the draft EIS. The draft EIS explicitly rejected analyzing an alternative that would impose a 10(j) rule without a reintroduction, see DEIS at 49, and also did not analyze any alternative where there would be a delay between the application of the proposed 10(j) management measures and the actual reintroduction. Adopting an unexamined alternative would thus violate NEPA.

Conclusion

In summary, Sierra Club strongly supports restoration of grizzly bears to the NCE and recovery of a viable population, as required by the Endangered Species Act. However, such an effort must ensure that healthy, non-conflict bears taken from their native ecosystems and brought to the NCE are given the greatest possible chance of success. If restoration moves forward under a 10 (j) rule, significant improvements to the proposed 10 (j) rule are needed to ensure adequate protections for grizzly bears and to comply with the Endangered Species Act, National Environmental Policy Act, and Administrative Procedure Act.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments. If you have any questions about our comments, please contact Sierra Club attorney Karimah Schoenhut at the email or phone number provided below.

[REDACTED]
Senior Staff Attorney
Sierra Club
Environmental Law Program
50 F St NW, Eighth Floor
Washington, DC 20001

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
National Wildlife Campaign Manager
Sierra Club
424 E. Main Street
Bozeman, MT 59715

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 12949Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lakewood, CO 80214
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 17:49:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I fully support grizzly bear restoration efforts in the North Cascades. As a former Washington resident, restoring grizzly population would be long overdue for a keystone predator that has a long awaited return to part of its historic range. With the recent Colorado wolf reintroduction program beginning, it gives me hope another misunderstood species may find its footing in land it was ripped from.

Correspondence ID: 12954Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98122-3011
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 17:55:21

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support restoration of grizzly bears into the North Cascades, and prefer option C.

I am an avid hiker and backcountry users and have made many trips to the North Cascades over the past 40 years. I also own a home on the Chiwawa River near Plain, WA.

The North Cascades ecosystem (NCE) is not complete without grizzlies. We need them to make this incredible place whole again. Numerous studies have shown that the NCE is big enough and wild enough to support a viable population of grizzly bears. Restoring grizzly bears to the NCE is a crucial step in preserving the region's ecological and cultural heritage.

They were hunted, trapped, and poisoned, exterminating them from the landscape. We owe it to them to support their return.

Far from feeling that restoration would pose a threat to me as I live in and enjoy the NCE, knowing that NCE is once again providing a home for grizzlies would be a huge positive.

Correspondence ID: 12956Project:112008Document:132104

Address: SEATTLE, WA 98106
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 17:58:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I fully support restoring grizzly bears in the PNW. I believe it's our responsibility to restore the ecosystems we have destroyed in the past and protect what remains for the future. I also think that grizzly bears are a significant part of indigenous culture, and that their roots should be honored and respected. The US government seized and decimated native land, and recognizing that grizzly bears should be restored is a step toward taking accountability for the irreparable damage caused by colonization and industrialization.

Correspondence ID: 12957Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Walnut creek, CA 91596
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 17:58:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We need to reintroduce these amazing animals! Please reintroduce them!

Correspondence ID: 12958Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Snoqualmie Pass, UN 98068
Japan

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 17:58:56

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Based on the data that I've seen, the environmental improvement by reintroducing the grizzly is questionable and limited at best. Aeration of roots and spreading seeds can be achieved by other animals and birds.

The downsides are obvious. Tragic human/bear encounters, impact to livestock and encroachment in populated areas will happen over time. Additionally, this will result in more armed back country enthusiasts - which personally does not appeal to me.

If we want our parks to achieve true balance in the ecosystem, let the grizzlies migrate to the N. Cascades without human intervention.

Correspondence ID: 12959Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 17:59:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing in support for the restoration of the grizzly bear population in the North Cascades. It is natural habitat for grizzly bears for thousands of years. The environment is interdependent - where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, abundant native fish and wildlife populations, and the necessary resources for the health and well-being of our human population.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation.

Alternative C designation would give communities and land managers additional options for managing bears, including deterrence, relocation, or removal of animals involved in a conflict. These additional tools could offer more safety and certainty for the region, while still providing for the recovery and conservation of the species. This is the best choice for bears and the people who live in and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

The 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please allow back this native species to our state's ecosystems through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage. Thank you for taking the time to keep our North Cascades healthy and wild!

Correspondence ID: 12962Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bremerton, WA 98310
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 18:05:56

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My family is an avid hiking and backpacking one. We have enjoyed many trips in the Copper Creek and Ross lake areas, extending of course into National Forest lands as well. We are 100% supportive of Alternative C:

Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation.

Aiming to restore grizzly bears in North Cascades National Park will give people the tools they need to thrive in and around grizzly bear country. Grizzlies belong in the North Cascades, as they enhance the park's ecological integrity and contribute to its wildness.

Just as with efforts focused on saving and restoring salmon, working to return grizzlies to their historic ranges will greatly remediate the ecological disruption we humans caused in the balance of nature and the food chain in the region.

We have backpacked in 'grizzly country' in Yellowstone National Park, and the pleasure and wonder we experienced at seeing repeated evidence of the grizzlies was amazing! Although we never sighted a bear, practicing bear smarts made us even better Leave No Trace visitors.

A restored population of grizzlies will boost the NCNP's appeal and attract nature enthusiasts, scientists, and tourists from around the world. This would provide economic benefits to local communities and support the park's mission to protect park resources in perpetuity.

Alternative C, with the 10(j) rule, addresses safety concerns while protecting the grizzly population. It ensures coexistence between humans and bears.

Please consider the positive ecological and economic benefits and support Alternative C. Restoring grizzly bears will preserve the park's natural heritage and conserve an iconic species for current and future generations.

Thank you for your dedication to our national parks.

Correspondence ID: 12963Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Spokane Valley, WA 99027
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 18:06:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Don't do it. It isn't smart at all. Every human that dies by a Grizzly is your fault.

Correspondence ID: 12969Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 18:14:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am in favor of reintroduction of Grizzly bears into the North Cascades Ecosystem. I prefer alternative 'C' of the EIS, which enables the protection of reintroduced bears. If bears are to be reintroduced, we need to set the stage for their survival and not allow for the past treatment of bears that led to their near extinction.

In reality the ecosystem of the North Cascades is not complete. It's controlled by human fear of, and over-hunting of, predators. The wilderness is less wild without the natural predators that contribute to the balance of a healthy ecosystem. While farmers and ranchers near and inside the North Cascades, need to protect their livestock from predators, I believe that the priority use of the North Cascades is to protect and preserve wilderness. Farmers and ranchers must implement measures to protect their livestock while contributing to a healthy ecosystem.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment. I am a person who enjoys hiking, bike-packing and backpacking in the outdoors. My privilege of enjoying the outdoors is founded on respect for natural ecosystems. Bears deserve their healthy place in the ecosystem of the North Cascades just as humans do.

Correspondence ID: 12978Project:112008Document:132104
Address: kenmore, WA 98028
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 18:26:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Don Striker and Supervisor Brad Thompson,

I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations. We need those bears as much as the need us to support them!

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. The proposal would bring up to 25 non-problem grizzly bears into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade and manage them as an experimental population.

Alternative C is the (qualified) best choice for bears and the people who live and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities. Furthermore, the 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and sometimes respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape. I am really only okay with 10(j) rule if lethal taking of a bear is nearly never invoked. Like literally almost never.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Thank you for taking the time to keep our North Cascades wild!

Sincerely,


Kenmore, Washington

Correspondence ID: 12982Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bremerton, WA 98337
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 18:27:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm commenting to give my vehement objection to introducing grizzly bears into the North Cascades. Grizzly Bears should have been removed from the Endangered Species list long ago, seeing as their numbers in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem is over 1,000 (up from 136 in 1975). With that population, establishing a new bear population makes little sense. The North Cascades currently has a healthy black bear population. Grizzly bears do not enhance the ecosystem in a unique way that would justify their re-introduction. Grizzly bears do, however, harm the ecosystem in multiple ways, each deserving consideration.

To begin, no federal bureaucracy or agency can contain any bear population to a specific area. The bears, once introduced and established, will leave the park boundaries and wander into neighboring valleys and onto farmers' and ranchers' property. These farms and ranches are a boon-- Washington State exported over \$8 billion dollars in Washington-grown or processed agricultural products in 2022. This incredible productivity is not only appealing to humans-- it is a veritable feast for opportunistic grizzly bears. Each and every farm contributes to the food economy in the state, and to the United States as a whole. The security of farms and ranches is a top priority for ensuring a healthy nation. Western Montana has adopted the Bear Smart program which seeks to restrict, control, or eliminate things bears target: garbage, bee hives, and fruit and vegetable gardens. Imagine intentionally restricting food production and bee keeping for the sake of environmentalism!

Introducing grizzly bears will mean introducing more layers of bureaucracy, more restrictions on citizen's liberties, and more tax-payer expense.

Grizzlies not only threaten the food economy in Washington, they are a menace to people. Washington aggressively limits citizen's second amendment right, most recently banning semi-automatic rifles (HB 1240). Semi-automatic rifles are used for both hunting and defense and would be the weapon of choice when protecting self or others from a grizzly bear. Bear spray has its merits but it is not a substitute for a gun. The government's restriction of citizen's rights to bear arms whilst introducing an incredibly aggressive apex-predator displays a malicious disregard towards the people of Washington. Will federal agents gather after each mauling and take the time to honor the lives of victims? Will they say their names?

Correspondence ID: 12988Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lake Stevens, WA 98258
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 18:30:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The fact that this is a "re-introduction" already clarified that the eco system in this area was developed around having these animals present. They were in the area long before people. Plans to grow should take grizzlies into account, with grizzlies populated again.

Correspondence ID: 12990Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 18:33:08

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We love hiking in the North Cascades and not having to worry about Grizzlies. We hiked in Banff/Jasper last summer...we carried bear spray and we were constantly on our guard. A couple backpacking in Banff National Park were killed by a grizzly during our trip. We are normally all in on animal conservation efforts, but the grizzly is an apex predator and the impact on park users, especially inexperienced users, will likely be deadly.

Correspondence ID: 12991Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Webb City, MO 64870
United States of America

Outside Organization: Citizen Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 18:34:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think this is a great idea! They are an important part of many ecosystems they once inhabited.

Correspondence ID: 12993Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Snohomish, WA 98290
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 18:35:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The landscape and land uses have changed. Land which may have once been suitable is no longer. The increasing number of human v animal conflicts is already on the rise. With 44 grizzly attacks on average per year and increasing, we are setting WA state up for catastrophic failure of its human residents. The wolf population reintroduction still hasn't been resolved properly. Why begin with another complicated and, frankly, ill thought out reintroduction when the first one is still so egregiously unsettled. I'm appalled by the willingness to endanger businesses and lives with this poor plan. I'm opposed.

Correspondence ID: 12995Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Issaquah, WA 98029
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 18:35:49
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I love the parks and being outside. I believe it's important we do what we can to protect the natural ecosystem.

As a Washington resident and national park lover, I strongly support the National Park Services preferred Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation. This plan will both effectively restore grizzly bears in North Cascades National Park and give people the tools they need to thrive in and around grizzly bear country. Grizzlies belong in the North Cascades, as they enhance the park's ecological integrity and contribute to its wildness.

Grizzly bears play a vital role in maintaining ecosystem balance, cycling nutrients, dispersing seeds, and changing the behavior of species around them. Restoring them would benefit the park and the people who use it.

A restored population of grizzlies will boost the park's appeal and attract nature enthusiasts, scientists, and tourists from around the world. This would provide economic benefits to local communities and support the park's mission to protect park resources in perpetuity.

Alternative C, with the 10(j) rule, addresses safety concerns while protecting the grizzly population. It ensures coexistence between humans and bears.

Please consider the positive ecological and economic benefits and support Alternative C. Restoring grizzly bears will preserve the park's natural heritage and conserve an iconic species for current and future generations.

Thank you for your dedication to our national parks.

Correspondence ID: 12997Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bothell, WA 98021
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 18:37:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do not introduce grizzly bears into the North Cascades. Grizzly bears are far more aggressive than black bears and cover larger territories. They will endanger hikers and campers and will endanger domestic animals near the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 12999Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Auburn, Washington, United States, WA 98092
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 18:40:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am very concerned with protecting the habitat of our existing populations of wildlife (plant and animal). These populations are already being stressed by human encroachment and climate change - it will be enough of a challenge to protect their future without the addition of more competition seeking limited resources.

I want to see further study of how climate change will impact the resources this environment provides.

I want to see further study how the introduction of the Grizzly Bear will impact the behavior of the currant animal (primarily

Cougar and Black Bear) populations.

It disturbs me that the NPS picks the winners and losers in nature (still riled over the slaughter of goats in Olympic National Park). Can we just provide for the beautiful creatures that we now share our environments with?

Correspondence ID: 13001Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Gainesville, FL 32608
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 18:42:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Absolutely brown bears should be reintroduced into the area! The reintroduction of natural predators will help aid in overpopulation issues of prey animals such as deer and therefore reduce the risk of issues such as Chronic Wasting Disease. As hunters decline, it is becoming a heavier financial burden to manage the deer population for the state. While reintroducing brown bears may not guarantee help, it certainly will provide ecological benefits that expand far past what the division of fish and wildlife can do.

Correspondence ID: 13004Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mukilteo, WA 98275
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 18:44:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am not in favor of re-introducing grizzly bears to the North Cascades. It is too great a risk to humans and other (wanted) animals. There is no need to do this, and there are a lot of risks and downsides. Please do not re-introduce grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 13005Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Selah, WA 98942
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 18:44:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As an avid horseback rider, I spend lots of time in the wilderness of Washington state. I am very against bringing grizzly bears into our wilderness. I see no reason why they should be! It would just cause our local wilderness to be unsafe.

Correspondence ID: 13007Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 18:46:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzlies should absolutely be reintroduced. Human beings are incredibly selfish when it comes to nature. Everytime we go out for a hike or a camping trip, we need to accept the risk that comes with venturing into wild animals homes. They were here before us, and they deserve to come home. And to the people who disagree because they won't feel "as safe", on their nature outings, well, then you didn't go on your outing because you love nature. You went for the photo op. If you actually loved nature, there would be no question in your mind to reintroduce these majestic creatures.

Correspondence ID: 13009Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Oroville, WA 98844
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 18:53:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Until five years ago, I was a long time resident of the Southern Sierra Nevada in California, living at approximately 5000 ft. elevation. We didn't have Grizzly bears but we were frequent victims of the next extremely dangerous bear - the Black bear.

I, members of my family, and my neighbors had many encounters with the Black bears dangerous behavior that resulted in destruction. And these encounters are not relegated to only the rural areas but also small towns. One family had their fence torn down more than once, their chicken pen destroyed, and their chickens killed. Several others had dogs killed and horses injured. One of my son's horses was injured so badly by a Black bear that it had to be put down.

In the process of building his log home, a Black bear tore out my son's door and proceeded to cause severe damage inside the house. A close friend kept a freezer, closed and secured with a chain, on their screened-in porch. A Black bear broke into the porch, drug off the freezer, tore off the lid, and spread the contents down their road. These are just a few incidents that show the power of bears - and Grizzly bears are much more powerful and aggressive than Black bears.

Now, as a resident of the mountains of Central Washington, I dread the possibility that Grizzly bears may be reintroduced into the North Cascades. I'm very concerned that my grandchildren may be at risk for bodily harm or death and that my family and neighbors may become victims of these vicious animals.

Please consider the danger, destruction, and fear that bringing Grizzlies to our area will cause. Please do not reintroduce Grizzly bears into the North Cascades ecosystem.
Thank you for reading these comments.

Correspondence ID: 13011Project:112008Document:132104
Address: La Conner, WA 98257
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 18:54:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: It is so important to restore the Grizzly Bears to their natural habitat in the North Cascades. I support the efforts of the National Park Service in the Grizzly Bear Restoration Draft Plan . Thank you for letting a long time hiker make a comment!

Correspondence ID: 13013Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98118
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 18:58:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: YES - I, and the rest of my family of 5, strongly supports reintroduction of grizzly bears into the North Cascades Ecosystem. We frequently hike/camp there and would be honored if USFW would help bring up population #s of grizzlies and many other T/E species into this area.

Bears were in the PNW well before humans and we should do EVERYTHING we can to help this species survive. It is far less expensive and more likley to be successful to use land that has not been ruined by human development for conservation/wilderness areas than trying to restore/change a damaged or inappropriate area. We are so lucky that the N Cascades ecosystem is already suitable habitat for grizzlies.

Counter-arguments to what some opponents argue:

"The campsite I own/operate may be impacted" - Humans, including campers and residents, are guests in the forest. Most people with even a HS education understand that animals (black bears, coyotes, racoons, etc.) can get into human food supplies when humans are careless. Human litter adversely impacts animals (refer to recent bear in Telluride CO that was so sick due to plastic blocking GI tract that it had to be euthenized) and it will always be our responsibility to not cause such suffering (e.g. by properly stowing our food and garbage and behaving kindly toward animals). All of this is already the case and adding grizzlies to the PNW does not change anything for humans.

"My land may become less valuable" - total speculation; we all take this risk whenever buying property. Just as likley it will go up as a result of the reintroduction of grizzlies as people realize this is a conservation area where people really CARE about being stewards for native flora and fauna. Don't be a greedy human - no one likes or respects that position.

There is really NO DOWNSIDE here.

Correspondence ID: 13014Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Oroville, WA 98844
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 18:59:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am against the introduction of grizzley bears to the North Cascades ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 13016Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Auburn, WA 98092
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 19:00:50
Correspondence Type:Web Form
Correspondence: Bring back the grizzlies!

Correspondence ID: 13028Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98199
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 19:19:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I strongly support the reintroduction of Grizzly Bears into their former territory of North Cascades National Park.

We have the responsibility to do everything possible to help the population grow, as it continues to remain on the Endangered Spieces List.

Many experienced hikers that go backcountry already know how to adjust their awareness when they hike in Glacier or Yellowstone National Parks.

The concern of private livestock owners should not dictate the the need for improving the range for the bears, as it is our responsibility to help improve bear populations, we must accommodate the bears and coexist.

I support Alternative Plan B.

Correspondence ID: 13029Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tacoma, WA 98418
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 19:19:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Indigenous people lived alongside bears for thousands of years. People still live alongside grizzlies in Canada and Alaska.

We know 2 things. Bears are a keystone species and this ecosystems coevolved around their presence. Grizzlies are dangerous. In this time of modern technology, I believe we have what we need to recognize the ecological role of the grizzlies and to minimize the danger they pose to people.

Let's continue to compensate farmers at fair market value for predation, bit let's also help these farmers innovate to meet this environmental challenge. For example, the addition of 1 Llama to a herd of cattle, sheep,or goats will cause the Llama to adopt the herd and serve their protector. Various instruments have been successfully used to ward off animals from wolves to elephants as well. Farmers should be financially aided to deploy these instruments on their land.

The unaddressed challenge beyond this though, is that farmers continue to graze on federal land where these bears will be introduced. Farmers that choose this practice will need to accept that they are sending their livestock into wilderness and understand the risks that come with that. Those who wish to use federal wilderness as a denatured cattle field must understand that this is public land, and if the public chooses to restore this land to full ecological function then they must respect that.

Correspondence ID: 13031Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Oroville, WA 98844
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 19:21:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Sir or Madam:

My husband and I oppose the introduction of the Grizzly bear into the North Cascades ecosystem. There is no room for these apex predators in this ecosystem. The current population of Black and Brown bears have established their territories - territories that have already been negatively affected by the spread of human populations further into the rural areas. What happens to the native Black and Brown bears when the Grizzlies are dropped into their territories?

Clearly the Black and Brown bears will be displaced by the Grizzlies, possibly being killed by the stronger, more aggressive Grizzly and/or starved out by competition for prey/food in what once was their territory. And what of the deer, elk, moose, and fish populations? What of the other food sources eaten by bears? The pressure on these animals and food sources will increase many fold. The introduction of the Grizzlies will cause a domino effect of negative impacts on the entire ecosystem.

As a result, Black and Brown bears may be forced into becoming marauders, turning to raiding campsites and/or foraging livestock and domestic fowl to feed their starving bellies. The destruction this will cause to local farmers, ranchers, hikers, campers, and other citizens of the area will in turn lead to destruction of the marauding bears. Just one more sad effect of having been pushed out of their territories by the non-native Grizzlies.

Why do this to the Black and Brown bears and the other members of the current North Cascades ecosystem? Please do not introduce the Grizzly bear into the North Cascades ecosystem.

Thank you for reading these comments - I hope they are taken to heart!

Correspondence ID: 13039Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98109
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 19:33:03

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I agree that grizzly bears should be reintroduced to North Cascades Ecosystem, they play an important role in the ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 13041Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 19:36:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support Alternative C with the Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) designation. That said, I would like to comment on the process that the National Park Service is pursuing to reintroduce grizzly bears to the North Cascades.

As much as I am a bit terrified of the animal itself, I have a boundless respect and admiration for this magnificent creature and would not want to do anything to lessen its chances for survival.

What distresses me is that outside of the sessions where the locals have a chance to air their concerns and fears (I attended the meeting in Winthrop this year and in Okanogan a few years ago), I see no efforts made to educate the community about grizzly bears. Just having posters around the room with a staff member standing by doesn't readily communicate the facts or clarify misinformation.

Instead, the myths and fears seem to proliferate and get worse. Rolled into that is distrust of the federal government and government employees. The impact statement does call for educating communities, but it needs to be done beforehand not after the fact. It would be helpful if local politicians and the sheriff were on board, but they're not. And the local environmental groups don't have much sway with the old-timers in the valley.

My husband and I live between Winthrop and Mazama in a riparian area that is rich with wildlife--black bears, cougars, moose, mule and whitetail deer, beaver, birds--all frequent and seem to flourish in this area. We dearly love seeing and are grateful for the wildlife here. We have learned to put up an electric fence to keep black bears out of our compost in the garden; I have seen black bears twice while walking our half-mile long driveway out to Highway 20. They go their way and I go mine.

However, when I imagine a grizzly in this scene (lots of chokecherry and serviceberry bushes along our gravel driveway), I feel a riskier edge to the stroll to the mailbox. Personally, I think that heightened awareness is a good thing, but I can also sympathize with the farmers, ranchers and outfitters who don't want their comfort level changed while enjoying and working in the outdoors.

Instead of respecting the wild and safeguarding it, all we humans seem to think about is our own comfort and security. Years ago, I had the great good fortune of being introduced to a series of caves at Carlsbad with a group of search and rescue volunteers. Ron Kerbo was our guide. He sat us down in a huge space and admonished us to treat that cave with the greatest respect and care. Somehow, my fears of crawling around in a tight confined dark space evaporated because suddenly I was in love with that cave. It was a deft and miraculous transformation of fear into love and caring.

I wish the same for the grizzly bear and its reintroduction to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 13054Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98122
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 19:45:58

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am enthusiastically in favor of introducing grizzly bears into the North Cascades. At a time when we are in climate crisis we will see the end of livestock sooner than we think. In 60-100 years no one will be raising cows to be

preyed on. And we can do without methane belching doggies. We may never see those amazing bears, but just knowing that they are out there fills me with joy!

Correspondence ID: 13056Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98104
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 19:54:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm writing to share my concerns about bringing grizzlies into the North Cascades. As someone who loves hiking, backpacking, fishing, and hunting in the area, the idea of grizzlies roaming around is pretty unsettling. I get that grizzly encounters are rare in general, but for hunters, it's a different story.

Studies show that grizzlies, especially during their hyperphagia stage, can follow hunters stealthily, often without being noticed. They're drawn to the carcasses of game like elk, which hunters often target. This behavior has been observed where grizzlies closely trailed hunters, sometimes even before any game was downed. It's a bit spooky to think that a bear could be tailing me and my family without us even realizing it.

Across North America, there were 183 bear attacks between 2000 and 2015, with grizzlies responsible for a significant number of these incidents. On average, 24 deaths were caused by grizzly bears in this period. Although the odds of being attacked by a bear are about one in 2.1 million, which is lower than many other risks, the presence of grizzlies could increase these odds for hunters specifically.

This possibility makes me think twice about bringing my family into the woods. And, honestly, it dampens my enthusiasm for contributing to conservation efforts if it means potentially putting us in harm's way.

Appreciate you taking the time to read my thoughts.

██████████
Seattle, WA

Correspondence ID: 13058Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 19:59:10

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello,

I would just like to say that for me, allowing Grizzly Bears to become more prolific in our area would be a mistake. We've had at least 3 instances where Black Bears have been interacting with our homes in the development. The loss of habitat seems to have driven them into our living space. I don't think that the Grizzly's addition to our area would be a good idea.

I know that the deer population in our area has been effected by the loss of habitat too. So the bears have to look somewhere else for their food. I wouldn't like to meet a Black Bear, let alone a Grizzly on a trail, far from help.

Thank you for your consideration

██████████
██████████
Winthrop, Wa. 98862
██████████

Correspondence ID: 13059Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 20:00:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As an avid mountaineer, I have enjoyed recreating in the North Cascades for over 30-years. I have reviewed the 2023 North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Environmental Impact Statement and support the proposal to restore the grizzly bear to the US portion of the North Cascades Ecosystem. I believe the expected benefits will out-weigh any potential impacts. I look forward to someday traveling through grizzly country in Washington state such as when I have traveled in the past though existing grizzly country in Alaska, Montana and British Columbia.

Correspondence ID: 13066Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Arlington, WA 98223
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 20:14:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support grizzly bear restoration in the north cascades, bring them back now. Our family logs many miles hiking on and off trail every year in the NCE. They are an important part of the ecosystem-we dont want a sanitized wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 13070Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Selah, WA 98942
United States of America

Outside Organization: BCHW Non-Governmental

Received: Nov,11 2023 20:18:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a member of Back Country Horsemen of Washington, I am very concerned with the ability to continue to recreate in the North Cascades should a small population of heavily protected grizzly bears be mechanically moved into the region that we recreate in. The DEIS does not sufficiently analyze the impact to recreation or present any options for how trails can be maintained open in the presence of protections implemented to reduce human-grizzly interactions.

1. The Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail runs through the core habitat and has permitted distance hikers of around 10,000. When considering the other trail users in and along the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE) since this is one of the most populated areas around any bear ecosystem, the use likely exceeds a quarter million visits. However, the DEIS indicates that the use is insignificant. It is very significant and will likely result in many human-bear interactions.
2. The Pacific Northwest National Scenic Trail also runs through the NCE as well as other bear ecosystems to the east, including the Cabinet-Yaak (CYE). The CYE has a more established population of bears but still has resulted with challenges to the very existence of the trail due to the limited number of bears in the CYE (20-40). Opposition to the National Scenic Trail in the recovering bear population area as well as the connecting landscapes between ecosystems has also been expressed by USFWS staff, the same agency putting forth the NCE proposal through which the same trail will pass.
3. Without a more detailed analysis of how to retain the carrying capacity of the trails, trailheads, and campgrounds without resulting in long term or permanent closures, there is no way to effectively review this DEIS.
4. Furthermore, the NPS and USFWS have pointed out that the Canadian counterparts and First Nations are preparing to release grizzly bears in the northern part of the NCE. IF that was the only release point, it would move the core recovery/release area north and away from the more densely human populated areas of Washington State. It also would be in line with Washington State law as well since no bears would be translocated directly into Washington, and there also would be predictability on how many bears are being moved into the entire NCE which overlaps both countries. The BC government has noted that their Recovery Plan is being developed jointly with the USFWS even though this US EIS only addresses the Washington effort.
5. As a trail horse rider in the NCE, I ask that the No Action Alternative be selected. The areas we ride in includes the Mt

Baker Snoqualmie National Forest, the Okanogan Wenatchee National Forest including the Pasayten Wilderness, and the North Cascades National Park. We have many horse camps along the boundary of the NCE. We cannot support either Action Alternative without more substantive analysis on impacts to recreation as well as knowing more on the joint planning with Canadian counterparts.

Correspondence ID: 13079Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 20:23:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not reintroduce grizzly bears into NCNP. There are so many people regularly recreating in the area that there would be more fatal encounters than the less populated territory in which grizzlies thrive today.

Correspondence ID: 13088Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Selah, WA 98942
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 20:36:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the: Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Environmental Impact Statement for the North Cascades Ecosystem

As a member of Back Country Horsemen of Washington, I am very concerned with the ability to continue to recreate in the North Cascades should a small population of heavily protected grizzly bears be mechanically moved into the region that we recreate in. The DEIS does not sufficiently analyze the impact to recreation or present any options for how trails can be maintained open in the presence of protections implemented to reduce human-grizzly interactions.

1. The Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail runs through the core habitat and has permitted distance hikers of around 10,000. When considering the other trail users in and along the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE) since this is one of the most populated areas around any bear ecosystem, the use likely exceeds a quarter million visits. However, the DEIS indicates that the use is insignificant. It is very significant and will likely result in many human-bear interactions.

2. The Pacific Northwest National Scenic Trail also runs through the NCE as well as other bear ecosystems to the east, including the Cabinet-Yaak (CYE). The CYE has a more established population of bears but still has resulted with challenges to the very existence of the trail due to the limited number of bears in the CYE (20-40). Opposition to the National Scenic Trail in the recovering bear population area as well as the connecting landscapes between ecosystems has also been expressed by USFWS staff, the same agency putting forth the NCE proposal through which the same trail will pass.

3. Without a more detailed analysis of how to retain the carrying capacity of the trails, trailheads, and campgrounds without resulting in long term or permanent closures, there is no way to effectively review this DEIS.

4. Furthermore, the NPS and USFWS have pointed out that the Canadian counterparts and First Nations are preparing to release grizzly bears in the northern part of the NCE. IF that was the only release point, it would move the core recovery/release area north and away from the more densely human populated areas of Washington State. It also would be in line with Washington State law as well since no bears would be translocated directly into Washington, and there also would be predictability on how many bears are being moved into the entire NCE which overlaps both countries. The BC government has noted that their Recovery Plan is being developed jointly with the USFWS even though this US EIS only addresses the Washington effort.

5. As a trail horse rider in the NCE, I ask that the No Action Alternative be selected. The areas we ride in includes the Mt Baker Snoqualmie National Forest, the Okanogan Wenatchee National Forest including the Pasayten Wilderness, and the North Cascades National Park. We have many horse camps along the boundary of the NCE. We cannot support either Action Alternative without more substantive analysis on impacts to recreation as well as knowing more on the joint planning with Canadian counterparts.

Correspondence ID: 13093Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bremerton, WA 98337
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 20:45:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello,

My name is [REDACTED] and I would like to comment on your decision regarding bringing Grizzly bears back to the Cascades. How can this be! If you are so concerned for the environment you should not be bringing Grizzly bears into it. Since when has introducing an apex predator into a unique, beautiful, and productive environment, been helpful? Our state is a lovely place, and it has a lot farms and ranches. As you and I both know, Grizzly bears are apex predators and they will go after any animal. This poses a real threat to farms and ranches, do you want to ruin Washington's economy?

Grizzly bears kill tens of people every year, and the attacks are only becoming more common. In fact, at many national parks there are signs that say "do not take selfies with the bears". Can you honestly say that you think more deadly animals will solve the problem? We have all heard the horror stories of small children, teens, and adults who were mauled by Grizzly bears. Are trying to kill Washingtonians? If you read a news article or a book, that was talking about a government that sent deadly bears upon their people. Then did not allow their citizens to protect themselves against these bears with a gun, that it was their right to have. And then deprived their citizens of meat, and therefore a healthy, strong, and long life. What would you think? It seems that in the name of environment you want to end many peoples lives.

Your [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 13094Project:112008Document:132104
Address: New York, NY 10025
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 20:46:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish, and wildlife populations. I have had the opportunity to visit 23 National Parks and dozens of National Forests and Monuments and I consider the preservation of America's wild spaces as one of the most important contributions we can make to future generations. I also had the privilege of spending 7 months exploring the North Cascades while living and working in Seattle.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live in and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

Furthermore, the 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Thank you for taking the time to keep our North Cascades wild!

Correspondence ID: 13101Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ellensburg, WA 98926
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 20:52:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do NOT support the Grizzly Bear Restoration plan for the North Cascades. I'm tired of the NPS continuing to try to get the restoration plan of Grizzlies approved in the North Cascades!!! Take a look at the problems occurring in MT with Black bears and Grizzlies, check out what's happening in Missoula and Bozeman.

Correspondence ID: 13104Project:112008Document:132104
Address: DuPont, WA 98327
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 20:53:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of grizzlies to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 13108Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Deming, WA 98244
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 21:09:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: After much thought following the public comment hearing on 11/01 I have decided to oppose grizzly bear translocation in the north cascades. As an advocate for wildlife, particularly wolves and bears, I am concerned about the risks to the animals that would be translocated, particularly because they will not have the same protection as bears who have migrated into the north cascades naturally.
At the public comment hearing the local livestock producers were very vocal and implied that they espouse the "shoot shovel and shut up" policy and I would be very disheartened if any wild grizzly were to fall dead at their hands, particularly after being translocated, which can be a stressful and disorienting process for the animal.
I understand and admire the parks service's goal of boosting grizzly numbers and I sympathize. I believe Washington state is a leader in wildlife conservation, the project that I think exemplifies this is the wildlife bridge over I90. In my opinion, the best approach to long term stability of wildlife populations begins with addressing habitat fragmentation. We know that there are a number of grizzly bears in the north cascades already and if we continue to reopen historic migratory corridors we can expect to see bears and other species returning to their native habitat without costly and complicated translocation operations. Thank you for your attention.

Correspondence ID: 13110Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98136-1023
United States of America
Outside Organization: www.judithwrightdesign.net Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 21:13:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am opposed to re-introducing Grizzlies. It is artificial to me not natural. I would not feel safe hiking in many areas which I have enjoyed. It is not endangering Grizzlies by not being transported here but it does endanger humans who enjoy the outdoors. This may seem simple but I have read the arguments and feel it is not necessary.
Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 13111Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America
Outside Organization: Self Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 21:17:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of the grizzlies to the North Cascades Ecosystem, preferring Option C with the 10j rule.
I believe the experience of people in places like Alaska and Montana show it can work to live with grizzlies.
I believe there is a role that they play in the ecosystem that must be honored.
As a principle, I believe we should strive for whole ecosystems.
I also believe humans benefit from a more respectful position towards nature .
I am active in the backcountry as a hiker , runner and skier.
Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 13113Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Woodinville, WA 98072
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 21:17:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Our family as crossed the North Cascades ~27 times and spent ~180 nights camping between Rockport, Ross Lakes, and Tonasket. I have experienced bears in the wild, aware of how we got here, support reintroduction of grizzlies, and feel this is our responsibility to future generations.

As a 58-year old son, fisherman and hunter that raised a family in Washington with frequent visits to Oregon, Montana, Yellowstone, Wyoming, and British Columbia, encountered bears in the wild, understand the protocols, heard the stories, studied the attacks, felt the primal fear bear-power, and experienced the joy they bring (in the moment) to young and old when we see them--whether in the wild or the zoo.

I remember every encounter I have had with bears in the my life and have many stories to tell. I would appreciate this same opportunity being available for future generations.

Correspondence ID: 13115Project:112008Document:132104

Address: San Rafael, CA 94903
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 21:29:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Saturday, November 11, 2023

Superintendent
North Cascades National Park Service Complex
810 State Route 20
Sedro Woolley, WA 98284

Subject: A recovering grizzly population in the North Cascades needs Endangered Species Act protection -- Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Environmental Impact Statement, North Cascades Ecosystem

To Secretary of the Interior Deb Haaland, NPS Director Charles Sams, USFWS Director Martha Williams, North Cascades National Park Service Complex Superintendent Don Striker, and USFWS Deputy State Supervisor Ann Froschauer:

I strongly support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades (and throughout their historic range), and I urge the National Park Service (NPS) and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) to conduct the restoration in ways that don't

violate the Wilderness Act or harm the area's wilderness character. Grizzlies belong in the North Cascades, as they enhance the park's ecological integrity and contribute to its wildness, but any restoration must be good for both bears and Wilderness.

Grizzly bears play a vital role in maintaining ecosystem balance, cycling nutrients, dispersing seeds, and changing the behavior of species around them. We have the opportunity to bring back these magnificent animals which were hunted and trapped into extinction during the 1800s and 1900s. The North Cascades Ecosystem is one of the remaining six areas in the lower 48 that has enough remaining habitat to support a viable population of grizzly bears. We have seen that grizzly bears and humans can coexist in the lower 48. Currently there are over 1,000 grizzly bears in each of the Greater Yellowstone and Northern Continental Divide Ecosystems. Restoring them to the North Cascades would benefit the park and the people who use it. A restored population of grizzlies will boost the park's appeal and attract nature enthusiasts, scientists, and tourists from around the world. This would provide economic benefits to local communities and support the park's mission to protect park resources in perpetuity.

"It is horrifying that we have to fight our own government to save the environment."
-- Ansel Adams

Disappointingly, both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, the placement and use of telemetry installations, and steer clear of heavy-handed management of bears. There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide release sites without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

While I fully support recovering a healthy grizzly bear population in the North Cascades of north-central Washington, I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule in the restoration work, which would designate threatened grizzly bears moved to the North Cascades as a "nonessential experimental population." This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection. This is unethical and must not be allowed to happen.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest. Grizzly bears in the lower 48 states are threatened, and we don't have extra grizzly bears in the lower 48 states to capture and ship to the North Cascades, only to be killed because they had lost their ESA protections.

A 10(j) rule makes it much easier to kill grizzly bears and treat a grizzly bear population in a way that the USFWS would not treat other grizzly bears in the lower 48 states. A 10(j) rule also allows the USFWS to preclude any habitat protections which are necessary if bears are going to recolonize this landscape and eventually link up with other recovery areas. A 10(j) rule also allows the federal agencies to avoid the normal ESA Section 7 consultation requirements, which otherwise require consultations among the federal agencies (in this case, especially the U.S. Forest Service) to avoid jeopardizing the grizzlies.

For all these reasons, I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the proposed grizzly bear restoration work in the North Cascades. Instead, a natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives, thus reducing the need for wilderness-degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

Unfortunately, the USFWS hasn't done the legwork for preparing communities and recreationists for the arrival of grizzly

bears through basic Bear Smart and coexistence measures, which just means that conflicts will be more likely--and the results will inevitably be dead grizzly bears.

Fortunately, the no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the North Cascades. Restoring grizzly bears will secure the park's natural heritage and conserve an iconic species for current and future generations. But the restoration must combine natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections

"A thing is right when it tends to preserve the integrity, stability, and beauty of the biotic community. It is wrong when it tends otherwise."

-- Aldo Leopold

Thank you for your consideration of my comments. Please do NOT add my name to your mailing list. I will learn about future developments on this issue from other sources.

Sincerely,


San Rafael, CA

Correspondence ID: 13118Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mazama, WA 98833
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 21:31:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing in support of Alternative C of the subject EIS. The data and arguments in the EIS are rational. My family and I live adjacent to some of the Forest Service land that will be most effected by the reintroduction. We chose to live close to wilderness and are willing to do what is required to coexist with wildlife. Already, in response to incidents with black bears we have built an electric fence around our beehives, bought a bear-resistant garbage can (which we also keep in the garage), have no bird feeders, etc. - all the best practices for not attracting bears. When we have had incidents with black bears we report them to Home Range Wildlife Research. With the slow rate of reintroduction into such a vast area, it's unlikely that I will even see a grizzly, but I will be prepared and am excited by the prospect.

Correspondence ID: 13120Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Anacortes, WA 98221
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 21:34:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I live in Skagit County & support reintroducing some Grizzly Bears into the North Cascades along with our Canadian comrades. This is one of the largest, most desolate chunks of land in the lower 48, they would have plenty of room to roam.

Correspondence ID: 13124Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellevue, WA 98005
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 21:45:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello NPS,

I read thru the draft, it didn't explain why grizzly bears disappeared from Washington State. If we don't know the root cause of this species' decline, what should we expect even if we reintroduce? Since the human activities have increased in the area, and the climate change has made natural resources scarer, how will they survive this time?

Not to mention how dangerous it would be for local communities and outdoor recreational visitors.

Thus I suggest not to take actions to re-introduce the grizzlies but to use the resources to protect what's left to us.

Thanks,

Correspondence ID: 13126Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bothell, WA 98011
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 21:56:03

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Many people enjoy camping and hiking in the wilderness. Why do you put their lives at risk by introducing aggressive animals that can kill them? This RUINS the recreational value of this park. Black bears can be commensal but grizzly bears are another matter entirely.

Correspondence ID: 13128Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98106
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 22:00:31

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly support the reintroduction of grizzly bears into the North Cascades National Park.

Correspondence ID: 13131Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tacoma, WA 98407
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 22:10:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am against the NCE grizzly bear reintroduction plan. There This reintroduction will have no benefit to the ecosystem. However, there will eventually be human and domestic animal deaths caused by grizzly bears in the area. People will be fearful of going into these areas. This appears to be another government action to use a protected animal to reduce access to public properties.

Correspondence ID: 13137Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sultan, WA 98294
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 22:34:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am not against grizzlies returning to the North Cascades, but I do question the wisdom of artificial reintroduction. The Park and adjacent Pasayten wilderness have been in existence for 55 years now with a lengthy and barrier free border with Canada (which also has extensive parks that abut the border). Why haven't grizzlies reestablished themselves

even though the habitat has been deemed suitable? Why are the populations declining in Canada? It seems to me that there should be definitive answers to these questions before considering reintroduction.

Correspondence ID: 13138Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ronan, MT 59864
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 22:42:52

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The American Bear Foundation of Washington has always been at the forefront of advocating for bear welfare. Yet, we cannot support the reintroduction of the grizzly bear. The state already hosts this formidable predator. With the challenges the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife faces in managing the rising numbers of black bear, cougar, and wolves, introducing a larger and more aggressive predator seems like a step in the wrong direction.

Correspondence ID: 13140Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Poulsbo, WA 98370
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 22:48:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am all for it.

Correspondence ID: 13144Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ellensburg, WA 98926
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 22:55:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Alternative A is the only one that makes any sense. The only reasonable protein source for grizzly bears on the Pacific crest would be the through hikers.

Correspondence ID: 13146Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellevue, WA 98005
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 22:57:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am firmly against the reintroduction of grizzly bears in the North Cascades in Washington state. I come from a family of hikers and we will no longer feel safe to bring our children to nature knowing there are grizzly bears in the wild. There are enough carnivores to control herbivores populations in the area such as wild cats and coyotes. So I disagree with the statement that the grizzlies would contribute further to the local ecosystem. Furthermore, there are other bear species which might be negatively impacted by the grizzlies.

I hope you take my opinion into consideration and those of other concerned citizens.

Correspondence ID: 13148Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellevue, WA 98005
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 23:03:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzlies are deadly. Unless you want every hiker to carry a gun, you should keep the Grizzlies far away.

Correspondence ID: 13154Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellevue, WA 98006
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 23:13:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears are too aggressive and deadly. Please don't bring them back to Washington. We have brown bears and that's OK.

Correspondence ID: 13155Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98109
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 23:14:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Support

As a hiker, backpacker, climber, and Washington resident, I support returning grizzlies to their land.

Correspondence ID: 13157Project:112008Document:132104

Address: West Richland, WA 99353
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 23:16:41

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello -

I am writing to express the fact that I am against any policy or action to haul dangerous grizzly bears into the North Cascade ecosystem. The very idea of doing such a thing is pure, bold nonsense. These are dangerous animals should be left in their current habitat. Mixing bears and humans is just asking for trouble. Leave the bears alone.

Cheers,

[REDACTED] Landowner, farmer, rancher, West Richland, Washington.

Correspondence ID: 13160Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellevue, WA 98005
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,11 2023 23:21:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the plan to restore grizzly bears to the NCE. I am not an avid hiker, but when I do hike in bear country (mostly in MT), I carry bear spray and have an awareness and understanding that I could have an encounter with a grizzly. These are risks I am willing to take when hiking in the wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 13161Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ellensburg, WA 98926
United States of America

Outside Organization: Kittitas Valley Trail Riders Business(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,11 2023 23:32:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My Name is [REDACTED] I am President of the Kittitas Valley Trail Riders, a group of about 45 Horse Back riders who ride many of the hundreds of trails in the Kittitas County area and a bit beyond. I am very concerned about the reintroduction of Grizzly Bears any part of Washington State.

I want you to think about the numbers, numbers tell the story. Montana has 7 people per square mile, Washington state 101 people per square mile. Riding the back country in Washington you see a whole lot of hikers, Mountain Bike Riders and Horse Back riders, it'll be just a matter of time for a chance encounter. Montana is 147,000 Square Miles where as Washington state is 71,000, half the size of Montana, the potential square miles a group of 20 grizzlies will need to roam will be in the neighborhood of 10,000 miles, that is a 7th of the state of Washington. Releasing Grizzlies in areas that are highly fire prone, or that have minimal habitat for Grizzly because of terrain will extend that 10,000 mile range. We had a fire next to the Teanaway Community Forest 5 - 6 years ago, The Jolly Mountain Fire, it drove deer, elk and bears from Jolly mountain down into the Teanaway. For up to 4 years we had multiple sightings of black bear in Teanaway, where we normally see one a year. Black Bear are legally hunted in Teanaway, talking with hunters who had been using game cameras in Teanaway they saw way more Black Bears then before, they told me that the Bears were pushed down from Jolly Mountain due to the fire and that it took several years for their forage to grow back enough to support a population. The Mega Fires that have occurred in the North Cascade areas will push bears into human population areas WHEN THEY OCCUR, because they will with global warming.

I'm not addressing the Ranchers dilemma, because that's a no brainer.

If Grizzlies are introduced it'll be just a matter of when a Human to Grizzly incident happens...

Correspondence ID: 13162Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98125
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,11 2023 23:39:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am very concerned about the introduction of Grizzly bears and what it will mean for outdoor recreation in the Cascades. Given the proximity to Seattle, there are a lot of inexperienced people exploring the outdoors (a great thing for them to appreciate the nature!) and I doubt they would all store their food safely, cook away from their tent when backpacking etc. This is a recipe for a bad encounter. Likewise there are a lot of climbers and other outdoor enthusiasts who will likely try to not carry bear spray or even a bear canister on their big mountain pushes. In addition, there is a lot of brush in the Cascades and travel on overgrown trails or off-trail is common. Together this is a recipe for fatal encounters with grizzly bears. Washington has perhaps the perfect outdoors: wildlife that is not life-threatening, beautiful weather, diverse rugged wild landscape. This is paired with a nearby megacity with many people not having experienced the outdoors before. It's where many people fall in love with it through the unique backpacking experiences, turning them into lifetime nature lovers and wildlife advocates. Introducing grizzlies will make that care-free adventure backpack almost impossible to experience. Especially since you can't rely on everyone behaving appropriately even if you follow the rules exactly, which will endanger both humans and as a result bears. Case in point is the example of the black bear at Cascade pass this year that had obtained food from humans too many times. If that had been a Grizzly there is a high likelihood there would have been a mauling. The cascades, or rather the human population here, are not ready for this. Maybe in a few decades, when responsible outdoors behavior has become more engrained in the culture. I strongly disapprove of introducing any additional Grizzly bears in the Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 13166Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Sammamish, WA 98074
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people

who live in and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

Furthermore, the 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Thank you for taking the time to keep our North Cascades wild!

Correspondence ID: 13167Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Everett, WA 98208

United States of America

Outside Organization: 11427 34TH Dr SE Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think bringing grizzly bears back to the North Cascades would help teach people about animals and would be a great experience to watch them roam our beloved state.

Correspondence ID: 13169Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98125

United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I explore the Cascades every weekend as a climber or hiker. This tends to take me and mostly just one other party member off trail into very remote regions. Given the long approaches and the weight of technical climbing gear, we minimize the gear we bring on each trip down to the grams. There is a sizable community here engaging in these kinds of mountain activities. I am convinced that only several Grizzly bear caused fatalities in Washington would induce climbers to carry both bear spray and a bear canister on big mountain pushes where every gram counts and you are already pushing your physical limits and safety margins (do I leave behind two climbing cams I will definitely need or the bear canister I might not?). Likewise group sizes for these kinds of activities will always remain very small, further increasing the risk of a potentially fatal encounter. This in combination with the high likelihood that bears will learn dangerous behavior from inexperienced hikers or at trailheads (since so many Seattleites are completely new to the outdoors) makes a fatality very likely. I would strongly caution against introducing Grizzly bears to maintain the safety of the outdoors and climbing community and our ability to enjoy this precious piece of wilderness we love so dearly.

Correspondence ID: 13171Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98125

United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a mountain climber and backcountry skier I've spent many days and nights in the the North Cascades. These activities take me, usually with only a single partner, into remote regions far from any trail at all times of the year. I have concerns about the safety of climbers and their gear in the presence of grizzly bears. Because of the remoteness, off trail travel, and small party sizes, any injuries from an encounter with an aggressive bear, or sustained while trying to escape or evade one, could lead to deaths.

Food storage options are often limited because of the terrain. Unfortunately, many climbers have dialed their equipment margins down to a minimum in order to move fast and far through challenging terrain. Few climbers will be willing to carry bear canisters or bear deterrents in addition to their other equipment. This could lead to bear encounters and the bears learning dangerous behaviors. Honestly, it would probably take at least one deadly encounter with a grizzly before even bear-educated climbers would take a bear canister with them.

Because of the remoteness and the nature of the terrain climbers encounter, any damage to gear caused by a bear looking for food could also lead to a life threatening situation. What gear is taken is essential and climbers travel with few pieces of back up equipment. Gear and food is often left unattended at base camp during summit days. If a bear were to destroy a tent, stove, or sleeping bag while trying to obtain food it could lead to a life threatening situation.

Grizzlies may pose no more of a risk than other animals climbers encounter - I'm not a grizzly expert - I just want decision makers to be aware of the presence and relative vulnerability of climbers in remote regions of the North Cascades. Climbers likely visit every single valley in the Cascades throughout the year and I hope that their presence is taken into account in this decision.

Best,

Correspondence ID: 13177Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Monroe, WA 98272
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Don't do it. Have you ever seen Jurassic Park? I know they aren't dinosaurs, but they are apex predators. The ecosystem has already adapted to their absence, there's no need to throw them back in. Especially since some of your plans involve human intervention to even make it work. I appreciate the desire of government agencies to spend as much money as possible, but this one has real potentially life and death consequences for Washington state residents and visitors.

I'll leave you with a quote from the movie Jurassic Park,
"Yeah, but your scientists were so preoccupied with whether or not they could, they didn't stop to think if they should."

Correspondence ID: 13178Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tacoma, WA 98407
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think reintroducing grizzly bears to a region that is so heavily used by recreational hikers and campers is a bad idea, and I don't see a good reason for it other than that they lived here for a very long time. I just can't convince myself that it is worth the risk, however small.

Correspondence ID: 13181Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support Alternative A: No action. I recreate in the north cascades and would live in constant (unjustified) fear.

Correspondence ID: 13182Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Tacoma, WA 98405
United States of America
Outside Organization: Tacoma DSA Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 01:03:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am thrilled by the prospect that the grizzly bear will be reintroduced into what has been its traditional habituate here in Washington. It is a keystone species, which helps maintain the balance of this vibrant and unique ecosystem. Its loss was deeply felt, and its reintroduction brings us closer to correcting the damage that we as humans have caused.

I fully endorse this Restoration plan and am excited to see it develop in the years to come!

Correspondence ID: 13184Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Chewelah, WA 99109
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 01:16:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I live near the Selkirk recovery zone. I work and recreate in the Selkirk recovery zone. A grizzly encounter is unlikely but possible, and poses a significant threat if I was to encounter one in the woods. It is enough to feel the need to carry bear spray as well as a pistol for self defense. I know of a person near Bozeman, Mt who felt it was necessary film an encounter with an aggressive grizzly before shooting it, to prove that the act was in self defense to the authorities, because of the scrutiny he knew he would face from Fish and Wildlife officials. Recently, a hunter was severely mauled near Big Sky, effectively losing his jaw. A couple and their dog were attacked, more than likely in a predatory attack, and killed in Banff National Park, just a few months ago. Glacier National Park has had numerous attacks over the decades.

While the release and population rise will be slow, it will inevitably eventually lead to negative encounters with people like myself who recreate in the North Cascades. I am strongly in support of a no action alternative. Grizzlies are present in Canada and may eventually return to the Cascades on their own. I see no reason to spend millions of federal tax dollars to return a creature which will inevitably lead to attacks and possibly deaths of humans. The management of problem grizzlies, including hazing, tracking, capture, relocation, and dispatching will alone cost a fortune, not to mention the initial costs of the release and monitoring program.

Shooting of grizzlies due to self defense are highly scrutinized. Activities such as camping or climbing will need another level of preparation with grizzlies in the area.

There is not enough scientific evidence to support benefits of restoration of grizzlies to the ecosystem. At the end of the day, it is an opinion that they would be beneficial, and it does not overshadow the negative effects. Grizzly restoration is primarily being pursued by wildlife biologists, who are blinded by the romanticism of returning a large carnivore to their management area. Hikers, skiers, climbers, hunters, and your average outdoorsman does not support Alternative B or C.

Alternative A - No Action is the most beneficial and cost effective option.

Correspondence ID: 13185Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98040
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 01:23:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of grizzly bears into the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 13191Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Greenwood, UN V0H1J0
Canada

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 01:56:37

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Absolutely allow Grizzly Bear population to live within the North Cascades NP.

I think it's a smart idea to restore nature and make sure natural habitats are protected and conserved for species that evolved to live as a keystone species. As humans we need to change our behaviours and live more simply on the planet. Humans must evolve to put other species life as a priority. Not live just for our consumption and comforts. If we have to change being in the Park, we should give space to Grizzly Bears.

Correspondence ID: 13194Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Brisbane, UN 4118
Australia

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 02:45:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Humanity tends to measure our progress through fairly simplistic economic values like growth. We expand & extend our presence into once wild areas, & if we come into contact with an species, & that species interacts with us in ways that arent convenient. Humans, decide to reduce that inconvenience by putting in place management programs, which basically mean, we kill those animals to minimise the risk to humanity. This is the slippery slope that we have embraced for many generations, & it eventually means that those animals die out.

I would ask you, "Why are we destroying this planets biodiversity for our short sighted convenience". Don't our children deserve to see the world's wonderful animals & wildlife, & their children, & their children's children. It takes one generation to say enough! Then put in place ways that we can coexist for now & for the future. It may take more money, it may take making some hard decisions, like lets not bull doze that forest area. But with some care & thought, we can find a way to live together with all of gods creations.

I support alternative C, which would restore Grizzle bears to the north cascades.

Correspondence ID: 13195Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Newcastle, WA 96059
United States of America

Outside Organization: Sustainability Ambassadors Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 02:52:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I would like to send support for all types of wildlife restoration efforts, especially reintroducing native and keystone species. Please follow through with this to help move towards a better, more stable environment in the future!

Correspondence ID: 13200Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Yakima, WA 98908
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 03:38:45

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Draft Environmental Impact Statement 'Alternative C' is the most comprehensive plan that ensures both active restoration and pragmatic management in recovering the North Cascades grizzly bear.

Correspondence ID: 13209Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Monroe, WA 98272
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 04:11:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do not support Grizzly bears in the North cascade though I do support wolves.
Thank you,
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 13233Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Savannah, GA 31405
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 05:37:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live in and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

Furthermore, the 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Thank you for taking the time to keep our North Cascades wild!

Correspondence ID: 13242Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Kennewick, WA 99338
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 06:26:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a Washington resident, I strongly support the National Park Services preferred Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation. This plan will both effectively restore grizzly bears in North Cascades National Park and give people the tools they need to thrive in and around grizzly bear country.

Alternative C, with the 10(j) rule, addresses safety concerns while protecting the grizzly population. It ensures coexistence between humans and bears.

Please consider the positive ecological and economic benefits and support Alternative C. Restoring grizzly bears will preserve the park's natural heritage and conserve an iconic species for current and future generations.

Thank you for your dedication to our national parks.

Correspondence ID: 13255Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellevue, WA 98008
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 07:15:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I oppose the reintroduction of grizzlies to the North Cascades. I hike there frequently, and would probably have to stop with the reintroduction. The obvious risks are just too great.

Since they are already gone, what's the need for this program? I certainly wouldn't vote to EXTERMINATE any species, but they are gone. The world is full of habitats no longer inhabited by one-time tenants, so this is a natural progression. In the absence, other species have settled into a existence. Introducing a top-line predator will surely have a dramatic impact on them -- is their existence too unimportant to consider? It seems that the goal of impacting an environment should be tilted towards maintaining the status quo, which currently does NOT include grizzlies.

I fully oppose the reintroduction and hope you will table the suggestion.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 13259Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bothell, WA 98021
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 07:44:12

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please bring back the Grizzly Bears! Thank you!

Correspondence ID: 13260Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Huntington Beach, CA 92649
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 07:48:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Based on the Agency's neglect for Public Safety the 'No Action Alternative A' is recommended for the following reasons, including the Agency's violation of federal law and the noncompliance by the National Park Services of its own policies.

(1) Failure to Comply:

Pursuant to Title 40 Chapter V Subchapter A, Part 1502.2(b) which states, "Environmental impact statements shall discuss impacts in proportion to their significance. There shall be only brief discussion of other than significant issues. As in a finding of no significant impact, there should be only enough discussion to show why more study is not warranted."

The draft EIS fails to comply with Code of Federal Regulations Title 40 Chapter V Subchapter A, Part 1502.2(b) insofar as it's noncompliance to proportionately document the risks to public safety. While the classification of the Grizzly is easily identified by laypersons as having dangerous and unpredictable behavior and is well known as the top-of-the-food-chain apex predator, nevertheless the draft EIS fails to discuss the consequences to humans of such dangerous and unpredictable behavior. Moreover, the draft EIS fails to discuss in proportion the well documented significant risks to the public as required by 40 CFR 1502.2(b). While Grizzly attacks have been frequent news headlines for communities located near existing Grizzly recovery zones, this same information is not easily available by heretofore unaffected communities. This is why the

draft EIS is required to inform the communities that are in the crosshairs of these actions proposed by the Lead Agencies, however this has not been done. The safety of the public deserves to be a principal consideration during the draft EIS process when proposing to put apex predators onto public lands. Clearly this is not the case. Instead, impacts to public safety are disproportionately represented, in fact are silent in the draft EIS through omission of relevant information concerning Grizzly attacks on humans. The fact is the draft EIS fails to include the well documented grizzly-to-human conflicts resulting from frequent Grizzly attacks occurring inside and outside existing recovery zones. Existing research shows the majority of human-grizzly bear conflicts occur outside recovery zones, according to the draft EIS Page 60 which states, "Approximately 90% of the recovery zone is in federal, Tribal, or state ownership, with only 10% on private lands (Dood, Atkinson, and Boccadori 2006). However, the majority of human-grizzly bear conflicts and bear mortality occur on private lands, especially as grizzly bears expand their ranges." In other words, while the draft EIS admits to the predominant destination of Grizzlies to private lands, by omission it conceals from the public the tragic consequences of Grizzly attacks on humans, including the frequency of such attacks, proximity to population centers, as well as severity of resulting injuries and deaths. As an example, at the end of my comments is a partial list of recent human deaths and injuries resulting from Grizzly attacks inside a brief 4-month period, and is a partial list because the season for Grizzly activity extends into late November.

(2) Failure to Comply:

Pursuant to Title 40 Chapter V Subchapter A, Part 1502.2(f) which states, "Agencies shall not commit resources prejudicing selection of alternatives before making a final decision."

The draft EIS fails to comply with Code of Federal Regulations Title 40, 1502.2(f) insofar as its repeated failures in a) furnishing accurate information on NCE habitat, b) neglecting to utilize relevant and currently existing documentation, and c) disregarding the adverse impact that Grizzlies will have on other wildlife, including bighorn sheep, Canada lynx, Fishers, and various fish species, some which are currently threatened and have ESA protection, but are still regarded as Grizzly prey. The draft EIS has utilized outdated resources that are prejudicial to the No Action Alternative A. The draft EIS applies multiple false narratives by citing documentation which dates back nearly 60 (sixty) years, consisting of reports on NCE habitat and health of the ecosystem. On other words by omission of present-day information, the Agencies are clearly and intentionally "prejudicing selection of alternatives before making a final decision". This is particularly significant given the growth in human population inside and bordering the proposed recovery zones, as well as the losses of habitat that have occurred over the last 60 years that the draft EIS is silent on.

(3) Failure to Comply:

National Park Service Management Policy language concerning NPS conduct and decision making -

NPS policy at Section 4.4.2.2 of the 2006 Management Policies Manual states:

"The Service [NPS) will strive to restore extirpated native plant and animal species to parks whenever all of the following criteria are met: 2) The species does not, based on an effective management plan, pose a serious threat to the safety of people in parks, park resources, or persons or property within or outside park boundaries."

Further, Section 1.9.1.4 of the 2006 NPS Management Policies manual emphasizes that human life must not be compromised, rendering analysis in the final NCE/EIS a necessity:

"The safety and health of employees, contactors, volunteers, and the public are core Service values. In making

decisions on matters concerning employee safety and health, NPS managers must exercise good judgment and discretion and, above all, keep in mind that the safeguarding of human life must not be compromised. "

(4) Failure to Comply:

The Revised Code of Washington (RCW 77.12.035) unambiguously prohibits transplantation or introduction of grizzly bears into the State, including Federal initiatives:

"The commission shall protect grizzly bears and develop management programs on publicly owned lands that will encourage the natural regeneration of grizzly bears in areas with suitable habitat. Grizzly bears shall not be transplanted or introduced into the State. Only grizzly bears that are native to Washington State may be utilized by the department for management programs. The department is directed to fully participate in all discussions and negotiations with federal and State agencies relating to grizzly bear management and shall fully communicate, support, and implement the policies of this section."

2023 GRIZZLY / HUMAN CONFLICTS

OCTOBER 01, 2023 BEAR COMES OUT OF BRUSH AND ATTACKS 73-YEAR-OLD

SEPTEMBER 13, 2023 GRIZZLY CHARGES HUNTER UNTIL HE SHOOTS IT

SEPTEMBER 24, 2023 PERSISTENT GRIZZLY AND HER CUB EUTHANIZED AFTER BREAK-INS

SEPTEMBER 11, 2023 DEER HUNTER SHOOTS AT ATTACKING GRIZZLY

SEPTEMBER 02, 2023 GRIZZLY KILLED HIKER NEAR YELLOWSTONE

SEPTEMBER 06, 2023 GRIZZLY CHARGES AT HUNTERS IN THICK BRUSH, SHOT DEAD

AUGUST 30, 2023 SPOOKED GRIZZLY CHARGES ANGLERS IN MONTANA WILDERNESS

SEPTEMBER 07, 2023 GRIZZLY KILLED WOMAN, EUTHANIZED AFTER BREAKING INTO HOME

SEPTEMBER 12, 2023 NAVY VETERAN, JAW TORN OFF IN HORRIFYING GRIZZLY ATTACK (AMBUSHED)

SEPTEMBER 10, 2023 GRIZZLY BEAR MAULS HUNTER IN CUSTER GALLATIN NATIONAL FOREST

AUGUST 30 2023 MONTANA MEN SURPRISE MOMMA BEAR WITH CUB

JULY 24, 2023 WOMAN FOUND DEAD IN MONTANA FOLLOWING GRIZZLY BEAR ENCOUNTER

ADDITIONAL GRIZZLY ATTACKS, PRIOR YEARS

SHED HUNTER KILLED BY GRIZZLY IN FIRST ATTACK OF 2022

Oct 21, 2022 GRIZZLY ATTACK ON 2 BOYS

WOMAN KILLED BY GRIZZLY IN CITY LIMITS, ripped from her tent, killed by a grizzly bear while camping

IN MONTANA, DEPT OF INTERIOR SECRETARY HEARS CONCERNS OVER GRIZZLY BEARS (OCT 7, 2019)

FIVE GRIZZLY DEATHS LAST WEEK ALL INVOLVED BEARS THAT WERE FEEDING ON CATTLE (OCT 14, 2019)

GRIZZLY ON ROCKY MOUNTAIN FRONT EUTHANIZED (OCT 11, 2019)

GRIZZLY BEAR EUTHANIZED AFTER GUNSHOT WOUND (OCT 8, 2019)

A FOURTH HUNTER IS ATTACKED BY A GRIZZLY BEAR WITHIN DAYS IN MONTANA (September 26, 2019)

GRIZZLY BEAR ATTACK IN WESTERN GRAVELLY MOUNTAINS (SEP 25, 2019)

SEARCH ENDS FOLLOWING BACK-TO-BACK GRIZZLY ATTACKS (SEP 20, 2019)

GRIZZLY BEAR ACTIVITY CLOSES GLACIER PARK CAMPGROUNDS, TRAILS (AUG 20, 2019)

OFFICIALS RELEASE DETAILS ON CABINET MOUNTAINS BEAR ATTACK (JUN 21, 2018)

INVESTIGATORS RECOUNT NOVEMBER GRIZZLY BEAR ATTACK (FEB 17, 2019)

14 GRIZZLIES EUTHANIZED THIS YEAR, DOUBLE THE 10-YEAR AVERAGE. (SEPT 11, 2019)

Correspondence ID: 13261Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98101
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 08:02:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have lived in the PNW for most of my life and also visited areas with Grizzly bears such as Banff and Yellowstone. I do not support grizzly release into the North Cascade. In grizzly bear areas today, people adjust their activities to avoid being put in a position where they might unsafely encounter a bear. This either means more planning or avoiding the activity all together. We do not need the additional risk or fear near population areas.

Correspondence ID: 13262Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Franklin Lakes, NJ 07417
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 08:10:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear National Park Service,

I support reintroducing grizzly bears into the North Cascades ecosystem. Grizzly bears belong in this region since they once occupied it and are of cultural and ecological importance.

Like for all wildlife, people and wildlife can coexist with each other. People need to respect these large predators that once occupied this region for thousands of years. If restoring the population were to occur, the chances of a human seeing a grizzly bear in the National Park would still be low since the North Cascades is a remote wilderness with limited road access.

Large areas of open space are a habitat requirement for a healthy brown bear population. The North Cascades ecosystem is a large open wilderness and is a perfect location to reintroduce grizzly bears.

Sincerely,

Correspondence ID: 13264Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 08:27:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a native apex predator, this reintroduction is necessary and a smart investment for a healthy ecosystem. Health is wealth. The ecosystem services realized will stimulate Washington's' economy, and enrich our local flora and fauna to create a more biodiverse landscape. This is a great proposal. Check out How Wolves Change Rivers via YouTube for a great clip that showcases apex predator influence on ecosystems.

Correspondence ID: 13265Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Davenport, WA 99122
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 08:59:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is the same argument that was used to try to stop the reintroduction of the wolves to Yellowstone NPS. With the wolves the park and wildlife is healthier and thriving.

Now bringing back an apex predator is not without concerns but we need bears and other predators to help keep a healthy wildlife population and bears help spread necessary seeds and even help to lessen to a small degrees the risk of fires.

I understand a small portion of the populations concern but the health of the forests and Washington State need bears. Most of the most vocal opposition is from people who don't want to learn something new.

Am I worried about Bear - human interactions, yes, but is rather have to carry bear spray than continue to watch or forests and wildlife slowly decline into history.

Correspondence ID: 13266Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellevue, WA 98005
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 09:09:01

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not reintroduce Grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem. Bears would endanger the lives of human beings who are increasingly enjoying the extraordinary outdoors of the North Cascades. I am not convinced there is any real benefit to the ecosystem to reintroduce the Grizzly. While I am a supporter of wildlife and the environment, there are far more urgent and important ecosystem topics to focus upon that will not endanger human life. While the Grizzly is iconic, why not put more emphasis and money into increasing natural grasslands/wildflowers, for example, so insects can thrive, birds can thrive, rodents can thrive and on up the food chain. The reintroduction of the Northern Leopard Frog in the Potholes area of WA state is a good example. Thank you for asking for comments and thank you for the good work you do every day.

Correspondence ID: 13267Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bend, OR 97702
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 09:09:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am 100% in favor of Grizzly Bear restoration in the Pacific Northwest. Restoring keystone species to ecosystems should be an obvious mission for the next century and more. In fact, I'm a bit surprised the mention of Grizzlies as a keystone species is buried on page 276. For me, that is a pivotal argument for restoration. The impact a keystone species has on an ecosystem is tremendous and should be highlighted. We need to build life-ways that are in harmony with natural ecosystems, including spending resources restoring those elements we can that we have had such a negative impact. Nature will re-build itself, but it needs a tiny bit of help from us to nudge it in a more complete direction.

Correspondence ID: 13270Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Watertown, MA 02472
United States of America

Outside Organization: none Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 09:24:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and suggest that the restoration be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is what would be best for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness. Also please avoid the placement and use of telemetry installations and don't over managem the bears.

There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that these could be used as release sites and avoid using helicopters.

We are opposed the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears. Please include these coexistence measures in both of the action alternatives.

Please do all you can to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the relatively large human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 13271Project:112008Document:132104

Address: San Francisco, CA 94121
United States of America

Outside Organization: Dr. (Mr.) Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 09:24:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and suggest that the restoration be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is what would be best for bears and

Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness. Also please avoid the placement and use of telemetry installations and don't over managem the bears.

There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that these could be used as release sites and avoid using helicopters.

We are opposed the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears. Please include these coexistence measures in both of the action alternatives.

Please do all you can to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the relatively large human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 13272Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lexington, MA 02421
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 09:24:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and suggest that the restoration be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is what would be best for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness. Also please avoid the placement and use of telemetry installations and don't over managem the bears.

There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that these could be used as release sites and avoid using helicopters.

We are opposed the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting

Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears. Please include these coexistence measures in both of the action alternatives.

Please do all you can to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the relatively large human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 13273Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Richmond, CA 94805
United States of America

Outside Organization: none Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 09:25:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades, and suggest that the restoration be done in ways that don't violate the Wilderness Act and harm the area's wilderness character. This is what would be best for bears and Wilderness.

Both of the action alternatives as they now stand would violate the Wilderness Act. The action alternatives should be modified to avoid helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness. Also please avoid the placement and use of telemetry installations and don't over managem the bears.

There are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that these could be used as release sites and avoid using helicopters.

We are opposed the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work. This would mean grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana would be taken from their homes, dropped into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection.

Montana doesn't have any "extra" grizzlies to lose to the North Cascades. Montana grizzlies are not yet recovered under the ESA, and any dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone are needed to naturally recover areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. The new information presented by Superintendent Striker regarding the likelihood of naturally migrating bears from Canada suggests active repopulation urgency may be more about protecting agency discretion than protecting Wilderness and creating the best environment for grizzly bears to migrate, live, and thrive.

For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears. Please include these coexistence measures in both of the action alternatives.

Please do all you can to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the relatively large human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 13275Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lacey, WA 98503
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 09:42:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I fully support the reintroduction of grizzlies into the north cascades. From studies conducted it is clear that the ecosystem can support this species and would benefit from their presence. Washington is a beautiful state that has fantastic wilderness and wildlife. Ensuring that the grizzly bear can survive here with a sustainable population would only benefit our beautiful ecosystem and ecotourism.

Correspondence ID: 13276Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ellensburg, WA 98926
United States of America
Outside Organization: BCHW Non-Governmental
Received: Nov,12 2023 09:43:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the: Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Environmental Impact Statement for the North Cascades Ecosystem

As a member of Back Country Horsemen of Washington, I am very concerned with the ability to continue to recreate in the North Cascades should a small population of heavily protected grizzly bears be mechanically moved into the region that we recreate in. The DEIS does not sufficiently analyze the impact to recreation or present any options for how trails can be maintained open in the presence of protections implemented to reduce human-grizzly interactions.

As a trail horse rider in the NCE, I ask that the No Action Alternative be selected. The areas we ride in includes the Mt Baker Snoqualmie National Forest, the Okanogan Wenatchee National Forest including the Pasayten Wilderness, and the North Cascades National Park. We have many horse camps along the boundary of the NCE. We cannot support either Action Alternative without more substantive analysis on impacts to recreation as well as knowing more on the joint planning with Canadian counterparts.

BCHW supports Alternative A the No Action Alternative.

Correspondence ID: 13277Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Union, MO 63084
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 09:45:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live in and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

Furthermore, the 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Thank you for taking the time to keep our North Cascades wild!

Correspondence ID: 13281Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Holladay, UT 84117
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 10:12:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think reintroducing grizzlies is a great idea. it's been shown over and over again reintroducing predators helps the environment. Please help restore this animals original land

Correspondence ID: 13282Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Blaine, WA 98230
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 10:13:15

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live in and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

Furthermore, the 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Thank you for taking the time to keep our North Cascades wild!

Correspondence ID: 13283Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 10:15:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The introduction of Grizzly Bears into the North Cascades will without a doubt result in 1-2 deaths on a yearly basis. This makes the outdoors significantly less safe for humans and I believe those who are in favor of this are not the same people who use the outdoor/trail system frequently. Backpackers like myself will now need to carry firearms, be on alert constantly and carry significant bear deterrents to protect themselves.

It's rare to see a public proposal that you know without a doubt will directly result in death in the future. If the government moves forward with this proposal I would like to see those that sponsored it explain to the families of those that are killed that their deaths were worth it to have a more 'full' ecological system.

Choose Life, don't introduce Grizzly Bears to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 13284Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Salt Lake City, UT 84117
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 10:17:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzlies are charismatic and ecologically critical creatures, reintroduction is the only way forward

Correspondence ID: 13285Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tonasket, WA 98855
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 10:18:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The people do not want Grizzleys in our state especially if it endangers livestock and the rancher is told he can't shoot the bear killing his cows. Grizzley bears have already been seen in past years in our Okanogan county. Listen to the people for a change. I don't know what you think the bears will find to eat in our Cascades as it has been so dry there probably isn't any wild food supply thus they will be in the valleys endangering people and livestock.

Correspondence ID: 13286Project:112008Document:132104

Address: ELLENSBURG, WA 98926-6932
United States of America
Outside Organization: Barnhart Ranch LLC Business(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,12 2023 10:26:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My family has lived and ranched in the Kittitas Valley for over 100 years. The problems with predators has escalated to the point that our livelihood is threatened.

The reintroduction of Grizzlies to Washington State would add one more apex predator to an ecosystem already overpopulated.

The Wildlife along with the public would be threatened.

Idaho has had more people attacked by Grizzley's since their introduction in the last few years than ever before. The public are out in the National Parks more and more each year.

What is more important Grizzley's or people??

The grazing of public lands helps with the fires and the ecosystem benefits.

Correspondence ID: 13287Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Orlando, FL 32825
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 10:31:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Nature is a part of who we are. We take care of Her and She takes care of Us

Correspondence ID: 13289Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kirkland, WA 98033
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 10:35:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Good morning,

As a mother, hiker, backpacker native to Washington and now raising my family here I support the "no action" option for Grizzly Restoration in the North Cascades. I do NOT support Grizzly Restoration.

My 14 year old son asked me to go backpacking alone with him last summer- an experience I cherish. I would not have the same comfort level backpacking alone with him with increased grizzly encounters.

Our population has grown and changed and re introducing grizzly bears in this region is not taking into account our human impact on the existing ecosystem or the increased probability of grizzly encounters including dangerous encounters.

I live within 10 minutes of downtown Seattle and we have black bears that frequent our neighborhood and live in the adjacent woods. These bears have been impacted by our growing population. We would create further problems by re introducing the grizzly to the North Cascades.

Please do NOT proceed with Grizzly Restoration in the North Cascades.

I support "no action."

Thank you

Correspondence ID: 13290Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Fox Island, WA 98333
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 10:38:37

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please take no action for reintroduction of Grizzlies into the North Cascades for the safety of those who enjoy this beautiful place. These animals are dangerous to backpackers and hikers. One human life is not worth an experiment. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 13291Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Marysville, WA 98271
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 10:42:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is nonsense. Grizzlies are dangerous, why on Earth re-introduce them? Why not in the L.A. area? They used to be there too, no?

I camp, fish, hunt, and bring my children to these woods. Why would you intentionally make it more dangerous for us? What happens when inevitably someone gets killed by a grizzly bear? Regardless of your "very small chance" nonsense, if you bring them back it WILL happen. Statistical inevitability. So when the family of that victim(s) rightfully points out in court that their loved ones would absolutely still be alive without your meddling, what will be the response I wonder?

Make no mistake, anyone involved in this will carry some responsibility for the inevitable and avoidable deaths of people. All just to meddle in things that don't need to be meddled in.

Correspondence ID: 13297Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Clear Lake, WA 98235
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 11:01:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: There are several questions that need to be asked (and answered) before making any determinations concerning establishing grizzly bears in the North Cascade Mountains. The most important question is this, What are the grizzly bears supposed to eat in the North Cascades? Is the information true that has been fed to the public about grizzly bears living and roaming in this area? After all, Lewis and Clark never mentioned this particular breed of bear living here--in Eastern Washington, yes, but no mention of them on the West side. We now have no deer living in our mountains because of cougars--the only deer will be found living in someone's backyard--the only safe place to live. Hikers enjoy spending time in our mountains--will they feel safe if grizzly bears are in our mountains (and are known for stalking humans)? Has anyone interviewed a person who has been attacked by a grizzly bear and lived to tell the story? These are the folks to talk to--not the so called environmentalists who have nothing better to do than insist on these questionable practices.

Correspondence ID: 13299Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kent, WA 98042
United States of America
Outside Organization: hiker Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 11:06:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am a avid hiker and climber. I've summited all the major peaks in the Cascades. I was a Scoutmaster for 35 years with a focus on backpacking and climbing. In 1985 I worked with the USFS and the Seattle Mountaineers to introduce "Leave No Trace" to the Boy Scouts of America.

I typically had 85 boys in my troop at any given time with an average of 60 nights of camping per year, most of it backpacking.

In 1990 I took my troop backpacking on the historic Chilkoot Trail in Alaska and then in the Yukon Territory in Northern Canada where we had an encounter with a grizzly. We educated ourselves prior to our arrival by seeking out subject matter experts. We had no problems with our face to face encounter as we did everything right and the bear departed.

It was made extremely clear to us that as soon as bears learn to associate people with food, encounters will happen. Posting a sign at the trailhead "Grizzly bears ahead" is insufficient. I have observed hundreds if not thousands of unprepared backpackers on the trails. After decades of backpacking it's pretty trivial to take a look at a hiker, his boots, clothes, pack and determine if he's prepared for what's ahead.

The Puget Sound area has had an explosion in population, with the wilderness as part of the attraction. These people didn't grow up here, many didn't even grow up in the US. I have seen soooooo many hikers totally unprepared for rain or snow, on the trail, camping overnight. If we can't prepare hikers for the rain, we can't logically expect to prepare them to be ready for an encounter with a grizzly. And it will only take a few encounters with people before the bear learns about the tasty snacks available for the taking. A 180 lb backpacker is no match for a 600 lb grizzly.

Also of note is that the Chilkoot Trail has an infrastructure to allow backpackers to be safe. There are cinder block buildings with steel doors and bear proof locks where campers can cook and store their food. The Wilderness Act of 1964 prohibits the creation of such buildings. You can be sure there will be grizzlies in Wilderness Areas in the North Cascades.

Finally, I have zero confidence the US Government will properly fund the introduction of grizzlies. INTENSE education is required. The plan doesn't say how this education will take place or how it's funded. A 10X increase of backcountry rangers is required. There is no way the financial resources will be allocated for the next 25 years to deal with bears that need to be destroyed or relocated. Bringing in 25 bears without funding all the other activities that must take place is plainly irresponsible. The plan submitted indicates humans will be able to defend themselves against grizzlies should the need arise. A pistol is going to be useless. Carrying a gun big enough to do any harm and having the skill to use it reduces the ability of a hiker to defend themselves to practically nothing. The plan also says other agencies can take action to relocate or destroy problem bears. But there is no mention of how this is going to be funded. It is irresponsible to bring bears into the area and put the onus on 'other agencies' to deal with the aftermath.

I am opposed to the reintroduction of grizzly bears in the N. Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 13300Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98133
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 11:13:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am vehemently against reintroduction of an additional predator to WA State. Is there a lack of predators in WA? Or, perhaps, is WA overrun by unchecked grazers? Why introduce another animal to the ecosystem that will be a problem to humans, when there are much better eco solutions that can be implemented with a much greater impact? For example, why is the reintroduction of the American Chestnut tree is going so slow? But, no, we have to go and put grizzlies in WA! I say no!

Correspondence ID: 13302Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sammamish, WA 98074
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 11:20:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please reintroduce these beautiful and needed animals back into the cascade range. Having lived and hiked and enjoyed Washington for the past 44 years we know you need to respect the wilderness and the animals that live there. The black bears return will make the cascade range even more special knowing you are sharing it with them once again. We can't survive as a single species. Thank you for your efforts in this reintroduction.
Sincerely, the Peltola Family

Correspondence ID: 13307Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98501
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 11:31:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Bring the bears back. We love them, we need them, a key species is missing from an ecosystem because of humans being awful (classic). Had it not been for our brutality, communities of today would have to coexist with grizzlies. Which many communities in states like Montana and Wyoming already do. It is not ethical nor lines up with Washington's love of the outdoors and her ecosystems to deprive her of a keystone species for the sake of capital.

Grizzly bears > Capital

Correspondence ID: 13308Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Fall City, WA 98024
United States of America
Outside Organization: BCHW Non-Governmental
Received: Nov,12 2023 11:33:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello,
I am strongly opposed to the introduction of Grizzly Bears in The North Cascades of Washington State. Our family enjoys the peace, quiet, and safety that the North Cascades offers our family on outings. Our tax dollars to local, state, and federal entities are given to you by us to be used responsibly. Grizzly Bears are a danger to our family, and we do not consider your introduction of the bears a responsible use of our tax dollars.

I am a member of Back Country Horsemen of Washington. We do considerable trail work for various government agencies. I feel our partnership has been violated with this Grizzly Bear topic. Grizzly Bears are dangerous and should not be allowed in the North Cascades.

Janet Keller

Correspondence ID: 13310Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98075
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 11:34:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is a terrible idea. How many people are you ready to sacrifice in order to achieve questionable work goals? Learn that the less you intervene with the nature and let it run its course - the better it is going to be for nature and people!

Correspondence ID: 13311Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98107
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 11:38:41

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live in and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

Correspondence ID: 13313Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 11:43:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support "alternative C, the preferred alternative, where the FWS would designate grizzly bears in the US portion of the NCE and surrounding areas as a 10(j) nonessential experimental population (NEP) under section 10 of the ESA. Designation of grizzly bears released into the US portion of the NCE, including their offspring, as a NEP would provide state, federal, and Tribal agencies with greater management flexibility should conflict situations arise. "

As demonstrated for Olympic National Park objectives to attain a prehistoric faunal diversity within the Park boundary by removal of Mountain Goats (*Oreamnos americanus*) from within the ONP it is appropriate that objectives to support the prehistoric faunal diversity within the North Cascades Ecosystem to restore Grizzly Bears to this portion of their historic range.

As demonstrated from recent habitat surveys in NCE there appears to be adequate vegetation diversity and distribution to support viable populations of Grizzly Bears. In addition with climate change and increased probabilities for wildfires and regeneration of early successional forests with shrubby vegetation and berry producing *Ribes* and *Vaccinium* spp. there may be greater opportunities for suitable Grizzly Bears habitat from an increased wildfire regime resulting from climate change. Although historic populations of Grizzly bears in the NCE may have been seasonally supported by anadromous fisheries, as currently occurs in coastal Alaska and British Columbia, Grizzly Bears are not dependent on fishery food source as demonstrated by inland populations throughout North America. Although anadromous fisheries have declined since prehistoric times restored populations of Grizzly Bears will likely not be compromised by the lack of sustainable fisheries food resource. Observation from WDFW field studies of Black Bears on the Olympic Peninsula (G. Koehler 1994, personal observations) Black Bears do not seasonally congregate along salmon spawning streams with current depauperate salmon

populations than occurred historically. However, Black Bears do congregate among seasonal high elevation alpine habitats where Vaccinium species predominant.

Although some publics express concern for human safety and conflicts with Grizzly Bears there is limited evidence to support these concerns. Grizzly Bear populations have increased from estimates of 136 in 1975 to 1,063 in 2021 in the Yellowstone Ecosystem where 3 to 4 million people visit annually. Only one visitor was injured by a Grizzly Bear in 2021 and 4 human fatalities are documented for Montana since 2020. These data suggest that there would be greater threat to public injury and fatalities during vehicle accidents for visitors traveling to YE than during an encounter with a Grizzly Bear.

Correspondence ID: 13314Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Grandview, WA 98930
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 11:44:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: It is important that a grizzly bear population be restored to the North Cascade Range of Washington state. Grizzly bears have previously resided in this area for ages. It is only appropriate to allow these majestic animals to again exist and thrive in the North Cascades. Grizzlies will give balance to this montane forest ecosystem. Restore the grizzly bear population to the North Cascades of Washington.

Correspondence ID: 13315Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spokane, WA 99207
United States of America

Outside Organization: Hiker Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 11:49:15

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We have family members, WE don't need or want grizzlies in our state of WA.Keep them in Mt. And yellow stone

Correspondence ID: 13316Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spokane, WA 99207
United States of America

Outside Organization: Hiker Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 11:49:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We have family members, WE don't need or want grizzlies in our state of WA.Keep them in Mt. And yellow stone

Correspondence ID: 13318Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Auburn, WA 98001
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 11:52:37

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Again, this is foolish.

It's not the 1800's, it's almost 2024 with many families and hikers
In the mountains.

We as taxpayers, again, will have to pay when someone

Gets hurt or killed by a grizzly.

I say a loud NO TO GRIZZLIES.

██████████
██████████

Correspondence ID: 13320Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 11:56:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think it is a very bad to bring grizzly bears into the North Cascades of Washington. There is no reason to take these bears from a place where they are doing fine and there is plenty of room for them. If people want to see these bears they can travel to where the bears are living. The bears are better off where they have less contact with people, contacts which can be fatal to bears that do what bears sometimes do. Bringing bears to the North Cascades in a goofy idea of selfish people who don't want to go out of their way to see them. It is a totally different thing with wolves, who move back to places on their own, and it very hard to find even one documented case of a wild wolf harming a human.To capture bears and take them against their will to a place where life will not be as good for them because "I want to see grizzly bears in the North Cascades" is WRONG,. SELFISH. Don't do it!

Correspondence ID: 13323Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Maple Falls, WA 98266-7713
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 12:10:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To Whom It May Concern:

I am in favor of reintroducing *Ursus Arctos Horribilis* into the North Cascades Complex. If successful, which it is not a certainty, it would go a long way in restoring the natural balance of those beautiful mountains. Which has been proven in other areas.

If it turns out that too many hikers & backpackers .or others, are threatened hunting permits could be sold to wealthy trophy hunters. They are always looking for a new quarry to pursue and it would recoup the costs if you charged alot. Seems like a win-win situation to me and at least we could say we tried.

Leave No Trace,


Maple Falls, Wa

Correspondence ID: 13324Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Decatur, GA 30033
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 12:11:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

I support the restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades as long as restoration is compliant with the Wilderness Act and does not harm the area's wilderness character. Additionally, restoration efforts must minimize human handling of grizzlies and prohibit any harassment of grizzlies.

Regrettably, both of the proposed action alternatives violate the Wilderness Act. Hence, these action alternatives must be modified to 1) prohibit helicopter landings and flights in Wilderness, 2) prohibit the placement and use of telemetry installations, and 3) prohibit heavy-handed management of bears.

Note that there are many roads that bisect or penetrate the recovery area or dead-end next to Wildernesses that could provide

access without the use of helicopters inside Wilderness.

I strongly oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the grizzlies in the restoration work because it would allow fully protected grizzlies (under the Endangered Species Act [ESA]) to be taken from their homes. This is far too disruptive & violates current protection measures.

This is especially true for the Montana grizzlies: their populations have not yet recovered under the ESA. Likewise, dispersing grizzlies from Glacier or Yellowstone is disruptive; these grizzlies are needed to naturally recover in areas like the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.

Relocating grizzlies from one place to another is cruel and unnecessary. They are sentient beings and should be left to repopulate habitats naturally.

A natural recovery alternative must be fully developed and analyzed, even if recovery would take longer than active repopulation. For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must be included in both of the proposed action alternatives. This reduces the need for wilderness degrading activities that ultimately harm bears and their habitats.

Natural recovery processes require strong partnerships with British Columbia to 1) ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and 2) prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no-action alternative has many good Bear-Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears; these coexistence measures should be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Thank you for considering these comments.

Correspondence ID: 13325Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bend, OR 97703
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 12:13:47
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please don't reintroduce Grizzly Bears to the local mountains, they are way to dangerous.

Correspondence ID: 13326Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Silverdale, WA 98383
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 12:14:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am for introducing grizzly bears back into the northern cascades region.

Correspondence ID: 13327Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Kent, WA 98042
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 12:14:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I hope there's a good pile of money for potential lawsuits. The money should come out of the pockets of the people who think this is a good idea.

Correspondence ID: 13329Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America
Outside Organization: Conservation Catalyst Business(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,12 2023 12:21:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I enthusiastically support the re-introduction of Grizzly Bears into their former habitat in the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 13334Project:112008Document:132104
Address: TONASKET, WA 98855-9790
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 12:24:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the plan to restore grizzly bears to the North Cascades. At best as an endangered species (which they most certainly are in the NCE) and as acceptable as an experimental population. They belong in this ecosystem and we need to put back what we have taken away.

Correspondence ID: 13335Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98136
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 12:29:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Don Striker and Supervisor Brad Thompson,

I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

Any effort we can do to combat the current climate crisis and restore the natural balance of the ecosystems is extremely important! People must be able to live harmoniously with all animals if we are to create a sustainable living situation for ourselves.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. The proposal would bring up to 25 non-problem grizzly bears into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade and manage them as an experimental population.

Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities. Furthermore, the 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and sometimes respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Thank you for taking the time to keep our North Cascades wild!

Sincerely,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 13336Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98112
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 12:29:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I appreciate the goal of restoring habitat for an endangered species and re-establishing natural ecosystems but, as an avid user of these lands for recreation (mountaineering, hiking, camping, etc.) and with a strong desire to bring my young family into these special places in the coming years, this proposal would put me and my loved ones at risk. We can recreate in these areas today without significant fear of predators and without all of the precautions required to mitigate their risk. I therefore request alternative A - no action.

Correspondence ID: 13337Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Enumclaw, WA 98022
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 12:30:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have spent a lifetime in the mountains and love them and the wildlife there. I have hiked tens of thousands of miles in the backcountry. That being said, there are better ideas than this plan. We are long past the time when this would work. Civilization has progressed much too far for there not to be conflicts that will lead to these animals being killed. That expensive and unpopular result will come from this poorly thought-out idea. The concept comes from people who do not understand nature. It will also lead to far more people being armed in the forests, which is never necessary. The last thing we need is more people in the wild areas with more and more guns, which will make it far less safe for all of us. Do you want to see thousands of more people with assault rifles everywhere in the mountains on hikes? If you do this, you will, I assure you. Please do not do this ill-conceived plan.

Correspondence ID: 13338Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98116
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 12:33:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am not in favor of reintroduction of grizzly bears into the north cascades.

Correspondence ID: 13339Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98116
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 12:33:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am not in favor of reintroduction of grizzly bears into the north cascades.

Correspondence ID: 13340Project:112008Document:132104

Address: new Orleans, LA 70460
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 12:33:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Why in the world would anyone want to reintroduce Grizzlies anywhere much less a highly used recreational area like the Northern Cascades. They have a very well proven reputation of being predatorial killers. Their natural environment is in the high alpine country where they are basically by themselves and that's where they belong.

Correspondence ID: 13343Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98125
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 12:54:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We are strongly NOT in favor of reintroducing grizzly bears into the North Cascades, if they wander down from Canada on their own that is one thing but this area of Washington is too near multiple population areas with intense use of the area for outdoor recreation.

Correspondence ID: 13344Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 13:00:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We have read and considered the arguments for reintroducing grizzly bears into the North Cascades, but, in our opinion, they don't serve sufficient purpose to outweigh the risks of attack to humans. If the bears are reintroduced, their habitat will compete with our recreation area and as population and human use increases, along with the bear count, so will potential encounters. We encountered a female grizzly and her cub while backpacking with our young children in Canada. We were lucky to escape the very agitated grizzly!
We are against the reintroduction of grizzly bears in the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 13346Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Selah, WA 98942
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 13:06:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To whom it may concern: I go by Bill. I am 85 years old. I have been a wildlife enthusiast all of my life. I am deeply concerned in about the proposed re-introduction of Grizzly bears into the North Cascade wilderness in Washington State. I have checked recently with the wildlife department of British Columbia and asked for the population of Grizzlies in that province. They gave me the estimate of 16,000 animals. It is my belief that if these British Columbia bears, the same sub-species once found the North Cascade Wilderness, found this area to be habitable over the last 200 years, they would have found their way by now.

I am totally agensnt any form of re-introduction program you suggested. We the people have previously spoken!! We have better wildlife projects to spend the tax payers dollars on.

Thank You

Correspondence ID: 13348Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bothell, WA 98021
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 13:12:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: November 12, 2023

I am writing in support of reintroduction of the Grizzly to the North Cascades. As a Washington native, an avid hiker and an educator of 33 years within the public school system teaching AP Environmental Science I am compelled to comment in favor of the reintroduction plan. This beautiful animal historically lived throughout Washington and was critical to the balance of the ecosystem. Due to many challenges, the grizzly has become increasingly isolated from others of the species making breeding and "natural" recovery of their numbers remote, if not impossible. The Grizzly is for the most part a solitary and shy animal that avoids human interaction. Reintroduction of Grizzly Bears from different regions would increase genetic diversity within the species, which would be especially important when the numbers of Grizzly Bear are critically low now. The North Cascades offers some of the best habitat for a successful reintroduction of this iconic animal! The reintroduction plan includes collaring and monitoring the bears, which should offset opposition to the reintroduction plan. We are stewards of this land and its inhabitants - learning to coexist with as many species as possible is both rewarding and our responsibility. Successful reintroduction of the Grizzly Bear in the North Cascades would enrich the culture of our state, increase biodiversity and be a step forward in managing our state lands considering what is available for future generations to experience. We have seen firsthand how reintroduction of *Canis lupus* has brought Yellowstone National Park back in balance; this is another chance to witness the recovery of a species and the associated return to full health of the ecosystem they belong in.

I wrote in support of the reintroduction of the Grizzly to the North Cascades in February 2017, July 2019 - this discussion has been going on for years - please move forward with reintroduction NOW!

Respectfully submitted,

Correspondence ID: 13351Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Kirkland, WA 98034
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 13:20:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My summer home is located 4 miles north of Concrete, Washington in a wooded area where we have seen wildlife including some cougars and black bears as well as deer and coyotes.

We have managed to live with these animals, but grizzlies are a different story. They are a more aggressive animal and threatening to our welfare and the enjoyment of our surroundings, including hiking trails, rivers and lakes.

I ask you, just because grizzlies might have existed there in the past, why is it necessary to bring them back to an increasingly human population that enjoys recreational activities and living in a wooded and forested environment.

It is also a threat to the farmers in the area who provide food for our population. There are not that many open spaces as our human population grows. Are bears more important than our welfare and livelihood? There are plenty of other places to consider. I hope that you will listen to and not ignore our concerns and comments.

Government tends not to listen to concerns and must be more transparent to the public.

I look forward to your public comments addressing our issues and concerns. Don't wait until something bad happens like the recent Grizzly attack in Canada. We are fearful.

Correspondence ID: 13352Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Issaquah, WA 98027
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 13:23:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We strongly support reintroduction of grizzly bears into northern Washington Wilderness lands. Your carefully-crafted plan, well-vetted by state residents is a key component of comprehensive environmental restoration. Such long-term efforts cannot be successful until and unless apex predators are present in relevant numbers. Please do not allow private parties (especially those raising livestock on public land) to thwart this effort. Nor should this program be adversely impacted by hypocritical reactions from hikers claiming their enjoyment of the terrain in question would suffer from the presence of ursus arctos horribilis. Please proceed with this long-overdue, carefully implemented plan.

Correspondence ID: 13353Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Vashon, WA 98070
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 13:24:49
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: It is NOT a good idea to re-introduce a predatory species into an environment where this predatory species has been eliminated a very long time ago.

Especially at a time when almost every citizen is completely overwhelmed with problems and overstressed - it is so important to have safe places in nature to be able to recover, "recharge" and breathe freely - without the fear of being attacked and mauled by a bear.

It happens again and again that bears attack and kill people:

In May 2021, a Colorado woman, walking her dog in the afternoon, was mauled and killed by a female bear and her two cubs.

In October 2022, a woman near a park in downtown Leavenworth, on the east slopes of the Cascades, was injured by a bear. And multiple hikers and campers have been killed by bears in recent years.

No - we truly don't need grizzlies reintroduced in the Cascades - this is totally inappropriate.
Absolutely No!

Correspondence ID: 13354Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kirkland, WA 98033
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 13:26:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a regular backcountry visitor to the Cascades (20+ days/year), I strongly oppose reintroduction of grizzlies into the area. Having traveled extensively through bear area and having encountered grizzlies before, I find it absurd that we would purposely increase risk to human life for any reason. Anyone with grizzly experience knows how ridiculous advice like be "bear aware" or "carry bear spray" is with respect to grizzlies. Two experienced hikers were just killed near Banff with empty bear spray cans found next to them. I carry a shotgun when traveling in Alaska bear country knowing even that barely increases my odds. Just look north to BC to see the people of Pemberton terrorized by grizzlies bluff charging children! My sense is that the overwhelming view of those that are even aware of this project do not support it. How can the federal government foist this upon us? I hope you will take the pleading to cancel this project seriously. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 13355Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Acton, MA 01720
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 13:35:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I would absolutely love to see grizzly bears return to part of their natural range! Looking at the success other national parks have ahead with reintroducing predatory animals such as wolves, I think the pros vastly outweigh the cons.

Correspondence ID: 13357Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Woodland, WA 98674
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 13:38:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a member of Back Country Horsemen of Washington, I am concerned about the plan put forth in the proposal to move a small population of heavily protected grizzly bears into the north cascade regions of Washington state, where we recreate in. The Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail and several other trails run through the core habitat area and are utilized by a significant number of users. The introduction of grizzly bears would clearly impact the safe maintenance and use of this popular area. Clearly this issue has not been identified or addressed in the proposal. As a trail horse rider in the NCE, I ask that the No Action Alternative be selected. Thank You.

Correspondence ID: 13358Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA, USA, WA 98226
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 13:40:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The reintroduction of Grizzly bears will do more harm than good to the environment as well as the populace.

Given that these animals will be relocated from where they once were roaming and released into foreign environments would exacerbate the bear's threatening behavior. This could lead to more attacks on those who enjoy the outdoors and Washington's beauty. It would be no surprise that we will see these kinds of incidents in the near future.

The expenditure on relocating these bears into our environment is not money well spent. Every year people from around the country and abroad get to enjoy what Washington State has to offer, from its Parks and Recreation to its natural resources. Access to these lands is deteriorating and are limiting access for hikers, hunters, animal/bird watchers and outdoor enthusiasts alike. The state needs to focus on rehabilitating access of forestry roads rather than relocating and introducing predators to the State.

Please reconsider this reckless project and look into reinstating and reinforcing access to Washington's beauty.

Don't deter it to its inhabitants.

Correspondence ID: 13360Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Pueblo, CO 81006
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 13:41:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I believe Grizzlies should be reintroduced into the north cascades system, reason being is that its prime habitat, akin to the western slope of Colorado and San Juan's in southern Colorado. These animals are counting on us to do the right thing to make our lands beautiful and diverse again.

Correspondence ID: 13362Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 13:42:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to express my strong opposition to the Grizzly Bear "Restoration" Plan for the North Cascades. I am 34 years old, and a third generation resident of Mazama, Washington. I grew up on a livestock farm located in Mazama with my childhood spent learning about the outdoors. I have been blessed with hiking, climbing and backpacking throughout the Cascades and packing horse trains into the Pasayten Wilderness. I believe that introducing grizzly bears into the Cascades poses significant risks and concerns.

As a child, and now adult, I would frequently backpack the PCT with my family. I grew up completing a "Peak of the Week" challenge with my dad and local friends and have now summited most of the local mountains over Washington Pass. My brother and I packed our horse trains countless times into the Pasayten, under the age of 18 and got to experience the tranquility that the wilderness offers. This was all done because we felt safe in the outdoors. With my experience I also consider myself a conservationist but at the same time am strongly opposed to this issue.

One primary concern is obviously for public safety and the potential danger that grizzly bears may pose to outdoor enthusiasts like myself. While I understand the importance of maintaining a diverse ecosystem, the safety of individuals who explore and coexist in these areas should not be compromised. Those that are arguing that the risks posed by grizzly bears are greatly exaggerated are wrong. The population in the Methow Valley has greatly increased in the last five years and are mainly from the Seattle and greater city area. They do not have the experience or have spent time in the outdoors to have knowledge of this. I will also mention that the Methow Citizens Council, an advocate for the restoration project, completely consists of second home owners and recent residents to the Methow Valley. I strongly urge you to listen to the people who have to live with the real consequences of the impact of this decision, rather than listen to the philosophical reasons.

After living in Bozeman, Montana and its surrounding areas for 8 years, I directly felt the looming anxiety of trying to coexist with grizzly bears. Every single year there are multiple, life threatening and fatal encounters. While living there, I never went anywhere without bear spray, even small local hikes. I eventually bought a gun as this was the only safe way one could backpack or complete the long day hikes offered in the surrounding mountain ranges. My enthusiasm for the outdoors rapidly declined and I found myself only adventuring in large groups, with bear guns. One reason I loved returning to the Methow Valley was my urge to solo adventure returned and I now venture daily into the mountains with my dog with neither bear spray or a gun. If Grizzly bears are introduced, this will not be the same for me and the Cascades will no longer offer the peace as they currently do.

Furthermore, I can say that again, as a third generation resident of the Methow Valley, I know that grizzly bears, with the exception of one in the 1940's, do not reside here. That is not because they were ever targeted or hunted. I would like to suggest an alternative conservation strategy, one that is not as controversial as introducing a large predator. The resources required may also be better used for other conservation efforts or community needs.

I would like to highlight the apparent inconsistency in the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife's approach to wildlife management. It seems contradictory to express concern over the mule deer and elk populations while simultaneously introducing additional predators such as wolves and grizzly bears into the Cascades. In Winthrop, two thirds of WDFW's wildlife units are being closed this winter to protect its migratory mule deer herd, yet we are introducing grizzly bears? Okanogan District Biologists have also been quoted multiple times reporting a recent "crisis point" for the deer population. As an advocate for responsible hunting, and a hunter myself, I am troubled by the potential impact of these predator introductions on the elk herds and other wildlife whose habitat is the Cascade Range.

I urge the department to consider alternative approaches to conservation that do not compromise public safety and the delicate balance of existing ecosystems. It is crucial to strike a balance that ensures the protection of wildlife while also safeguarding the interests and safety of outdoor enthusiasts who contribute significantly to the region's appreciation and

conservation.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my concerns. I hope that the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife will carefully evaluate the potential risks and consequences associated with the Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan for the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 13363Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98122
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 13:47:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As someone who enjoys hiking in the cascades with my family and going on trail runs, I do not want grizzlies wandering in the forest. It would be one thing if grizzlies migrated back, but to intentionally re-introduce them seems like an unnecessary risk. Having a management plan for human-bear conflicts is not sufficient - let's prevent them by not re-introducing the bears. Ecosystems change and adapt to change all the time. I don't think it was right to kill off the grizzlies in our region, but it's done. Let's not over-meddle in the other direction and create more problems.

Correspondence ID: 13364Project:112008Document:132104

Address: BOZEMAN, MT 59715
United States of America

Outside Organization: High Country Apps LLC Business

Received: Nov,12 2023 13:47:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I live in Montana and have for the last 24 years. My husband and I have backpacked in grizzly bear country (Yellowstone National Park very frequently, Glacier National Park less often and some mountain ranges outside the National Park system).

We carry bear spray and make noise when we see signs of bear or were hiking on trails in brush.

We always hang our food. We never pitched our tent near our cooking area or the bear hangs.

We often see grizzlies at a safe distance, and never have had a dangerous encounter.

I fully support the maximum reintroduction of Grizzly Bear to the North Cascade National Park. We also backpack in the North Cascades, having hiked the Pacific Crest Trail and the Pacific Northwest Trail.

Correspondence ID: 13366Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mercer Island, WA 98040
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 13:50:52

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly agree with plans to reintroduce grizzly bears into the Cascade Mountains areas described here. Encouraging, supporting, and fostering a full spectrum of wildlife populations is good for the natural world and for humans. The risks posed by these animals are minimal and overstated by those opposed. Thoughtfully and carefully moving into and through natural environments is important to avoid all sorts of risks. Falls on uneven terrain are far more common and dangerous than a few dozen animals spread out over many miles. Please continue your excellent work on this and other projects.

Correspondence ID: 13368Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Greenbank, WA 98253
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 13:55:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I fully support the reintroduction of Grizzly Bear to the northern Cascades including North Cascades National Park and the National Forests surrounding the park on both sides of the Cascade Mountains.

Correspondence ID: 13369Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Cambridge, VT 05444
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 13:56:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a keystone species, grizzly bears have a positive effect on the ecosystems where they thrive. They regulate healthy populations of the animals they prey on, such as elk and moose, and keep forests healthy by dispersing seeds and berries through their feces. Grizzly bears are also known to catch salmon and bring their meals into the forest. The salmon carcasses serve as fertilizer and help trees grow strong and healthy. I refer you to the Umbrella Effect: Wherever they roam, grizzly bears are monarchs on the land. From the Yellowstone high country to the coasts of British Columbia and Alaska--where the species is often called the brown bear--grizzlies cast broad impacts over the plant and animal communities with which they share space.

Despite their predatory capability, grizzlies are opportunistic omnivores, not carnivores. In most places, their diet relies significantly on plant foods, as bears dig for roots and browse for berries from spring to fall. Aside from the fish-loving coastal brown bears, the meat grizzlies eat often comes from grubs and moths, or from scavenging animals that died from other causes. When grizzlies kill larger animals for food, they are opportunists, picking off the weakest prey from a group in order to save energy.

However, a grizzly fills its stomach, the process plays a key role in the balance of a natural area. By digging for roots and insects, a bear freshens soil like a rototiller. Its scavenging and digestion of dead animals returns energy quickly to the ground, fertilizing the soil that grows the plants upon which a place's food web relies. Meanwhile, the presence of grizzlies keeps deer and elk herds on the move, preventing them from lingering in an area so long that they overgraze its shrubs and grasses.

It adds up to a simple biological truth: where grizzly bears walk the land, other plant and animal species are healthier. In scientific terms, this wide-reaching impact makes the grizzly an umbrella species.

Thank you for your attention to this very important matter.

Correspondence ID: 13371Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sammamish, WA 98074
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 13:59:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: No grizzlies in the North Cascades

Correspondence ID: 13373Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Deer Harbor, WA 98243
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 14:07:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

Having wiped out the grizzly bear over the past 150 years we now have the unique opportunity and the ethical obligation to restore them to their native home, where suitable habitats still exist.

People and grizzly bears can coexist and thrive. They do so in British Columbia, Montana, and Wyoming where grizzly populations and back and front country recreation continue to grow hand in hand, providing a vital economic boost to those areas' gateway communities.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

The North Cascades Grizzly Bear Recovery Zone (NCGBRZ) is the second largest of six such designated areas at nearly 10,000 square miles. Combined with contiguous protected areas in British Columbia, including Manning Park, there are 14,000 square miles of productive, wild habitats, wilderness, and roadless areas.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live in and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

Furthermore, the 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Correspondence ID: 13377Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Arlington, WA 98223
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 14:14:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am very opposed to the reintroduction of Grizzly Bears to the NCE. I approve of Option A under this Draft EIS, do nothing. The last confirmed Grizzly Bear sighting was in 1996. If our ecosystem and environment has not suffered adverse consequences in almost 30 years, then why are they now being deemed of such importance? I sat in on the Darrington public comment meeting, where I heard the Sauk-Suiattle tribe speak out about how their traditions and food sources have changed over time, and Grizzly Bears are not needed for them to continue their cultural practices and sustenance of life. This goes directly against the one of the prime objectives listed for this proposal- "seek to support tribal culture and spiritual values related to the grizzly bear". We need to listen to their peoples as they were here long before us, and coexisted with the grizzlies first.

Correspondence ID: 13378Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Anacortes, WA 98221
United States of America
Outside Organization: Life long hiker,wildlife lover, and resident of WA. Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 14:15:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To all involved in this decision of reintroducing Grizzlies to the North Cascades of Washington state:

As one who has cherished, roamed with and studied wildlife my entire life and careers, I am adamant that Grizzlies are NOT reintroduced to the North Cascades mountains and park and forests.

My first question is what good will this do for them? As humans we decimated their population, is this what you want to do AGAIN? Human-bear interactions have never worked for the bear, no matter how you manage it all or efforts you make or thoughts you have of it working, the animal always loses.

My husband and I are Pro wildlife but also pro bear, meaning we love all wildlife and to look out for their welfare, is to leave the area as is.

Mountain Goats were introduced into the Olympics, then moved to the Cascades because, again, human and wildlife do not coexist, with the animal always the loser. Many perished in this transition. Then wolves were introduced to many areas, AGAIN, we end up shooting them in cold blooded murder of numerous families of wolves. How is this good at all for the animals, the ecosystem, anyone and everyone?

If Grizzlies are reintroduced, we only see negative interactions of humans and wildlife AGAIN with the outcome always being death for the wildlife. We see absolutely no reason to reintroduce the Grizzlies. You may think that you're putting them far from humans into the wilderness, but we all know that more and more humans are exploring and recreating/hunting/poaching deeper into the wilderness as human population explodes. This is NOT something our wildlife agencies need to add to their management woes. PLEASE think of the animal and not your human fantasies in decision making. WHO BENEFITS AND WHY?

Thank you for reading this and realizing this is not a good thing for the future of humans and Grizzlies.

*██████████ Anacortes, WA.

Correspondence ID: 13381Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Chehalis, WA 98532
United States of America

Outside Organization: Back Country Horsemen of Washington Non-Governmental

Received: Nov,12 2023 14:19:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The purpose of my comment is to voice my NO vote for planning to introduce the Grizzly Bear to the North Cascades.

My decision is based on three research articles/letters and a lifetime of living in Washington State. .

1. The use of the North Cascades by humans' peaks in the summer and fall months. The appetite of bears increases during these same months. The opportunity for the bears to collide with the campers, hikers, horse, mule riders is great. Therefore, we are in present in the same annual time period while there are more humans using the forests/meadows/back county trails for recreation in this State year to year. (Backcountry Horsemen.

2. "Bearing UP" is a WSU published article sharing how the University is currently researching bear resistant food coolers (magazine.wsu.edu /extra/cooler-bears). Humans bring in food that all bears smell and like. This "new" food source will be learned by the Grizzlies very quickly and draw them to human odors, animals, camps and vehicles.

3. I have read the Environmental Impact Statement. It indicates the human use is insignificant. We are significant! We build and clear the trails; we use the trails, and we provide emergency services to the human and animal populations living and using the area. We also kill the very predators Supporters wish to introduce when they enter human areas and commercially harvested forest and farm areas. I know this to be true from horseback riding in Federal and State and Private Forestlands owned by Weyerhaeuser, Green Diamond and other companies. I listened to the Vail Forest black bear cries suffering in traps set by Federal workers (Hell of a way to make a living I think.). So why bring Grizzlies into unwelcome areas, I believe, they will just kill or be killed. We aren't ready for this in Washington. And certainly not necessary at this time for Grizzly or human protection if not done. NO ACTION PLEASE.

Correspondence ID: 13383Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Arlington, WA 98223
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 14:31:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Do not reintroduce Grizzly Bears to the NCE. The benefits of reintroducing a once native species is far outweighed by the detrimental and negative consequences taking this action would lead to. I have read through the draft EIS summary, and there are very alarming details in there leading me to this conclusion.

For example, the information provided stated that the last habitat evaluation done on the NCE was 1986-1991. Over 30 years ago. They are using model projections for growth to calculate the current carrying capacity. I'm not sure there is any model that could accurately depict the immense changes in population, climate, industry, and access that we have seen in the Pacific Northwest over the last 30 years. Before proceeding, I would expect a more recent survey to be conducted on the sufficient habitat available for grizzly reintroduction.

Another concerning line in the draft summary reads like this- "primary restoration activities under alternative B would not involve any disturbance of fish habitat. Fish are not expected to be a primary food source for grizzly bears." Where is the research on this? Animals go for the easiest food source available, that is why we are continuing to see black bears in suburban neighborhoods all over the Pacific Northwest. Their lands are being encroached upon by housing and instead of leaving, they are staying because they can eat out of garbage bins. When the high mountain berries dry up, and the grizzly's are still hungry, what is stopping them from going to the alpine lakes, then the rivers to continue their foraging? How far down river will they continue to venture? How long before they get low enough and have a year-round food supply that they no longer need to hibernate? I disbelieve the draft statement on fish habitat, unless further research and proven studies can be shown.

Choose draft alternative A- the do nothing stance.

Correspondence ID: 13385Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kirkland, WA 98033-4459

United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 14:31:37

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Three or four years ago an initial proposal to reintroduce grizzly bears was circulated and comments were collected and published. I took the time to review the over one thousand comments for positive or negative response, and to note where the respondents lived.

1. The negative responses greatly outnumbered the positive ones. The respondents who did not wish to have the grizzlies reintroduced were mostly local residents, farmers, climbers and hikers. A great many were from the Methow Valley which protrudes deep into the North Cascades. A common statement was, "are you crazy?"

2. The positive responses were largely from out-of-State individuals including many from the East Coast and Europe, who seemed to believe the Reintroduction Area to be pristine wilderness where little contact with the population might occur.

My Comment: The new Recovery zone is larger than the initial proposal and encompasses literally hundreds of miles of forest roads and trails heavily used by our Puget Sound populous each summer. The chance of encounter is much higher, I believe, than the Montana-based proponents suggest.

Correspondence ID: 13386Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98109

United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 14:32:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support restoring grizzly bears to the North Cascade mountains

Correspondence ID: 13388Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America
Outside Organization: None Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 14:34:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Howdy

I do not believe you are paying enough attention to all the potential bear food the many thousands of apple and other fruit trees that are present within and adjacent to the recovery area.

I have read that even though there are not a lot fruit orchards near Yellowstone or Glacier NP, a number of grizzly bears have traveled quite some distance outside of their home ranges in order to help themselves to some fruit.

Some years ago, I was fortunate enough to be invited to attend the one week grizzly course in Yellowstone at the facilities in the Lamar Valley. I was with a group of folks from the Wenatchee Valley at lunch one of the days when one of the professional biologist came over to eat with us. He suggested that the reintroduction of grizzly to our area, on the east slope of the cascades would be quite problematic due to the vast area of orchards in and adjacent to the recovery area. He suggested that the bears would likely be able to smell the apple orchards from dozens of miles away and travel to them.

Assuming that the information that I have read and heard is correct, you need to have a much more detailed plan than you have presented in order to be successful in keeping the grizzly out of the orchards. Few of the orchards are fenced to any extent and the logistics and cost of fencing all of them are likely prohibitive for both the owners and for the government. In addition, I have heard that the WDFW has not been at all helpful when an orchard owner has a black bear problem.

You need a more detailed plan of action for when a grizzly finds an orchard.

Reply requested

Thank you
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 13389Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Kent, WA 98030
United States of America
Outside Organization: Berkshire Hathaway Home Services NWRE Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 14:40:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am a 76 year old woman who still enjoys hiking with my friends, family and dogs. We camp often and the North Cascades are a favorite destination. It appals me to think Grizzlies could be introduced to the area. WHY would you want to endanger people in that way? Once it's done, and some innocent outdoorsman is killed, how will you undo it? I would personally support any lawsuit brought to put an end to this stupidity.

Correspondence ID: 13390Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Arlington, WA 98223
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 14:45:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am in accordance with draft EIS alternative A- do nothing to reintroduce grizzly bears to the NCE.

My biggest concern with either of the action alternatives is the access and tourism issues that may arise with the

reintroduction of grizzlies. Highway 20- the main highway through the North Cascades, is closed for half of the year due to snow. This means all the small towns on either side of the mountain pass are fully reliant on tourism business during the summer and fall months to sustain the year. Living in Arlington, a close neighbor of Darrington, my wife and I often find ourselves out there year round visiting friends. I can tell you from experience, it is a ghost town after the pass gets closed for the season. Business hours are reduced, and some even close up shop a few days a week. I believe the same is true for Winthrop, an even larger tourism town. If grizzly sightings start closing off trailheads for hiker safety, or if people are just not comfortable being up there anymore, that will directly impact several small businesses that are barely hanging on in these small towns.

Another concern is access for hikers. I'm not sure if you have driven over Highway 20 in the summer, but there are cars lined up for miles on the sides of the highway near trailheads. This is a super population destination for day hikers, and overnight backpackers. How are you going to keep that many people safe with grizzly bears in the mix? Will there be a permit requirement for hiking access like there is at places like Mt. Rainier? How many permits will be given out? The same amount as the current hiking brigade we see every year up there? If less permits are given than the current amount of hikers up there, that will lead directly back to the tourism financial issue. Do people like going up there now because there is no waiting or permitting period?

There are too many unknowns in the action alternatives, and at some point one party, or several parties, will suffer the consequences at the expense of having grizzly bears reintroduced. Please, please, do not reintroduce grizzly bears to our backyard.

Correspondence ID: 13391Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Darrington, WA 98241
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 14:45:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a lifelong resident of Darrington, and avid outdoorsman, it is disheartening to once again see policies that directly affect myself and my neighbors being pushed by people from large cities and distant states who have no real connection to any consequences that may result. Our salmon, deer and elk populations continue to suffer under the regulations put in place by people who have no real connection to any part of the situation other than uninformed feelings. Adding more large predators to the area will not add to the health of the ecosystem as it may have in places like Yellowstone. Yellowstone is a large, fully protected area with minimal human competition, the North Cascades is my backyard. The population of deer and elk will not sustain more predators on the landscape. Even with the 10j rule allowing for management the Washington department of Fish and Game has shown an appalling bias toward restricting hunting, especially the hunting of predators.

History has shown that "reintroduction" of animals rarely happens without unexpected downstream effects. With wolves bringing hoof rot to the elk or goats attacking people for their urine, we need to leave nature to sort itself out. I am against bringing Grizzlies to the north cascades. I am against being the feel good nature show for people in Seattle to look at and think they have "helped"; I am against being part of the group most affected and least acknowledged.

Correspondence ID: 13393Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 14:51:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live in and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where

grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

Furthermore, the 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Thank you for taking the time to keep our North Cascades wild!

Correspondence ID: 13396Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lake Stevens, WA 98258
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 14:54:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm a beekeeper, I take hives to fireweed sites near the Mountain Loop Highway out of Granite Falls. A small electric fence will keep local bears from attacking my hives but not grizzly bears.

Grizzly bears love honey and are attracted to beehives. They eat more than just honey, they will also consume the bees and larvae inside the beehive. They will destroy a hive in minutes then return to destroy all other hives.

If Grizzly bears are released, I will have to stop a vital part of my beekeeping. It will not be safe for me and other beekeepers within many miles of those bears.

Many beekeepers will have to stop keeping bees once grizzly bears are released.

Correspondence ID: 13397Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Renton, WA 98059
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 14:55:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to express my opposition to the proposal of restoring and managing grizzly bears in the North Cascades of Washington. I am a hiker and I enjoy exploring the natural beauty of this region. However, I do not want to worry about the danger of encountering a grizzly bear on the trail.

Grizzly bears are large, powerful, and unpredictable animals that can pose a serious threat to human safety. According to the National Park Service, grizzly bears have killed 10 people in Yellowstone National Park since 1980¹. In 2020, a grizzly bear attacked and killed a hunter in Alaska². These incidents show that grizzly bears are not compatible with human recreation and activities.

Moreover, grizzly bears are not native to the North Cascades and have not been confirmed in the area for decades. The last confirmed sighting of a grizzly bear in the U.S. portion of the North Cascades Ecosystem was in 1996³. Therefore, restoring grizzly bears to the North Cascades would not be a natural recovery, but an artificial introduction of a non-native species. Furthermore, grizzly bears are not endangered or threatened in the U.S. as a whole. There are about 55,000 grizzly bears in the U.S., making homes in only 5 states⁴. The grizzly bear population in the Greater Yellowstone and Northern Continental Divide ecosystems has recovered and is ready for delisting⁵. Therefore, there is no need to restore grizzly bears to the North Cascades for the sake of conservation.

I urge the National Park Service and U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service to reject the proposal of restoring and managing grizzly bears in the North Cascades. This proposal would endanger the lives of hikers, hunters, and residents in the region,

and disrupt the natural balance of the ecosystem. Please consider the interests and safety of the human population over the unnecessary and risky reintroduction of grizzly bears. Thank you for your attention and consideration.

Correspondence ID: 13401Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Blaine, WA 98230
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 15:05:19
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: [REDACTED]

Comments

Draft September 2023 Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/EIS North Cascades Ecosystem

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft September 2023 Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/EIS North Cascades Ecosystem.

On December 13, 2022, I provided "Public Scoping Comments" on the 11/14/2022 "Notice of Intent to Prepare North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE) Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/EIS, WA" through the online National Park Service PEPC submittal process. Many of my December 13, 2022 comments still apply.

Following are my general comments, concerns, and specific comments.

General Comments & Concerns

I support the no-action alternative (Alternative A). In addition, I support using the 10(j) nonessential experimental population (NEP) under section 10 of the ESA, as proposed in Alternative C, so that when Grizzly Bears (GB's) do expand back into the NCE it would give state, federal, and tribal agencies greater management flexibility should conflict situations arise. Recent news reports indicate that Canadian reintroduction efforts just across the border in British Columbia, are imminent. If successful, some of these GB's could end up occupying habitat in the NCE.

Relocation/Reintroduction VS Restoration of Grizzly Bears (GB)

The Draft EA does not have any information about the relocation of GB's being used to restore populations elsewhere. It appears that the proposed GB restoration for the NCE, which recommends relocating GB's from other GB ecosystems, has never been tried before. Consequently, the potential success of this GB relocation technique as a method to restore populations has never been evaluated. For public agencies (federal, state, Canadian, etc.) to spend significant time, resources, and funding this, so far, unproven technique, combined with the high risk of injury and death to GB's which are an ESA listed "Threatened" species, during capturing (trapping, anesthetizing, transporting, etc.) and relocation (via helicopter and other methods), seems like an unwise use of public funds.

Instead of relocating GB's to the NCE implement habitat restoration actions to increase habitat diversity. Increase GB forage habitat using silvicultural treatments, prescribed fire, etc., for ungulates species (deer, elk, mountain goats, etc.) to provide more food for GB's. Increase GB forage habitat by increasing huckleberry habitat, through silvicultural treatments and prescribed fire methods. It is unclear whether, or not, these GB habitat restoration treatments have been thoroughly investigated in the NCE.

Concern about potential permanent road and trail closures for Grizzly Bear restoration.

The Draft EA makes no mention of road or trail closures, other than for temporary closures only expected to last a few hours up to a couple of days during actual GB helicopter flights to relocate bears. However, it states "Beneficial impacts could occur from the decommissioning of roads in or near species habitat" but does not state whether, or not, permanent road closures could be implemented as a result of the plan implementation. It also states that "Closure of park or forest facilities and main roads are not expected to occur" and that "it is reasonable to assume that any trail and area closures would be temporary, localized, and limited."

The Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest, which is adjacent to the North Cascades National Park, has already been implementing, or proposing permanent road closures for GB habitat management purposes, in order to meet requirements for the North Cascades GB Recovery Area MOU with the USFWS, "that there be no net loss of core habitat." (USFWS 1997). Examples include the Upper North Fork Nooksack River (MBS NF 2022), Upper Middle Fork and South Fork Nooksack watersheds, Upper Swift Creek, and Baker River (Skagit River) watershed (MBS NF 2002), and the Finney Creek (Skagit River) watershed. Will this new plan for GB's result in more permanent road and trail closures on National Forest lands

adjacent to the North Cascades National Park? These public roads and trails are critical for recreation access to these important public lands and provide significant recreation benefits to the local economies. Closing existing public roads and trails on USFS lands that provide important recreation value to the public is a significant issue.

Concern about the genetics and adaptability of the Grizzly Bears proposed to be relocated.

The Draft EA (page 58) described studies (Alamack et al. 1993; Gaines et al. 1994) that were conducted to evaluate portions of the NCE for GB's and concluded that the NCE has suitable habitat essential for the maintenance of a Grizzly Bear population. The studies identified 124 plant species known to be GB foods through an exhaustive review of studies conducted on GB's south of Alaska and that 100 of the 124 identified plant species exists in the study area. They also mapped ranges of GB wildlife prey species known to occur in the NCE study area and said that ungulates were dispersed relatively evenly throughout the study area. Based on these studies, the teams concluded that sufficient vegetative GB foods are readily available in the NCE and that occurrence of wildlife prey species can sustain a GB population. I have worked in the NCE area since 1984 and do not understand how the study could say that important GB prey species (elk, deer, mountain goats, marmots, etc.) are dispersed relatively evenly throughout the NCE. My experience is that these animals (especially elks, mountain goats and marmots) are found in certain areas but missing from many other areas in the NCE.

The EA Draft (Fig. 5, Page 59) indicates that GB's would be captured from four source areas in British Columbia that have healthy populations that are ecologically similar to the NCE: 1) Robison GBPU, 2) Wells Gray GBPU, 3) Columbia-Shuswap GBPU, and 4) North Seilkirk GBPU. Have genetic studies been conducted on these proposed source populations to determine similarities between these populations before relocating any of these GB's?

The EA Draft (page 56) describes a habitat study (Agee et al. 1989) that compared historical GB sightings to land cover types to determine which land cover types bears prefer. The results showed that GB sightings were positively correlated with whitebark pine, subalpine larch, and subalpine cover types, inferring that these are the preferred habitat types of GB's. It also noted that whitebark pine is not a common habitat type throughout the NCE and may not be as important for GB's in this ecosystem as it is in others where it is more prevalent.

How well adapted would the relocated GB's, from the proposed source areas, be to new habitat conditions in the NCE? These other ecosystems could be more different from areas in the NCE where bears could be relocated.

How successful would these relocated GB's be in a new ecosystem, which may have a different combination of food resources (plant and animal) than they were adapted to, and how viable and self-sustaining would these population be?

Specific Comments

Page 18. States "If the preferred alternative is selected, and if release sites on USFS-managed national forests were used, the USFS would have to separately comply with applicable federal laws prior to authorizing any actions on national forest lands, which could include issuing temporary closures around staging and release areas as needed per 36 CFR 261 Subpart B, 'Prohibitions in Areas Designated by Order.' Therefore, the responsible officials for the USFS will decide through their own process whether to authorize any needed actions on their respective forests."

"Prior to authorization of the staging or release of grizzly bears on USFS lands, the alternative would be implemented on NPS lands only."

For the USFS to separately comply with these federal laws they will need adequate staffing and funding to conduct this process. Based on recent USFS funding for the Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest, the chance of receiving funding is unlikely.

Page 24. Last paragraph states "Any loss of core area within the park complex would likely require mitigation on USFS land to maintain no net loss of core area for the BMU as a whole. The USFS would continue management under the no net loss agreement established by the 1997 interagency MOU until forest plans are revised or amended."

Again, the concern here is that USFS will not have adequate funding and staff to handle planning and implementing mitigation measures (road closures, etc.), let alone to revise or amend forest plans.

Page 28. Release. 2nd paragraph States "Release sites would be chosen from within three release areas, shown in Figure 3." Only the North Unit Park area is located completely within the NC National Park. The other two areas (Western Pasayten and South Unit Park and GPW) contain significant amounts of USFS land. Therefore, no GB releases can occur in the USFS lands until all USFS planning requirements are completed, which again, will take adequate funding and staffing, which is unlikely based on recent funding.

Page 30. Monitoring. 2nd paragraph states "Key uncertainties associated with the implementation of this plan include accurately predicting grizzly bear behavior, habitat utilization, and movements once released; reproductive success; genetic limitations; and source and rate mortality."

Given all these uncertainties and unknowns associated with this plan, the cost to taxpayers, and my comments above, it is unwise to pursue any action alternatives.

Page 32. Access Management. 1st paragraph states "No long-term closures or modifications to public access would be

implemented because of grizzly bear restoration. The agencies do not anticipate the need for lengthy closures such as those experienced in Yellowstone National Park because no similar bear congregation areas have been identified (e.g., areas of high prey concentration)."

However, as stated above on page 24, "Any loss of core area within the park complex would likely require mitigation on USFS land to maintain no net loss of core area for the BMU as a whole."

The MBS NF is already implementing, or proposing, permanent road closures for GB habitat management purposes, to meet requirements for the North Cascades GB Recovery Area MOU with the USFWS, "that there be no net loss of core habitat." (USFWS 1997).

Page 33. Primary Phase. 2nd paragraph states "Grizzly bears would be released at multiple sites in remote areas on NPS lands. Release sites on USFS lands could be included once USFS completes its own environmental compliance."

Again, the USFS would need additional funding and staff to complete this required environmental compliance.

Page 35. Top of page. States "Livestock depredation by grizzly bears would likely occur in the NCE."

Page 36. Management Zones. States "The proposed geographic extent for the GB NEP includes all of Washington state except an area around the Selkirk Mountains GB recovery area (Fig. 4, page 37)."

This is a huge area contains many opportunities for GB-human conflict and potential impacts to wild ungulate populations, especially those that are known to be declining, such as the North Cascades and Colockum elk herds [see page 74] and ESA federally listed salmon, steelhead, and Bull Trout populations, located in various watersheds draining into Puget Sound to the west, and into the Columbia River to the east. In addition, as stated on page 35, domestic livestock and other domestic animals would be at risk from GB impacts.

Page 48. Natural Recovery. States "A Joint Nation grizzly bear recovery partnership has been established among First nations in collaboration with the British Columbia government to outline population recovery objectives and strategies in a 'North Cascades Grizzly Bear Stewardship Strategy.' Translocation efforts in British Columbia have not started, and it is unclear how such an effort, if implemented, would impact the US portion of the NCE. Should reintroduction efforts occur in British Columbia, it is likely that some grizzly bears reintroduced into the Canadian portion of the ecosystem may move into the proposed NEP area in the U.S., either as a transient and return to Canada or may ultimately remain in the US."

Recent news reports indicate that these Canadian reintroduction efforts, located just across the border in British Columbia, are imminent. So, there is the potential for these GB's to expand south into the NCE.

Page 52. Analysis Area. States "The 6.1-million-acre recovery zone includes all of the park complex and most of the adjacent Okanogan-Wenatchee and Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forests, along with small amounts of interspersed state and private land."

Page 53. North Cascades Ecosystem Description. States "The recovery zone encompasses the entire Park complex, which makes up 11% of the recovery zone, along with most of the Okanogan-Wenatchee and Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forests, which together make up 74% of the recovery zone. Private lands account for an additional 7% of the recovery zone, while state and local lands make up the remaining 8%."

Again, if the GB reintroduction is successful, this huge area presents many opportunities for GB-human conflict and impacts to wild ungulate populations, ESA federally listed salmon, steelhead, and Bull Trout populations, as well as domestic livestock and other animals.

Page 83. Predator-Prey Interactions. States "In summary, grizzly bears released into the NCE are expected to have an opportunistic feeding strategy and may prey on ungulates if encountered during spring calving/fawning season. Grizzly bears are expected to kill deer and elk, mainly fawns/calves, and small numbers of moose, particularly neonates."

Page 84. 2nd paragraph. States "Once restoration population goal is achieved, grizzly bears would have a greater impact on other wildlife and fish via predation. Grizzly bear distribution in the NCE would expand throughout secure core habitats and increase the potential for bears to encounter ungulate calves in spring or spawning salmonids, and potentially impacting local recruitment of wild ungulates or spawning of local salmon runs."

Again, if the GB reintroduction is successful, this is a huge area with many opportunities for GB-human conflict and potential impacts to wild ungulate populations, ESA federally listed salmon, Steelhead and Bull Trout populations, as well as domestic livestock and other animals.

References

- Agee, J.K., S.C.F. Stitt, M. Nyquist, and R. Root. 1989 (Agee et al. 1989). A geographic analysis of historical grizzly bear sightings in the North Cascades. *Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing* 55:1637-1642.
- Almack, J.A., W.L. Gaines, R.H. Naney, P.H. Morrison, J.R. Eby, G.F. Wooten, M.C. Snyder, S.H. Fitkin, and E.R. Garcia Almack et al. 1993). 1993. North Cascades Grizzly Bear Ecosystem Evaluation. Final Report. Denver, CO: Interagency Grizzly Bear Committee. 169pp.

Gaines, W., R. H. Naney, P. H. Morrison, J. R. Eby, G. F. Wooten, and J. A. Almack (Gaines et al. 1994). 1994. Use of Lands at Multispectral Scanner Imagery and Geographic Information Systems to Map Vegetation in the North Cascades Grizzly Bear Ecosystem. In Bears: Their Biology and Management. Volume 9, Part 1: A Selection of Papers from the Ninth International Conference on Bear Research and Management. February 23-28, 1992 (1994). Missoula, MT: International Association for Bear Research and Management.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, U.S. Forest Service, Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest, Pacific NW Region (MBS NF 2002). 2002. Baker River Watershed Analysis. August 2002. 442pp.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, U.S. Forest Service, Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest, Mt. Baker Ranger District (MBS NF 2022). 2022. North Fork Nooksack Vegetation Management Project. Revised Final Environmental Assessment. April 2022. Mt. Baker Ranger District, 810 State Route 20, Sedro Woolley, WA 98284.

U.S. Department of Interior, U.S. Fish and Wildlife (USFWS 1997). 1997. Grizzly Bear Recovery Plan Supplement to the North Cascades Ecosystem Recovery Plan. Missoula, MT. 29pp.

U.S. Department of Interior, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Park Service (USDI, USFWS & NPS 2023). 2023. Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) North Cascades Ecosystem. September 2023. 303 pages.

Correspondence ID: 13402Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Marblemount, WA 98267
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 15:07:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: One of the things I love about the North Cascades is the vastness, ruggedness, and seemingly untouched wilderness there. However, its not really untouched at all. Human intervention has eradicated one of the greatest native species in the Cascades - the grizzly bear. I believe true conservation of this land should include reintroducing the grizzly through the 10(j) designation. Supporting a harmonious balance between bears and the people of this area is most likely to ensure the long term success of the reintroduction project. Grizzlies play a vital role in the native ecosystem and that ecosystem is what those of us who live here and recreate here love most.

Correspondence ID: 13407Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Okanogan, WA 98840
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 15:16:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: North Cascades National Parks Service Complex
Project: 2022 North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly Bear (ID: 112008)
Restoration Plan/Environmental Impact Statement

Document: Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/Environmental Impact Statement, North Cascades Ecosystem (ID: 132104)

Docket No. FWS-R1-ES-2023-0074

City: * Okanogan State/Province: * WA Postal Code: * 98840

Organization: Self Employed/Delfeld Farms

Date: November 12, 2023

Comments or Requests: I am a landowner in Okanogan County, producer, Small Business Owner, Wildland Fire Contractor and our Farms is 3rd Generation Cattle and Farming operation. To stay in business, we have had to diversify, update, change and make current our business plans. We are not operating under business plans our 1st generation Grandparents

created our cattle and farming operations. We have changed for many reasons some we have been forced, due to government regulations. Why is the National Parks Service referencing to, and operating under 30,32-,37- and 41-year-old, outdated plans, documents and studies throughout this EIS document to support introducing grizzly bears? None of us in private business, would still be in business, operating under those same circumstances. Please see my specific substantive comments supporting Alternative A: NO ACTION
NO to Section 10(j) ESA RULE needed.

I am requesting NPS to respond to my comments, to myself and the people of Okanogan County.

NEPA requires Agencies to consider the reasonably foreseeable projected lifetime outcome direct and indirect short-term and long-term effects of their proposed actions and reasonable alternatives.

- The Agency failed to fully, openly and adequately address NEPA requirements on several levels as required.
- Agency failed to address significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.
- Agency failed to consider reasonably foreseeable direct and indirect effects of their proposed actions and alternatives as well as no action alternatives short- and long-term effects pertaining to all aspects to Okanogan County customs and cultures, citizens, businesses, producers, our way of life, industries and recreation activities.
- Agency failed to address who is responsible when grizzly bears kill our family members?
- Agency failed to address who will pay for loss of life?
- Agency failed to address what process will be for loss of livestock loss reimbursement cost.
- Agency failed to address who is Liable?
- Agency failed to address and outline the Emergency process to the citizens of and/or the visitors to Okanogan County WHEN a grizzly bear attack occurs on a family member, employee, livestock, pet, etc.
- During large wildland fire incidents, temporary cell towers are brought in, for cell coverage in our remote areas. There are many areas in Okanogan County with NO CELL SERVICE!
 - o The Agency failed to address, For example:
 - o Who will people call when we have a grizzly bear emergency?
 - o What procedure has been established with our local Sheriff 911 Dispatch?
 - o Has this plan been approved by our Elected County Sheriff?
 - o Will they call North Cascades NPS in Sedro Woolley?
 - o Will a NPS employee be available by phone 24/7?
 - o How long will we have to wait until an "official government representative" shows up before we can remove our wounded/eaten/mauled family member or livestock to prove it was a grizzly bear attack? (As we have learned from the introduction of wolves).
 - o Are we to take pictures of our wounded?
 - o Pictures of the grizzly bear before the attack on us?
 - o Does the agency really expect us to contact them for permission to kill a grizzly bear that just killed one of our family members? When our Constitution give us our RIGHTS to protect our LIVES/FAMILIES?

Agency failed NEPA requirements.

The Agency failed to address clearly, reasonably foreseeable projected lifetime outcome direct and indirect long-term and short-term effects of their proposed actions and reasonable alternatives of these realistic issues to the residents of Okanogan County.

Alternative A: NO ACTION

NO to Section 10(j) ESA RULE needed.

The Agency failed to address Okanogan County Search and Rescue, including Back Country Horsemen, ATV/UTV into remote areas finding lost, injured/hurt hikers. The Agency through their proposed alternative will be putting each and every search and rescue member in deaths way of grizzly bear attacks.

- Horses can smell bears from a distance before humans can visibly see bears, potentially causing severe turmoil for the rider.
- Potential attack on the horse and rider from grizzly bear killing horse and/or rider (s)
- Potential harm to one or more of the search and rescue horses or riders
- Agency failure to address: Potential breakdown of one of the UTV/ATV engine failure/flat tire causing effect of "sitting duck" potential grizzly bear attack on one of the search and rescue members.

Agency failed NEPA requirements.

The Agency failed to address clearly, reasonably foreseeable projected lifetime outcome direct and indirect long-term and short-term effects of their proposed actions and reasonable alternatives of these realistic issues to the residents of Okanogan County.

Alternative A: NO ACTION

NO to Section 10(j) ESA RULE needed.

As stated, The U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service is separately inviting public comment on a proposed rule under section 10(j) of the Endangered Species Act that The Agency will "Provide local communities more flexibility to manage the grizzly bear population with additional wildlife management tools."

Section 9 of the ESA describes prohibited acts under the law. For endangered species, along with other prohibited acts, it is unlawful to take any endangered species (16 USC 1538(a)). The term "take" means to "harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect, or to attempt to engage in any such conduct" (16 USC 1532(19)). Whenever any species is listed as threatened (e.g., grizzly bear), the FWS issues regulations under section 4(d) of the ESA that are necessary and advisable to provide for the conservation of the threatened species. The 4(d) rule is the mechanism by which take prohibitions can be applied to threatened species. Section 10(a)(1)(A) of the ESA provides exceptions to the take provisions. Under section 10, the FWS may permit acts that purposefully take threatened or endangered species so long as those actions are for scientific purposes or "to enhance the propagation or survival of the affected species." Section 10(a)(1)(B) allows the FWS to permit take that is incidental to, and not the purpose of, the carrying out of otherwise lawful activities (16 USC 1539(a)(1)).

Comment:

ESA was specifically designed to protect endangered species at all costs. There is not flexibility that is easily "Provided" to local communities to manage. There are too many hoops, we must jump through, that takes time, or phone calls we must make, in a county that in some areas has little to no cell coverage, to make emergency calls! So, no, I do not believe there is any government program that can provide this. This statement is misleading to the people of Okanogan County and provides false hope that we will be able to take care of a grizzly bear emergency issue ourselves without penalty.

The Agency has failed transparency, clear explanation of plan and how it will be carried out:

- The comment, "Provide local communities more flexibility to manage the grizzly bear population with additional wildlife management tools," in full detail to be understood, upfront, prior to EIS decisions, what actions, if any, can be taken when a grizzly bear attack happens.
- What will be the response time after a Grizzly Bear attack on any livestock?
- Person, or family pet?
- Who will people call when we have a grizzly bear emergency?
- What procedure has been established with our local Sheriff 911 Dispatch?
- Has our Elected County Sheriff approved these procedures?
- Does the public call North Cascades NPS in Sedro Woolley?
- Will a NPS employee be available by phone 24/7?
 - o Okanogan County doesn't have enough Deputies to staff 24/7 shifts.
- How long will we have to wait until an "official government representative" shows up before we can remove our wounded/eaten/mauled family member or livestock to prove it was a grizzly bear attack? (As we have learned from the introduction of wolves).
- Are we to take pictures of our wounded?
- Pictures of the grizzly bear before the attack on us?
- Will immediate permission be given to us to kill a grizzly bear, without the threat of going to jail, under Section 9 ESA?
- Specifically address what fines will be assessed on us for the taking of a grizzly bear?
- WE understand our Constitutional rights, however, specifically explain how Agency Employee's will interpret our rights.
- Does the Agency understand in the majority of our county, has NO cell phone service?
- During or after grizzly bear attacks, getting medical aide to our family members before they die, could be impossible, how does the agency expect us to contact them for permission to kill a grizzly bear that just attacked our loved one, before they kill the entire family?

The agency failed to specifically outline plans to address any and all of these very important questions that will impact

residents and visitors of Okanogan County when grizzly bear attacks occur.

Agency failed NEPA requirements.

The Agency failed to address clearly, reasonably foreseeable projected lifetime outcome direct and indirect long-term and short-term effects of their proposed actions and reasonable alternatives of these realistic issues to the residents of Okanogan County.

Alternative A: NO ACTION

NO to Section 10(j) ESA RULE needed.

North Cascades National Park Service: "North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/EIS" It implies that Grizzly Bears will only be released into the North Cascades Ecosystem. This statement is false and misleading. This information is within the EIS; however, all other publicized information is related to "North Cascades Ecosystem" implying to North Cascades Mountain Pass area, NOT the actual land mass as described within the document.

The NCE itself, is comparable in size to the state of Vermont, encompassing approximately 9,800 square miles, or 6.1 million acres, within the state of Washington (FWS 1997). Situated in the core of the area of analysis is the 680,855-acre North Cascades National Park Service Complex (park complex). The park complex includes North Cascades National Park and Ross Lake and Lake Chelan National Recreation Areas and makes up approximately 11% of the NCE grizzly bear recovery zone. The 642,340-acre Stephen Mather Wilderness composes approximately 94% of the park complex. The park complex is bounded on the east, west, and south by national forest lands. These lands consist of most of the Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie and Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forests, including nearly 2 million acres of wilderness, and make up roughly 74% of the NCE grizzly bear recovery zone (for a total of 85% of federally managed land in the NCE). Approximately 8% of the NCE grizzly bear recovery zone is made up of state and local lands including state parks and Department of Natural Resources lands, and 7% is made up of private lands (FWS 1997).

Comment: Agency failed to clearly communicate to the public the actual land masses the grizzly bear EIS will cover. Agency implying "North Cascades Ecosystem" SHOULD have stated "6.1-Million Acres North Cascades National Park Service Complex Ecosystem" throughout the State of WA.

Okanogan County 3.5 million acres is the largest County in WA ST. Private land ownership is probably 6% or less. We carry the tax burden, struggle to stay in business with the heavy unnecessary regulations from the State and Federal Government, fighting for our private property and water rights, fighting against wolves, cougars now agency employees want to help build numbers of grizzly bears. When grizzly bears already exist in at least two locations, north of Okanogan County adjacent to Canada and in NE WA in WA STATE, adjacent to Idaho.

Agency failed NEPA requirements.

The Agency failed to address clearly, reasonably foreseeable projected lifetime outcome direct and indirect long-term and short-term effects of their proposed actions and reasonable alternatives of these realistic issues to the residents of Okanogan County.

Alternative A: NO ACTION

NO to Section 10(j) ESA RULE needed.

From EIS document: "Other Wildlife and Fish

"Wildlife or fish species such as elk and deer, black bear, and salmonids could be affected in terms of grizzly bear predation or competition for resources".

Comment:

The Agency failed to meet NEPA requirements especially regarding salmon.

The Agency failed to provide sufficient evidence that long term negative impacts to the Salmon population, that all of us have had to adjust water, agriculture operations, road construction, housing developments, building, taking land out of production, purchasing land with waterfront and water rights all around saving and building salmon populations in Okanogan County. Introducing Grizzly Bears that it's a proven fact they will have a negative impact on salmon and put us back on all of our salmon recovery efforts that millions and millions of dollars have been spent and have cost us for salmon recovery already.

- Quick research: an average male grizzly bear can eat 30 salmon a day
- Agency Staff goal grizzly bear population will be 200

- 200 X 30=6,000 salmon a day could potentially eaten a day
- Or 6,000 X 360 days a year=2,160,000
- If I could do the quick research and math, why did Agency personnel fail to provide this information?

SO, 2 MILLION, ONE HUNDRED SIXTY THOUSAND SALMON A YEAR potentially to our salmon recovery efforts! I'm not a fish biologist, I'm not in salmon recovery, but to me it sounds like it could be a major impact to Okanogan County salmon recovery efforts! Again, when we all have been forced to change our farming, ranching business management practices, costing us thousands of dollars for the salmon, and the Agency provided NO information, NO studies, NOTHING regarding this government driven issue, that WILL be impacted! WHY?

Agency failed NEPA requirements.

NEPA requires Agencies to consider the reasonably foreseeable projected lifetime outcome direct and indirect short-term and long-term effects of their proposed actions and reasonable alternatives.

Alternative A: NO ACTION

NO to Section 10(j) ESA RULE needed.

Wilderness Character: Portions of this section are included:

Together, the park complex and surrounding national forest wilderness areas protect over 2.6 million acres of federally designated wilderness within the NCE. Grizzly bear restoration activities could affect wilderness character and values for solitude or primitive and unconfined recreational qualities of wilderness character.

Comment:

- Agency admits their own actions will result in varying effects on wilderness.
- Utilizing helicopters, possibly airplanes.
- Agency staff will be introducing grizzly bears, monitoring, relocating.
- As grizzly bear numbers increase so will the activities of the agency.

However, these actions are acceptable because it's the agency personnel performing these actions and impacts, with their main goal, at all costs, to introduce the grizzly bears. The Agency has ignored local comments from the people that will be impacted. As you read the next paragraph, you will clearly understand, close roads, stop cattle grazing, with no mention of the benefits of rotational cattle grazing studies.....

The Agency failed to meet NEPA requirements.

NEPA requires Agencies to consider the reasonably foreseeable projected lifetime outcome direct and indirect short-term and long-term effects of their proposed actions and reasonable alternatives.

Alternative A: NO ACTION

NO to Section 10(j) ESA RULE needed.

Trends and Planned Actions:

USFS forest vegetation management projects could have both beneficial and adverse impacts on grizzly bears if bears return depending on whether they create opportunities to enhance habitat for certain species. Cattle and sheep grazing on USFS lands could have adverse impacts on grizzly bears if conflicts with grizzly bears occur. Beneficial impacts on grizzly bears could occur from decommissioning roads for a 63

variety of reasons unrelated to grizzly restoration actions in or near sensitive habitat. However, trail maintenance, mountain lake restoration, motorized travel management, and administrative flights may temporarily disturb grizzly bear habitat, while ski area expansion projects on USFS lands could have adverse impacts on grizzly bears or habitat because land clearing could disturb and fragment additional habitat. Cattle and sheep grazing on USFS lands would continue to impact wildlife and fish habitat by altering the composition, structure, and productivity of plant communities. In general, grazing adversely affects species that require denser cover for protection and benefits species adapted to open habitats. Grazing degrades riparian and instream habitat and increases competition among fish and wildlife for resources.

Comment:

Comment: After reviewing the EIS document, it is very obvious the Agency Personnel/Employees approving this EIS has several underlying goals OTHER THAN introducing grizzly bears. The Agency, through the EIS admits WA ST already has grizzly bear locations in our STATE in at least two locations repopulating themselves. Current, 2020 and 2022 studies

confirm grizzly bears are re-populating in the natural habitat adaptation ecosystems they are choosing. One location, north of Okanogan County, they travel back and forth across the Border to Canada, the other location in NE WA, they can travel into N. Idaho if they choose. However, to achieve Agency, Employee, underlying goals, are using grizzly bears as their introduction to:

- Close roads
- Stop cattle grazing
- Limit public access to public lands
- Stop future ski expansion areas
- "Prohibitions in Areas Designated by Order."
- The benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations of people.
- "Beneficial impacts on grizzly bears could occur from decommissioning roads for a 63 variety of reasons unrelated to grizzly restoration actions in or near sensitive habitat".
- Agency failed to address the items listed above that could be perceived by the public that were attempted to be "hidden" within the document.
- The agency must explain why they failed to address the agency's goals of road closures, limit public access to public lands, stop cattle grazing, stop future ski expansion areas, beneficial impacts on grizzly bears could occur from decommissioning roads for a 63 variety of reasons unrelated to grizzly restoration actions in or near sensitive habitat, prohibitions in areas designated by orders.

The Agency failed to meet NEPA requirements.

NEPA requires Agencies to consider the reasonably foreseeable projected lifetime outcome direct and indirect short-term and long-term effects of their proposed actions and reasonable alternatives.

Alternative A: NO ACTION

NO to Section 10(j) ESA RULE needed.

Visitor Use and Recreational Experience

including hiking, backpacking, camping, climbing, fishing, horseback riding, bicycling, boating, winter sports, and wildlife viewing. Opportunities for hunting are available in the NPS national recreation areas and on the national forests and state-owned lands, and off-road vehicle use is permitted on portions of the national forests (USFS 2016a,b). The park complex offers a variety of educational and interpretive programs, visitor facilities, and lodging facilities (NPS 2012b). The restoration of grizzly bears to the NCE could increase visitation and recreational use of the NCE as visitors seek to experience grizzly bears in their native habitat.

Comment: The Agency failed to provide the public of the long term reasonably foreseeable direct and indirect short-term and long-term impacts our people and visitors to Okanogan County can/might expect from grizzly bear introductions.

- The agency admits restoration actions that result in an increased grizzly bear population could also affect recreational opportunities for visitors who do not wish to encounter grizzly bears.
- The Agency is not being forthcoming. They know of grizzly bear attacks on public, camping, hiking and various outdoor activities from other States.
- They have realistic examples they have not shared or considered with the public. Why?
- Is the agency going to wait until one loss of life in Okanogan County THEN analyze that? NO

The Agency failed to meet NEPA requirements.

NEPA requires Agencies to consider the reasonably foreseeable projected lifetime outcome direct and indirect short-term and long-term effects of their proposed actions and reasonable alternatives.

Alternative A: NO ACTION

NO to Section 10(j) ESA RULE needed.

Bear-related Public and Employee Safety

Agency admits, negative interactions between humans and grizzly bears, while rare, do occur. Every situation is dynamic, and a grizzly bear's reaction depends on a variety of factors including the proximity between a bear and a human, the type of encounter (i.e., whether the bear is behaving in a defensive or offensive manner), and whether cubs or a valuable food resource are involved, among other considerations (Herrero 2002). The restoration of grizzly bears in the NCE has raised

concerns about safety risks to residents living in and adjacent to the NCE, as well as backcountry recreationists and other visitors because of the potential for negative grizzly bear interactions. Although rare, human injuries from grizzly bears can and have occurred in other ecosystems. In addition, the capture, release, and monitoring of grizzly bears could affect employee safety because of the dangerous nature of the activity--one of the two reported injuries listed above was to a FWS bear biologist monitoring the population (IGBC 2018).

Comment:

- The above Herrero 2002 referenced is 21-year-old information.
- The Agency provides a report regarding FWS biologist injuries, that could pertain to agency personnel, however nothing is provided potentially pertaining to Okanogan County concerns regarding our public and/or family members or livestock, when clearly a quick search can provide information.
- Quick research 2023 MT man mauled by Grizzly hunting deer
 - o "10-2023 Banff, National Park, Canada 2 people and their dog killed, such encounters are increasing"
 - o July 12, 2023 "WY Fisherman Watched Grizzly Bear Chase Down a Helpless Cow"
 - o August 17, 2023 Montana Wildlife Officials killed a male grizzly bear in Southern Park County after it attacked livestock on a private ranch in the Tom Miner Basin. This was the 3rd euthanized of grizzly bears due to cattle depredations after becoming accustomed to cattle food sources.

The agency recognized safety concerns however, only when it aligns with employee safety. The Agency failed to address 2019 comments and concerns regarding our lives, way of life, cattle, which are the same comments during 2023 meetings. The basic quick research I have provided above, SHOULD have been provided by the Agency for our current review and comments.

The Agency failed to meet NEPA requirements.

NEPA requires Agencies to consider the reasonably foreseeable projected lifetime outcome direct and indirect short-term and long-term effects of their proposed actions and reasonable alternatives.

The Agency has failed to provide the public of the long term reasonably foreseeable direct and indirect short-term and long-term impacts to our cattle industry, livestock, workers, and family can/might expect from grizzly bear introductions.

Alternative A: NO ACTION

NO to Section 10(j) ESA RULE needed.

Socioeconomics

The NCE consists of an expansive and largely undeveloped wildland area that spans the crest of the Cascade Range from the more populated, industrialized, urban areas of the Puget Sound region to the more rural, agricultural, and natural resource-based economies of the Okanogan Highlands and Columbia Plateau. The restoration of grizzly bears in the NCE has raised concerns about economic impacts on natural resource-based industries such as mining and logging, specifically regarding the potential for motorized access and road development restrictions in core grizzly bear habitat. Concerns about depredation of livestock or agriculture, such as fruit orchards, have also been raised. In addition, local business and hunting revenues may be affected due to changes in tourism and hunting revenue because of grizzly bear restoration.

Comment: The agency has already stated they have interest in the following from "Trends and Planned Actions" Section of EIS. It appears they already have their decision made to do the following:

- Close roads
- Stop cattle grazing
- Limit public access to public lands
- Stop future ski expansion areas
- "Prohibitions in Areas Designated by Order."
- "Beneficial impacts on grizzly bears could occur from decommissioning roads for a 63 variety of reasons unrelated to grizzly restoration actions in or near sensitive habitat".

The Agency failed to meet NEPA requirements.

NEPA requires Agencies to consider the reasonably foreseeable projected lifetime outcome direct and indirect short-term and long-term effects of their proposed actions and reasonable alternatives.

Alternative A: NO ACTION

NO to Section 10(j) ESA RULE needed.

Okanogan County Wildland Fire Disasters

The agency failed to address the wildland fire disasters Okanogan has had and will continue to have with the poor condition of our national forests and wilderness areas. Some caused by lightning strikes, some human caused. However long term and short impacts poor air quality for days, loss of timber, lack of immediately harvesting timber, creating ecosystem changes, invasive species, loss of wildlife, impacts to wildlife and agency failure to address these issues.

The Agency failed to meet NEPA requirements.

NEPA requires Agencies to consider the reasonably foreseeable projected lifetime outcome direct and indirect short-term and long-term effects of their proposed actions and reasonable alternatives.

Alternative A: NO ACTION

NO to Section 10(j) ESA RULE needed.

The Ministry of Forest, Lands and Natural Resource Operations (MFLNRO) estimated the population in the adjacent British Columbia portion of the NCE to be about six grizzly bears over a decade ago (MFLNRO 2012). Only one confirmed grizzly bear sighting has been documented within the greater NCE during the past decade (IGBC NCE Subcommittee 2016; Rine et al. 2020). The confirmed sighting was in British Columbia. The greater NCE, including its Canadian and US portions, is bounded roughly by the Fraser River on the north, the Okanogan Highlands and Columbia Plateau on the east, Snoqualmie Pass to the south, and the Puget lowlands to the west.

For the purposes of this EIS, the NCE grizzly bear recovery zone within the US portion of the ecosystem is hereafter referred to as the NCE. The US portion of the ecosystem spans the crest of the Cascade Range from the temperate rainforests of the west side to the dry ponderosa pine forests and sage-steppe on the east side.

A grizzly bear habitat evaluation was conducted from 1986 (37 years) to 1991 (32-year-old information) in response to recommendations made in the 1982 (41-year-old information) FWS nationwide Grizzly Bear Recovery Plan. This habitat evaluation and a report by the Interagency Grizzly Bear Committee (IGBC) NCE Subcommittee, concluded that the US portion of the NCE contains sufficient habitat quality to maintain and recover a grizzly bear population (Servheen et al. 1991; (32-year-old information) Almack et al. 1993 (30-year-old information). More recent carrying capacity modeling suggests the most plausible carrying capacity for the US portion of the NCE is approximately 280 bears (Lyons et al. 2018).

Despite the historical presence of grizzly bears in the NCE and the availability of sufficient habitat to recover and maintain a viable population, there is no confirmed evidence of current grizzly bear presence within the NCE grizzly bear recovery zone in the United States (Rine et al. 2020).

There has been only one confirmed detection of a grizzly bear in the greater NCE in the past 10 years, which occurred in British Columbia (IGBC NCE Subcommittee 2016; Rine et al. 2020). Since there has been no confirmed

COMMENT: The agency is making their recommendation on 30, 32, 37, 41, year, outdated information to support THE Agency's goal of grizzly bears. However, a study in 2022 reports 17 known grizzly bears in NE WA actively re-populating themselves without the help of the government. Over the past 17 years Okanogan County has had several very large Wildland Fire Incidents, 2006 Tripod Fire Complex, for example, thousands of timbered acres lost. In 2014 and 2015 WS ST Record setting wildland fires. How can the people that lived through, fought these fires, lost so much from these fires, support a one-sided proposed EIS that it again, points out the Agency's decision has already been made from outdated, pick and choose information that fits their goals, at the price of the people that live here in Okanogan County, that does not adequately address all major issues of Okanogan County?

- Agency failed to mention those specific fire disasters, the long-term short-term impacts and the hundred of thousands of acres burned, pertaining to grizzly bears.
- Failed to mention of the smoke hazard, poor air quality long term ecosystem impacts.
- Agency failed to address Wildland fire impacts past, and future wildland fire impacts, with the poor condition of our forests, beetle damage in our timber, lack of timber harvesting to properly manage our forests, increase in public visiting in and near all public lands, there will be more fires.
- Why did the Agency fail to address reasonably foreseeable direct and indirect long term impact effects of wildland fire incidents in the EIS?

The Agency failed to meet NEPA requirements.

NEPA requires Agencies to consider the reasonably foreseeable projected lifetime outcome direct and indirect short-term and long-term effects of their proposed actions and reasonable alternatives.

Alternative A: NO ACTION

NO to Section 10(j) ESA RULE needed.

Purpose and Need:

As stated by the Agency, action is needed at this time to:

- ♣ Contribute to the restoration of biodiversity of the ecosystem to build ecological resilience and for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations of people.
- ♣ Enhance the probability of long-term survival of grizzly bears in the NCE and there by contribute to overall grizzly bear recovery through redundancy in multiple populations and representation in a variety of habitats.

Comment: The "NEEDS" of the people that live, work, have businesses, enjoy various recreational, natural resource, agriculture opportunities, hundreds of local people have stated in 2019, and again during local October 2023 meetings we do not NEED or WANT grizzly bears in Okanogan County, because of the dangerous various threats, loss of lives, livestock, pets, wildlife, the long-term negative impacts to our future generation farming and ranching operations.

- There is no "NEED" for present and future generations. As stated in the EIS, currently there are at least two known locations in the State of WA.

- o North where 17 grizzly bears are crossing back and forth into Canada and WA

- o NE WA where known # (they did not specify #) of grizzly bears are living and some are crossing into Idaho.

- o Both known populations are re-populating on their own without help from the government!

- People can visit these locations to see grizzly bears in their natural habitat at any time.
- They can visit, for their "enjoyment" Alaska, WY, MT, ID, or other states with grizzly bear populations.
- There is NOT a significant NEED for more grizzly bears, in WA ST, specifically Okanogan County.

The Agency needs to listen to our local citizens comments regarding short- and long-term negative impacts, concerns, our comments and the agency's lack of addressing NEPA requirements Okanogan County residents, WILL be impacted directly and indirectly.

The Agency failed to meet NEPA requirements.

NEPA requires Agencies to consider the reasonably foreseeable projected lifetime outcome direct and indirect short-term and long-term effects of their proposed actions and reasonable alternatives.

Alternative A: NO ACTION

NO to Section 10(j) ESA RULE needed.

Objectives in Taking Action:

Provide Pacific Northwest residents and visitors with the opportunity to again experience grizzly bears in their native habitat.

- ♣ Expand outreach efforts to inform and involve the public, and build understanding about grizzly bear recovery.

Comment:

- Pacific NW residents or anybody, can travel to other States, WY, MT, Alaska, Idaho, and Canada, all within a few hours' drive from Okanogan County, WA to "experience grizzly bears in their native habitat."
- NE WA already has known population of grizzly bears; people can travel there to see them in their "natural habitat"
- "Expanding outreach efforts" statement, this process should already be happening by the Agency from states that already have grizzly bears. The Agency can educate and have outreach efforts without placing grizzly bears in Okanogan County.
- Request the Agency remove above language from EIS and Plan, because it can already be provided without grizzly bears in Okanogan County.

The Agency failed to meet NEPA requirements.

NEPA requires Agencies to consider the reasonably foreseeable projected lifetime outcome direct and indirect short-term and long-term effects of their proposed actions and reasonable alternatives.

Alternative A: NO ACTION

NO to Section 10(j) ESA RULE needed.

Issues and Impact Topics

The agencies identified a range of issues and impact topics to evaluate in this plan/EIS to determine the potential impacts on the human environment that could result from implementation of the alternatives. Issues were analyzed in depth for the following impact topics:

- ♣ Grizzly bears
- ♣ Other wildlife and fish
- ♣ Wilderness character
- ♣ Visitors use and recreational experience.
- ♣ Bear-related public and employee safety

- ♣ Socioeconomics
- ♣ Ethnographic resources

Comment:

Agency is not being transparent on the topics and concerns Okanogan County people have been expressing 2019 meetings and again October 2023. They continue to blur the topics into the examples of the above bullet points. People want to know the Agency's decisions specifically identified and then have the Agency specify the impacts so the people can clearly understand what we will be faced with. Agency needs to specifically address how introducing grizzly bears into Okanogan County will impact, (long and short impacts) of:

- Natural resource-based industries
- Agriculture industries
 - o Cattle
 - o Fruit
 - o Farming
 - o Livestock-specific to horses, sheep, goats
 - o Small Family "Hobby Farms"
 - o Loss of Life
 - o Loss of pet, cattle, horse, sheep, goat
 - o Wildlife population decreasing #'s white tail and mule deer, elk small animal populations
 - o Salmon population decreasing numbers. Especially when we all have had to modify, change, adapt to new governmental regulations and policies for salmon recovery.

♣ EIS fails to mention salmon recovery efforts laws regulations and negative impacts of large dominate grizzly can potentially eat up to 30 salmon in one day.

Agency failed to meet NEPA requirements.

NEPA requires Agencies to consider the reasonably foreseeable projected lifetime outcome direct and indirect short-term and long-term effects of their proposed actions and reasonable alternatives.

Alternative A: NO ACTION

NO to Section 10(j) ESA RULE needed.

Invasive Species

The implementation of grizzly bear restoration activities could contribute to the spread of invasive species such as diffuse knapweed (*Centaurea diffusa*) or reed canary grass (*Phalaris arundinacea*) within the NCE. Given the anticipated nature, scope, and scale of restoration activities, it is expected that avoidance of areas with known invasive plant infestations and mitigation measures such as the proper cleaning of vehicles, equipment, uniforms, and footwear would be sufficient to prevent the spread of invasive species. The agencies would locate and use weed-free project staging areas. In addition, they would avoid or minimize all types of travel through weed-infested areas or restrict travel to those periods when spread of seed or propagules are least likely. Based on these conditions, this topic was dismissed from further analysis.

Comment:

The Agency's suggested increase in visitors to see grizzly bears, so comes the increased introduction of non-native invasive species into our county, roads and public lands, that the agency failed to address long term integrated, site specific control methods, utilizing Early Detection Rapid Response fully funded approach.

- Has the Agency performed surveying and mapping of invasive species throughout the boundaries of the grizzly bear zone in Okanogan County?
- Has the Agency prepared NEPA for the identified invasive species control measures?
- Has the Agency prepared Categorical Exclusion (CE) for new invader invasive species treatments within the grizzly bear management zone in Okanogan County to prevent new introduced invasive species from becoming large infestations?
- No specific explanation on how the Agency will address Executive Order 13751 and Executive Order 13112.

The Agency failed to meet NEPA requirements.

NEPA requires Agencies to consider the reasonably foreseeable projected lifetime outcome direct and indirect short-term and long-term effects of their proposed actions and reasonable alternatives.

Alternative A: NO ACTION

NO to Section 10(j) ESA RULE needed.

Environmental Justice

Environmental justice is associated with Executive Order 12898, published on February 11, 1994. This executive order

requires all federal agencies to incorporate environmental justice into their mission by "identifying and addressing ... disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of [their] programs, policies and activities on minority and low-income populations in the United States" It was determined that while a small number of communities adjacent to the NCE grizzly bear recovery zone may qualify as minority and/or low-income populations, these communities would not be disproportionately affected by grizzly bear restoration because restoration activities would not be focused in these areas. Therefore, this topic was dismissed from further analysis.

Comment: Agency failed to take into consideration that Okanogan County has minority, low-income populations, some borderline poverty line, some below poverty line standards, that utilize Okanogan County public lands with their families because that is all they can afford to do. Releasing grizzly bears into Okanogan County, increasing "high and adverse health or environmental effects to our local low-income and minority people of our county. After the Agency Personnel get done closing more roads, removing cattle, mining, logging and people from our public lands, killing our cattle, our way of life, businesses, our children, and families, from grizzly bear attacks. What's left of us, will be more within the minority and low-income category, or also known as food chain for grizzly bears, which seems to be the main goal for NPS employees pushing this plan.

The Agency failed to meet NEPA requirements.

NEPA requires Agencies to consider the reasonably foreseeable projected lifetime outcome direct and indirect short-term and long-term effects of their proposed actions and reasonable alternatives.

Correspondence ID: 13408Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellevue, WA 98005
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 15:16:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I regularly hike, fish, and backpack through the North Cascades. I also lead scout troops through the area on long, backpacking trips. I am against introducing grizzly bears back into the area. The North Cascades are now too heavily trafficked by humans so I am concerned that the interaction between humans and grizzlies will not turn out well.

Correspondence ID: 13409Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Woodinville, WA 98275
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 15:16:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not support introducing grizzly bears to the North Cascades of Washington state. I think there will be too many conflicts between humans and bears, especially for ranchers who raise livestock. The plan does not allow individuals to euthanize a bear if it threatens their animals or their safety. This is similar to the problem with wolves in the NE part of the state, which has become extremely problematic for the people who live there. Adding grizzly bears to the north central region of Washington would increase stress to inhabitants of the region.

Correspondence ID: 13415Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Oak Harbor, WA 98277
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 15:27:12

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We are NOT the top of the food chain. Why do you think people have to carry a hand cannon in the wilderness? Talk to someone who has been in Alaska or CA. Grizzlies can smell food many miles away. Do you honestly think they will stay in a designated area and not range further looking for easier food choices? I have had experience with Grizzlies when camping. in CA. in remote areas. This program will endanger anyone with farms, domestic animals, compost pits, smokers, or outdoor and even indoor cooking. This is foolish.

Correspondence ID: 13419Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Edmonds, WA 98020
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 15:31:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am very against having grizzly bears in Cascades near such a populated area like Seattle. I have hiked in around Lake Wenatchee and there is enough worry with just the black bears. I see no benefit to humans or the bears to be living so close to each other. I would not hike or want to be in the Cascades again if this project is approved. Please stop this project!!!

Correspondence ID: 13424Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bothell, WA 98021
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 15:47:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No, we should not re introduce grizzliies to the area. They will be dangerous to people who live nearby, and kill many farm animals.

Correspondence ID: 13425Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98125
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 15:49:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: All bears, including grizzly bears, are a vital part of the ecosystem in the Cascadia region. I support the conservation and protection of grizzly bears along with all bears and condemn any mistreatment, violence of them or their habitat.

Grizzly bears have as much of a right to this land as we do - maybe even more so.

Correspondence ID: 13426Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Edmonds, WA 98026
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 15:50:08

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Since studies have proven that Grizzly bears roamed the Pacific Northwest and they have been on the endangered list since 1975 they should be introduced into the North Cascades Mountains. My concern is with the lack of education for those out hiking the Pacific Crest Trail. If a mandatory education program isn't part of this reintroduction then it will most likely be a disaster from the start.

Similarly to how Leave No Trace principles are practiced by many it's those who don't follow LNT that get the attention leaving trash in their wake.

Please consider a mandatory education program for those seeking back country trail permits and upgrade the posting at all WA trailheads.

Thank you

██████████

Correspondence ID: 13427Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bainbridge Island, WA 98110
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 15:50:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: In this age of climate disaster, we have to do whatever we can to make the earth healthier. One way to do that is by re-creating ecological diversity and balance where we've erased it. Reintroducing grizzlies to our region will shift natural resources in crucial ways. And, as someone who spends a lot of time in the grand outdoors of the Pacific Northwest, I welcome the grizzlies. It's up to us to learn how to share space again while we still can.

Correspondence ID: 13428Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Walla Walla, WA 99362
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 15:50:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: What effect has the absence of Grizzly bears had on the area? How often will the population be monitored if they are reintroduced?

Correspondence ID: 13429Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 15:52:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support returning this apex predator to its natural habitat. Please support restoration of grizzlies in the North Cascades!

Correspondence ID: 13431Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98125
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 16:03:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of grizzly bears into the North Cascades as part of a complete and viable ecosystem. I support funding to maintain this project, educate people and normalize grizzly bears.

Correspondence ID: 13434Project:112008Document:132104
Address: vantage, WA 98950
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 16:05:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please, NO!!! to Grizzlies in Washington! We have sufficient predators with cougars, black bears, wolves and coyotes. Their food sources are limited. So the Grizzlies will resort to easy prey like boy scouts and livestock.

Correspondence ID: 13435Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Kirkland, WA 98034
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 16:07:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Totally supporting this! More areas to bears and other endangered animals to thrive, please!

Correspondence ID: 13436Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Longview, WA 98632
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 16:09:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To the PEPC,

I am in full support of reintroducing Grizzly bears to the Cascades. The history of Grizzly bears has given a horrid impression of the species, but as our understanding of the animal and how human involvement impacted them has grown it has become apparent Grizzly bears were never the real problem. Previous attacks made by Grizzlies on humans was mostly due to unsafe food storage practices and harmful human behavior, such as in the case of the Granite Park Chalet in Glacier National Park in the 1960's. The owner of the Chalet at the time created entertainment for the guests by purposefully leaving food waste out and watching the Grizzlies come for the food and fight over it. It was one of the direct causes of the Night of the Grizzlies in 1967, as the bears were offered a more convenient means of food and it drastically threw off their natural hunting pattern. It was after that event that Grizzlies were so demonized, when it was the act of humans that caused the issues in the first place.

As we know more about bear safety practices now, it is not just an option to reintroduce Grizzlies to the Cascades. It's our responsibility to do so, and to not repeat mistakes of the past when we have the knowledge to do better by our beautiful wildlife. Grizzly bears play an important part in the ecosystem and when left to their regular patterns of hunting with no interference from humans, they are far less harmful.

In short, it's been long overdue that we should introduce Grizzly bears back into their home. It's one of the steps to mending the errors of our past, an absolutely necessary one.

Correspondence ID: 13437Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Carnation, WA 98014
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 16:09:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I oppose the active introduction of grizzly bears into the North Cascades because of the impact it will have on hikers, hunters, bird watchers, and all of our recreationists. The reality is, despite an active grizzly population in British Columbia (a much larger, less populated place), including bears near the border who sometimes cross into American territory, these bears have not wanted to re-establish themselves here. I have no problem with a natural re-establishment, but I do not support the introduction of grizzlies into this tranquil territory.

Correspondence ID: 13438Project:112008Document:132104
Address: West Valley City, UT 84128
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 16:11:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly support the National Park Services preferred Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation.

This plan will both effectively restore grizzly bears in North Cascades National Park and give people the tools they need to thrive in and around grizzly bear country. Grizzlies belong in the North Cascades, as they enhance the park's ecological integrity and contribute to its wildness.

Grizzly bears play a vital role in maintaining ecosystem balance, cycling nutrients, dispersing seeds, and changing the behavior of species around them. Restoring them would benefit the park and the people who use it. Look at Yellowstone and the return of wolves. I guarantee that the grizzly bear will be able to maintain and restore the natural environment through chain reaction and create a thriving ecosystem for us to lay our eyes upon in the future.

A restored population of grizzlies will boost the park's appeal and attract nature enthusiasts, scientists, and tourists from around the world. This would provide economic benefits to local communities and support the park's mission to protect park resources in perpetuity.

Alternative C, with the 10(j) rule, provides managers flexibility to address community concerns while protecting the grizzly population. It ensures coexistence between humans and bears.

Please consider the positive ecological and economic benefits and support Alternative C. Restoring grizzly bears will secure the park's natural heritage and conserve an iconic species for current and future generations.

Thank you for your dedication to our national parks.

Correspondence ID: 13440Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Lolo, MT 59847
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 16:14:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Comments - Grizzly Bear Reintroduction Proposal, North Cascades Ecosystem

I grew up in the Pacific Northwest, hiking and backpacking literally hundreds of miles in the Alpine Lakes Wilderness and the North Cascades. I have lived, worked, and recreated in Southeast Alaska (very much bear country), and currently live on the edge of the Bitterroot Ecosystem Bear Recovery area near Missoula, Montana, where I continue to hike, travel, and recreate -- in bear country. In all these years, I have not had any negative encounters with these magnificent animals. I love bears - grizzlies (also called brown bears in Alaska), black, and polar bears as well. They are beautiful, amazing creatures, and are a vital keystone species for ecosystems throughout the Intermountain West and in the North.

After reviewing the DEIS, I have a couple major concerns regarding the current NPS and USFWS proposals to reintroduce grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem, which includes some observations from here that I hope may be helpful.

To start, grizzly bear recovery here in the Northern Continental Divide Ecosystem has been an amazing success (and one that will also need constant vigilance to ensure genetic diversity is retained multi-generationally). It's been such a success that per radio collar tracking data, grizzly bears are now wandering close to neighborhoods in Missoula, MT (population 70,000); 2 young grizzlies recently were captured near here who had gotten themselves into an apple orchard (relocated without incident), and grizzly bears have been killed this year on highways just east and north of Missoula (near Bonner, MT and Ronan, MT). This year we are experiencing a troubling uptick in the number of bears that have been killed in self-defense as well as bear maulings and human deaths that have occurred in Montana. Rare incidences, for sure, yet a small trend upward. A local decision was also recently made requiring bear resistant garbage containers for several small communities around Missoula as well as Missoula itself. All indicators that grizzly bear recovery has occurred, as bears begin to push into more urban environments. Many folks here are supportive of grizzly bear recovery (and of course, many are not); it's hard, constant work to not only initiate a recovery plan but also to work with agencies, tribes, local communities, interest groups, recreationists, hunters, anglers, farmers, and ranchers to keep working together to continue making this work.

While there may be quality grizzly bear habitat along the backbone of the Cascades, what is different about the North Cascades Ecosystem is that it is surrounded by over 7.7 million people (with over 4.3 million people from the Puget Sound region alone). No other grizzly bear recovery area has this number of people surrounding its recovery zones. The NCE is also narrow. There is heavy urbanization and growth on the west side of the Cascades, with housing developments continuing to

edge into Cascade Mountain valleys. There is extensive agricultural use on the east side. The NCE is a slender island of habitat surrounded by people - a lot of them. Bears like to roam, explore, and seek out new territory. Young adult bears get pushed out by older bears. Food sources change. Food sources disappear. There's not a lot of "wiggle room" should a bear decide to wander.

In Montana, we have the geographic advantage where prime grizzly bear habitat and recovery areas are still surrounded by extensive front country and foothills that are pretty much undeveloped and wild in character. We only have a little over a million people spread out across the 4th largest state in the Union. Alaska, which has the most grizzly (brown) bears of all, is similar with lots of space for both bears and people to disperse. And even with "all that room" that we have here in Montana, we still have some conflicts.

Even with a target population goal of 200 bears for the NCE, with a shared home range of 50 - 150 square miles for a female grizzly and a shared home range of up to 600 square miles for a male grizzly (University of Montana, Grizzly Bear Recovery Program description), the NCE just doesn't seem like a good option for this type of recovery effort. I would be concerned. For the bears. And for people.

I am also concerned that the DEIS doesn't seem to account for current, real time climate change impacts. While the models used seem to indicate an increase in more quality habitat for bears under different climate emission scenarios, here in Montana, we are already seeing warmer springs, hotter summers, more severe fires, and less snowpack, with impacts on huckleberries and other forage crops, pushing the bears out into rural/urban areas to look for food when berries and other food sources have either dried up or did not come into bloom or occurrence as they typically would.

The North Cascades are undergoing dramatic changes which does not appear to be accounted for in the DEIS - mountain pine beetle infestation has impacted forests (as seen by the mortality along the North Cascades Highway and other parts of the Cascades), and Pacific NW summers appear to be trending hotter/drier as well (as evidenced by large forest fires now on the west side of the Cascades, such as the 2022 Bolt Creek Fire near Skykomish and fires in the North Cascades NP this past summer). Things are changing much faster than earlier models and studies have predicted, even the ones it appears that were used for the DEIS. I am concerned that the amount of quality habitat that would truly be available for a recovering grizzly bear population in the NCE will be significantly less than modeled, resulting in bears moving into urban and rural areas, looking for food.

In many ways I would love to see grizzly bears back in the North Cascades. It is an amazing feeling with a little bit of an edge to know you are walking a mountain with a grizzly.

I am concerned though, that the North Cascades Ecosystem just isn't the "right" place anymore to help restore grizzly bear populations, and even less so as the climate, and the Pacific NW, continues to rapidly change. The NCE is too narrow of a band of land, too close to high densities of people (who likely won't change their behaviors to lessen potential adverse encounters), and it's intersected by major highways that have much higher traffic volumes than we have here in Montana.

If the decision is made to reintroduce grizzly bears to the NCE, I would recommend that, right at the start, the federal agencies, the State of Washington, the respective tribes, and concerned citizens, consider proactively setting a "cap" on the grizzly bear population at a level that is genetically viable and sustainable within "real time" information on quality habitat in light of climate change, so that bears are not being "pushed out" into populated areas or areas with large ranching and farming operations. Instead of allowing the population to eventually expand to fit available habitat, as is proposed in the DEIS, I would offer that keeping population levels at a "less than the maximum" and/or "less than optimum" range could be an approach that could work better and be quicker at adapting to landscape scale effects from a rapidly changing climate.

If grizzly bears are to be reintroduced to the NCE, it will also be vital for everyone to work together, with a willingness and openness to continually adapt as you go. Ongoing communication channels that build trust, social acceptance, and support for having a large, top of the food chain carnivore as your new neighbor will be essential - and hard work. With this calendar year being the hottest on record, world-wide, and climate change happening rapidly, how we've restored and managed for endangered species in the past, in terms of both species recovery as well as working with communities, cannot be how we do so in the future. We must come at this differently. In a big way. Getting all communities of interest on board - collaboratively and for the long term - will be essential to the success of this effort, regardless of the amount of habitat available for grizzly bear recovery in the NCE.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Sincerely,

Correspondence ID: 13441Project:112008Document:132104

Address: kirkland, WA 98934
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 16:15:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please make this happen, but also allocate appropriate budgeting for determining when to close trails so neither humans nor animals are put in danger!

Correspondence ID: 13442Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98127
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 16:15:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have been a Seattle resident since 1982, and an avid hiker for many years. I base my comments in part on having lived in the Canadian Rockies for 4 years (Banff & Canmore, Alberta), my understanding of the proposals & information from several articles (cited below) about experiences with grizzlies in the US where they currently reside.

I'm only in favor of option (A). The proposed reintroduction is based on "best case" scenarios of adequate habitat, which cannot be reasonably predicted based on climate change variables. The extended periods of drought and high temps that we've experienced over the last several years have made it very rough for berries in the expected grizzly range.

Consider that the Greater Yellowstone Coalition felt it necessary to raise more than twice as much money as it had ever raised in a two-year period in order to acquire just under 1600 additional acres to protect the griz currently subsisting on over 2.2 million acres, just to protect them from a proposed mine.

https://www.nytimes.com/2023/10/16/us/yellowstone-gold-mine-grizzly-bears.html?unlocked_article_code=1.30w.Gi0r.FOBwWn-1tLI3&smid=url-share

Compare that to NCNP (505K acres) contingent with Ross Lake NRA (117K acres) and Lake Chelan NRA (62K acres). Subtract out the high elevation areas of the NC that are not habitable for bears. More importantly, grizzly populations currently thriving in the US are doing so in states with very low population density outside of the bears' protected ranges. Yellowstone is one. Glacier NP is the other, and they're having trouble even in Montana. They are thriving, yet moving out of the park in increasing numbers, with a concurrent rise in bear/human confrontations, as cited in the NYTimes article,

"Grizzlies are coming to town. Can the West live with them?" (please google it)

I might also add that in the last two decades (if not longer), Banff National Park has gotten extremely "militant" (for lack of a better word) in keeping humans away from grizzlies, as visitation to the Canadian mountain parks has exploded. Depending on the area, it's not uncommon for wardens to close off entire valleys to hiking if a single grizzly is known to be in the area, or limit visitation to parties with a minimum of 4-6 hikers. This is in areas where you used to be able to hike wherever and whenever you wished.

Central Puget Sound grew by 600K in the last 10 years, and is currently at 4.3M. Future growth will continue to expand into counties adjoining the North Cascades (Skagit, current population 130K and Whatcom, 234.5K).

The grizzly is a magnificent animal. I wouldn't like to see the griz managed the way wolves are now, and worse. The animal always loses when they "get out of line", I understand that the Canadians are proceeding with their own plans for the Canadian North Cascades. If they include some highway bridges for critters and a few of their bears manage to get across the border and thrive, great. But I can't support reintroducing them down here, where the deck is stacked against them, regardless of what the proponents say, whose reports, I suspect, are loaded with confirmation bias.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

Correspondence ID: 13445Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98105
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 16:23:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The re-introduction of grizzlies is a prescription for anti-environmental backlash that could de-fund salmon recovery, wolves, and land restoration. The ecological benefits are not worth the potential cost.

Correspondence ID: 13446Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ellensburg, WA 98926
United States of America

Outside Organization: BCHW Non-Governmental

Received: Nov,12 2023 16:27:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: 5. As a trail horse rider in the NCE, I ask that the No Action Alternative be selected. The areas we ride in includes the Mt Baker Snoqualmie National Forest, the Okanogan Wenatchee National Forest including the Pasayten Wilderness, and the North Cascades National Park. We have many horse camps along the boundary of the NCE. We cannot support either Action Alternative without more substantive analysis on impacts to recreation as well as knowing more on the joint planning with Canadian counterparts.

Correspondence ID: 13447Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kenmore, WA 98028
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 16:30:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: If you've followed the reintroduction of wolves in Yellowstone, you know that these larger keystone species are vital to the overall health of the ecosystem. In the absence of grizzlies, we have seen an increase in the deer population, coyotes seem to be everywhere, etc. At this point, the health of the North Cascades is dependent on human interaction, because it was humans that removed grizzlies to begin with. We are talking about a very small number of animals in a very large amount of space. Thus, I do not foresee them being an issue for humans. Think about how many black bears we have around and most people coexist peacefully with them. Don't keep food outside, be aware of your surroundings. Essentially, if humans are "bear aware"; there should not be conflict.

Correspondence ID: 13448Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Roseville, MN 55113
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 16:32:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Just say NO to the reintroduction of brown bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE). Here's why ...

I am Western Washington State-born and raised. I have ridden many trails, fished, hunted, and climbed many mountains in

my time. I have worked in another state for the last few years but I am retiring to Washington next year, where some of my family lives in the North Cascades.

I lived in Western Washington as a child at a time when one of the last great brown bears lived on the western side of the Cascades. My guess is the people who want to reestablish numbers of the magnificent brown bears in the NCE have never actually lived day-to-day with brown bears (or cougars, or wolves).

My experience is brown bear behavior is much more aggressive than black bears, and also I note the NCE is not a zoo or a wildlife park. Additionally brown bear populations exist in the lower 48 and elsewhere, they are not facing extinction--of course they're not or there would not be any to bring to the NCE. They had their time of massive numbers in history. It has been stated that brown bears were hunted for the fur trade in the late 1800s; but, they were killed in the decades that followed because they are a threat to humans--of course they are or they would be as common as black bears.

I am thankful to God, my horse, and the circumstances on the day my horse and I lived for me to tell about my last encounter with a brown bear as a child. No less terrifying were earlier encounters when the bear hunted our farm, despite brown bears not being territorial and it living in over one thousand acres of wetlands and forest with abundant huckleberries and game. My experience then and later is that brown bears are not frightened by humans at all, and they consider livestock, pets, and humans preferred food options.

For these reasons, I am completely opposed to the increasing of brown bears by reintroduction of ANY brown bear species anywhere in Washington State under ANY federal, state, local, or tribal rule, and under ANY federal, state, local, or tribal proposed "management" plan.

If you are reading this and believe opposition to these proposals is about ignorance, politics, or land-greedy ranchers, I encourage you to speak with your elderly who remember the brown bears and to your rural neighbors who live with brown bears, and carefully consider their comments.

The childhood experiences mentioned above were in the early 1960s in the area that is now Samammish, Washington--it wasn't called Sammamish then. No thinking person would want the brown bears reintroduced into their natural habitat in Sammamish simply because the brown bears once lived there, part of their original habitat preserved as Soaring Eagle Regional Park. Nor for the same obvious reasons should brown bears be reintroduced or their numbers intentionally increased in the NCE or anywhere else in Washington state.

Correspondence ID: 13449Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Anacortes, WA 98221
United States of America

Outside Organization: Northwest Design Business(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,12 2023 16:32:48

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Let the grizzlies over time find their own way to the North Cascades. Being traumatically moved to a completely new place is very disorienting and sets the bears up for bad outcomes with humans and in general.

Correspondence ID: 13450Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lynnwood, WA 98036
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 16:33:03

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I believe it is essential to re-introduce the grizzly bear to the north cascades in order to balance the environment.

Correspondence ID: 13452Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Maple Valley, WA 98038
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 16:40:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Good afternoon,

I believe introducing Grizzlies into the Cascades where they once roamed would bring the ecosystem back into balance like the introduction of Wolves did for Yellowstone and Washington State...I have hiked and rode horses in that area all my life and I believe Grizzlies will avoid humans, there haven't been any issues in Yellowstone

Correspondence ID: 13454Project:112008Document:132104

Address: College Place, WA 99324
United States of America
Outside Organization: Retired Teacher Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 16:40:47
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: No, do NOT reintroduce Grizzlies to the North Cascades.

Background to comment: I grew up in Brewster,WA in the foothills of the North Cascades. We spent our family's recreational time packing horses and hiking in many areas from the Paysayten Wilderness to the head of Lake Chelan. We felt safe-only scanning for rattlesnakes. Black bear were shy and posed virtually no threat.

Increased Arming the Wilderness to stay safe: Grizzly bears' more aggressive nature and strength pose a real threat to the safety of the Cascades. I have never wanted to pack a gun into the woods, but with the risk of encountering a grizzly would change safety for children, hikers and even horseback riders.

Too much increased danger already: Wolves reintroduced to the Blue Mountains are endangering livestock. It's hard to take our children to play freely in the mountains because of the danger from Cougar and wolves. Cougar attacks are more frequent-it was only folk lore to Okanogan Valley in the 1920s -1970's.Infact, there is a 1930's plaque by Rattlesnake Lake in Brewster noting the site of a boy eaten by a cougar. It was a tale that my dad loved to tell because if was unbelievable.

Summary: I want Washington to keep its safe and accessible beauty of spirit. Please do not alienate people further. Thank you for taking my comments.

Correspondence ID: 13455Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Anacortes, WA 98221
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 16:44:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please finally do begin restoring grizzly's to the Cascades, long past time.

And do so in whatever way necessary that can't be politically aborted if a bonehead Republican led government should be in power for a time.

thanks

Correspondence ID: 13456Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 16:44:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears are an important part of the ecosystem. Restoration will help bring back a balance.

Correspondence ID: 13457Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Belchertown, MA 01007
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 16:53:48

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in favor of grizzlies naturally repopulating the North Cascades without any interference from humans or government agencies. This organic approach allows any migrating grizzlies to transition more smoothly into a new territory where they can acclimate to the new environment's food and denning resources, scope out ranges and eventually develop a healthy, diverse gene pool. In addition, migration ensures they will have automatic ESA protection. The proposed alternatives to migration would rely too strongly on disturbing the wilderness and (more concerning) manipulating grizzlies from established populations to relocate them and risk unintended harm, consequences and questionable outcomes. As my boss would always say "slow and steady wins the race". Thank you for your consideration.

Correspondence ID: 13458Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bridgewater, NJ 08807
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 16:56:01

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Don't live there but visit and camp at times. please do not introduce Grizzlys to the area. Let nature take its own course

Correspondence ID: 13460Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sewell, NJ 08080
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 17:00:03

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live in and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

Furthermore, the 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Thank you for taking the time to keep our North Cascades wild!

Correspondence ID: 13461Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 17:01:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Humans were responsible for removing grizzlies from the North Cascades, which was a travesty, and it's our responsibility to bring them back home. If we don't take action now, we risk losing grizzly bears from the North Cascades forever.

Correspondence ID: 13462Project:112008Document:132104
Address: KENT, WA 98030
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 17:02:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I value our wild spaces and want grizzlies back in their native habitat.

Correspondence ID: 13464Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98109
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 17:02:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Alternative A: No Action

Correspondence ID: 13467Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Chelan, WA 98816
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 17:07:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I would like to comment "No action"
We do not need another dangerous
Predator in the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 13469Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Chelan, WA 98816
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 17:11:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We do not want a big, dangerous, pest introduced near our home. We want Alternative A. No action.

Correspondence ID: 13471Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Yacolt, WA 98675
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 17:12:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzlies were part of the ecosystem, and undoubtedly, the system would work better with them back in it.

That said, there will have to be significant education of humans in how to coexist with grizzlies. And, grizzlies will need more salmon restoration to feed them.

It should probably have a permit for those humans that want to go into grizzly territory. The worse thing for bears is to associate humans with food. And that takes some specific actions on humans to prevent that

Correspondence ID: 13473Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Gig Harbor, WA 98335
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 17:16:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I wanted to take this moment to express my strong opinion that grizzly should not be reintroduced to the Cascades in the Pacific northwest.

I've been in Washington state now for over 20 years and spend a great amount of time in the backcountry every year. Adding grizzly will create a very high danger risk for humans who enjoy Backcountry activities such as backpacking camping hiking mountaineering horseback riding fishing and hunting. There's a great difference between the way that black and grizzly bears interact with humans, their aggression, and their level of danger.

By introducing grizzly bears to the Cascades you will be directly responsible for the human deaths that we will result from this action.

Please do not proceed with this reckless plan.

Sincerely,
Concerned citizen of Wa State,

Correspondence ID: 13475Project:112008Document:132104
Address: SAMMAMISH, WA 98075
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 17:21:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Good evening,

I am writing in opposition to any plans to reintroduce Grizzly Bears to the North Cascades, and believe ALTERNATIVE A: NO ACTION is the best option for a variety of reasons.

First, I am very concerned about the inevitable human/bear interactions that will occur, and the negative consequences for both. Hiking and outdoor recreation has become incredibly popular in Washington State, especially in the last five years. In some of the most popular areas, thousands of people will enter a wilderness area or region of the National Park on a single day, and each year this leads to problems. For example, this past summer the Cascade Pass trailhead area had a bear that with a food reward was destroying cars. A second incident with a bear destroying a tent to get food led to the closure of a backcountry zone. These incidents show that outdoor recreationalists are already not behaving smart to keep themselves and bears safe, and I fear for the incidents that will occur when it is a Grizzly instead of a black bear. The recent deaths in Canada highlight the worst possible outcome of the interactions for people and the bear.

Second, the bears will limit access to backcountry areas due to concern over the bears. The North Cascades in Washington are a unique place to hike because with only the presence of black bears, I and many of my friends feel comfortable hiking alone or in a very small group during the day. This would change with the presence of Grizzlies, and I would be very sad to lose this access. Not everyone can find a group to hike with, and this will exclude many from the region.

Third, Grizzly bears are not a keystone species for this ecosystem, and as a result there is no strong ecological reason to reintroduce them.

Fourth, Bears are already present in the regions north of the Cascades, and will make their way south if they want to.

Fifth, human presence in the North Cascades is only going to increase with our rapidly growing population, popularity of hiking, and increase in visitors from out of state, and none of these people are prepared to recreate responsibly in Grizzly territory. Many hikers right now can't even be bothered to dispose of their poop and waste properly or follow Leave no Trace principles, and are unlikely to be careful with food and scented items, putting themselves and the bears in harms way. The North Cascades are simply too crowded and the recreational population too unaware/ uncaring to change behavior enough to make a reintroduction plan sensible in any way.

I can only see sad outcomes if Grizzlies are reintroduced, especially for the bears, which is why I advocate for the No Action Alternative.

Sincerely,

■

Correspondence ID: 13476Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Gig Harbor, WA 98335
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 17:24:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do NOT think it's a good idea to re-introduce Grizzlies into the North Cascades. The wolf packs have been terrible for the cattle ranchers and I can only imagine how difficult grizzlies would be. My children and husband regularly take back packing trips to the mountains. Black bears are one thing, but grizzly encounters are an entirely different level of danger. Please do NOT reintroduce grizzlies in Washington state. Thank you

Correspondence ID: 13477Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Greenbank, WA 98253
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 17:24:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support adoption of Alternative C: action alternative with Rule 10(j). Part of being human is the ability to respect the environment and non human organisms. Adoption of the recommended alternative would mitigate our past inhumanity. We have the power to choose to modify our behavior to the needs of these others, with the result of our greater happiness. I raised livestock in the Selkirk for many years and am speaking my truth.

Correspondence ID: 13478Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98108
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 17:24:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Thank you for considering public comments in support of restoration of grizzly bear (*Ursus arctos*) populations in the North Cascades. Presence of bears is an important measure of ecological function and their reintroduction will serve as a vital cornerstone of continued stewardship of the North Cascades ecosystem. I am strongly in favor of the science-based, evidence-based plan for reintroduction.

Correspondence ID: 13479Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98506
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 17:25:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support alternative C.

Correspondence ID: 13480Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Port Orchard, WA 98366
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 17:25:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Do it only if you don't stop the bunting season for predators. Bring them back let them reformulated fir a few years and then open season for hunting

Correspondence ID: 13481Project:112008Document:132104
Address: WINDSOR, CO 80550
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 17:33:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am writing to express my deep concern and opposition to the proposed introduction of grizzly bears in the Northern Cascades of Washington State. While I understand the importance of biodiversity and conservation efforts, I believe that introducing grizzly bears to this region may have severe consequences that need careful consideration.

The safety of local communities must be paramount in any decision regarding the introduction of large predators. Grizzly bears are known to be powerful and potentially dangerous animals. The presence of such apex predators in close proximity to dense human settlement raises legitimate concerns about public safety. Incidents of human-wildlife conflicts, though rare, can result in serious consequences for both humans and bears. We must prioritize the well-being and security of the residents who call the Northern Cascades home.

Additionally, the potential impact on livestock and agriculture cannot be ignored. Grizzly bears are omnivores and have been known to prey on livestock, particularly in areas where natural food sources are scarce. The introduction of grizzlies in the Northern Cascades could pose a significant threat to local ranchers and farmers, whose livelihoods depend on the well-being of their livestock. This could lead to increased financial burdens for these individuals and negatively impact the region's agricultural economy.

Moreover, the Northern Cascades are a popular destination for outdoor enthusiasts, hikers, and campers. The introduction of grizzly bears could alter recreational activities in the region, deterring people from enjoying the natural beauty of the area due to safety concerns. This could have a ripple effect on tourism, which plays a crucial role in the local economy.

The ecological impact of introducing grizzly bears also raises questions. While proponents argue that reintroducing grizzlies will restore a natural balance and contribute to ecosystem health, the reality is that Western ecosystems are complex and dynamic. The introduction of a top predator can have unforeseen consequences on prey populations, plant life, and other species in the area. The Northern Cascades' delicate ecosystem should be thoroughly studied before implementing such a significant change.

While I strongly support conservation efforts and the preservation of biodiversity, I vehemently oppose the introduction of grizzly bears in the Northern Cascades. The potential risks to public safety, agriculture, tourism, and the local ecosystem demand careful consideration. I urge you to prioritize the concerns of the communities directly affected by this proposal and conduct comprehensive studies to assess the potential impacts before making any decisions.

I trust that you will consider the diverse perspectives surrounding this issue and make decisions that prioritize the well-being of both the human and natural communities in the Northern Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 13482Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Brewster, NY 10509
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 17:38:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly support the grizzly bear restoration plan for the North Cascades. This is an important part of the former range that still contains large areas of wilderness that could support a breeding population of grizzly bears. It will undue a historical wrong, increase the wildness and ecosystem function of the North Cascades, and contribute importantly to the conservation of an endangered species. I also support managing the re-established population as non-essential to give management flexibility to ranchers and others who would be most impacted by the reintroduction.

Sincerely,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 13483Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98118
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 17:38:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The successful reintroduction of wolves in Yellowstone gives me hope for the grizzlies. As someone born and raised in the PNW, I'd love to see the bears return.

Correspondence ID: 13484Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Maple Valley, WA 98038
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 17:45:15

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I firmly believe that the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades would be extremely beneficial for the population and for the northern cascade environment.

Correspondence ID: 13485Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Port Ludlow, WA 98365
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 17:50:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am a Washington native and began hiking high country as a child with my father. I admire the natural world and value wildlife, so please add my name as a supporter of Grizzlies reintroduction to the Cascades. I won't have to see them, but will delight knowing they are living and thriving here in Washington state.

Correspondence ID: 13486Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Darrington, WA 98241
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 17:53:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I completely support reintroduction of grizzlies to the North Cascades. I am an avid user of public lands for outdoor recreation. I believe the reintroduction and recovery of the grizzly bear is mandated by the Endangered Species Act and provides for a healthier ecology and ecosystem in many ways (i.e. seed dispersal, tilling of soil, reduced erosion, improvement of habitat.)

Correspondence ID: 13487Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Yakima, WA 98901
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 17:53:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As an avid backpacker for the past 50 years, I am totally against the Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan. Over the 50 years I have stayed away from any area that may be the home for grizzly bears. The animals are TOO dangerous to be located near humans. Humans can't be trusted to take all of the necessary precautions to avoid the grizzlies. I've encountered black bears during my lifetime, but have avoided any serious issues with them.

If the grizzlies are introduced, human deaths will eventually take place. How many deaths will it take to reverse a possible restoration?

Please say NO to the restoration!

Thank you very much.

██████████

Correspondence ID: 13489Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lynden, WA 98264
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 17:57:12

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: There are already grizzly bears in the North cascades. Please do not add any more. It will be detrimental to all other species.

Correspondence ID: 13490Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lynden, WA 98264
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 18:01:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am adamantly against the reintroduction of Grizzly bears into the North cascades. To release another Apex predator in the an ecosystem whose ungulate numbers are already severely depressed, would undoubtedly lead to conflict with local ranchers, farmers and other residents of local mountain communities. There is also an added risk to those of us who recreate in these mountains with our families and young kids. If the habitat and prey base is sufficient for a larger population of Grizzlies, then they will reestablish their population there without human involvement. If, as I believe, it is not, the addition of dozens of bears will only lead to problems. Let nature takes its course.

Correspondence ID: 13491Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Portland, OR 97215
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 18:02:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Plan C would be my preferred choice as I'd love to see endangered wildlife restored, however, there are plan gaps, which sway me toward option A, take no action, until these are addressed: education of the public and food storage options have not been given enough funding or fully detailed in plan yet.

1. Education -

Included in the draft: A. USFS staff time would likely be needed during the primary phase to assist with project implementation and to educate the public

How much projected time? In what ways -- just signage? Does USFS staff actually have the time and staff to do so?

On page 257, education is a line item of \$10-15,000/year.

2. Food storage -

On page 257, prevention supplies are listed at \$25,000/year. Does that include, in plan: bear-resistant trash receptacles and bear-resistant food storage lockers in NPS and USFS campgrounds ?

How many campgrounds do not already have bear resistant food storage lockers? What is the cost to implement? Does this plan account for that cost? Can you clarify? If the average cost of a food locker is \$1500, that's 16 a year.

What is the detailed plan to ensure all campsites and backcountry camping facilities have appropriate food storage?

Today this is already in a poor state with lack of funding to the NPS and USFS. This past year, there were closures due to food conditioned bears. A lot of the public cannot be trusted to keep food secure.

<https://www.columbian.com/news/2023/aug/22/lax-food-storage-gives-rise-to-bear-problems-in-north-cascades-national-park/>

When/how often does NPS/USFS audit campsites for maintenance of existing bear wires, poles or other? Please take example of McAlester Lake camp site. I was there this past summer and the advertised bear wire in the permit was strung across two trees and was able to be reached by a 5'8" person standing on the ground. These backcountry camp sites aren't in the condition to support keeping grizzlies safe if they can easily access food.

In plan, page 125:

In addition, some of the backcountry campgrounds are equipped with poles or wires, provided for hanging food out of the reach of bears (NPS 2021b). Not all backcountry campgrounds are equipped with bear-resistant infrastructure; however, when campsites are moved or upgraded they are designed to have separate cooking and food storage areas roughly 100 feet from tent pads (NPS, Braaten pers. comm. 2023h).

In plan, page 130:

Current management actions, such as providing food lockers and bear-resistant waste receptacles and visitor education on backcountry food preparation and storage, contribute to maintaining the safety of both grizzly bear and human populations.

Other questions that seem like gaps in the plan:

1. The Yellowstone population grew to 1000+ bears in 40 years' time. Why would the North Cascades bear population only grow to 200 bears in 60-100 years' time? (p. 88)

2. Population growth and popularity of climbing/thru-hiking/trail running.

There is information in the plan with the existing regional human population but no scaling on growth of what these cities/town would look like in 60-100 years.

PCT thru hikers, 1000+ completed the trail in 2019. That does not account for how many start each year and how many day hikers it gets. Was PCTA consulted in this plan? Were other tourism or outdoors groups consulted in this plan?

In plan: Overnight backcountry stays in wilderness increased gradually from 2010 (1,316 stays) to 2019 (2,744 stays) (NPS 2023c) ...

from 2021 to 2022, the park complex saw a 29% increase in backcountry campers (NPS 2 (P 112/pdf 136 backcountry visits)

What is the projected growth of visitation as population grows? Has that been accounted for?

As written, this plan does not detail how education would be spent nor how much time rangers and staff would need to educate the public, which is a key component of keeping both grizzlies and humans safe.

This plan does not detail how it would ensure proper food storage mechanisms at all areas. What is the most effective method of food storage in bear country?

I've seen how many visitors treat food storage in leaving wrappers, or not hanging food at all. My concern is that this plan has gaps in how to keep grizzlies safe from being food conditioned because of careless humans. A lot of care and attention was put into this research -- so much planning in helicopter rides, noise, other protected animals, etc. However, I don't believe the plan is ready in the gaps highlighted above haven't been fully addressed or at least communicated out. Thank you and I hope these are being addressed in more detail.

Correspondence ID: 13492Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98274
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 18:05:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: November 12, 2023

Superintendent Don Striker
North Cascades National Park Service Complex
Submitted electronically as attachment to form on National Park Service (PEPC) Planning, Environment & Public Comment website, <https://parkplanning.nps.gov/commentForm.cfm?documentID=132104>
and

Ms. Janine Velasco,
Acting Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Public Comments Processing
Attn: FWS-R1-ES-2023-0074
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Submitted electronically as attachment to form at <https://www.regulations.gov/commenton/FWS-R1-ES-2023-0074-0001>

Re: Public Comment on Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Environmental Impact Statement, North Cascades Ecosystem and Docket #FWS-RI-ES-2023-15310074

Dear Superintendent Striker and Ms. Velasco,
Please accept our comment on both the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) concerning restoration of the grizzly bear to the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE) and on Docket #FWS-RI-ES-2023-15310074. We strongly support the effort to restore grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem as a part of the recovery of this species required by the Endangered Species Act. The designation of the NCE as a recovery area was made 32 years ago. Proposed Alternative C would bring up to 25 non-problem grizzly bears into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade to be managed as an "experimental population". We encourage you to choose Alternative C in the DEIS, but with changes to improve

the 10(j) regulation as discussed below. Please take this opportunity to bring back the grizzly bear to the NCE where it once thrived and ensure the success of its restoration.

We are recreational visitors to public lands.

In the past we have hiked, backpacked, kayaked and tent camped in grizzly bear habitat in Denali National Park, Glacier National Park, Yellowstone National Park, Banff and Jasper National Parks and in the Great Bear Rainforest in B.C. In four of these places we have seen and heard grizzly bears and have also seen evidence of their presence (scat, paw prints in riverbeds and the like). Over the years, park(s) staff and biologists in these places educated the public, including ourselves, on human/bear interactions and how to keep ourselves and the bears safe in their territory. At present we camp, hike, photograph and explore the North Cascades National Park and the nearby National Forests, primarily in Skagit, Whatcom, and Okanogan Counties. Restoration of a species in a habitat that it once occupied is key to its successful recovery. The NCE is one of the few remaining places where it is still possible for your agencies to meet the Act's requirements for this species.

The grizzly bear has occupied North America, including the North Cascades.

The grizzly bear is known to have occurred in North America for thousands of years. There is ample evidence that historically it also occupied the North Cascades. This wild icon is an important part of the natural heritage of the Northwest and is of particular importance to the Tribal cultures in this area that regard the bear as a spiritual animal and deeply respect its presence and right to exist. Yet, the species was lost during the 19th and 20th centuries as the western expansion of European trappers and hunters engaged in an industrialized fur trade, killing the bears for their fur. Additionally, fearful settlers exterminated bears. Eventually NCE grizzly bears were extirpated. One Tribal speaker on a recent documentary about the American Buffalo, aptly labeled the result of European expansion across the west "the largest destruction of wildlife in the modern world." Like the Buffalo, wolves, raptors and other wildlife, the grizzly bear became a victim of this tragedy.

We are keenly interested in the restoration of a creature that we know contributes to the health of the ecosystem. The NCE contains over 6 million acres that will support the bears. Among other things, the bear's foraging behavior will help the biodiversity of the ecosystem's abundant native wildlife, plants and landscapes.

We believe that grizzlies will not be able to repopulate the North Cascades Ecosystem "naturally" on their own as some people argue, perhaps in their effort to discredit the need for restoration. There are significant barriers between the NCE and areas populated by grizzlies in the United States and Canada. Although there are unconfirmed reports of an occasional bear in the NCE, biologists have not found evidence of a reproducing population in the North Cascades in more than 30 years of searching. And as your DEIS states: "There has been only one confirmed detection of a grizzly bear in the greater NCE in the past 10 years, which occurred in British Columbia (IGBC NCE Subcommittee 2016; Rine et al. 2020)."

We support Alternative C, but request changes to improve the proposed rule.

We understand that Alternative C would apply ESA §10(j), Experimental populations. We agree with the goal of your 10(j) regulation to: "support reintroduction and recovery of grizzly bears within the NCE and provide the prohibitions and exceptions under the Act necessary and appropriate to conserve the species within a defined NEP area." We support your 10(j) map that envisions a future expansion of grizzly bear populations into Zone #2 that may create connectivity between populations in the U.S. and Canada if corridors can be developed and bear habitat is protected. This contributes to species conservation. This would contribute to species conservation.

The 10(j) regulation as proposed would allow the federal agencies involved greater flexibility to manage the bear population around the issue of human-bear conflicts should these occur. But given the sad history of the species in the U.S. and the fear and anger that it can provoke in some hostile persons we are concerned about designation of the NCE grizzly bears as a "non-essential population" (NEP) (thus allowing the species here to be treated as a "species proposed to be listed" rather than allowing it to maintain its threatened status) in light of one troubling aspect of your proposed 10(j) rule: conditioned lethal take authorization.

Once back in the "proposed" category under a §10(j) rule the NCE grizzlies will lose other ESA protections including the more restrictive prohibitions of ESA §9 currently applicable to the species and, except for the within the National Park, the consultation requirements for activities on federal lands and federally funded projects in §7 (substituting conferring on such projects and FWS issuing "advisory recommendations). There can be no designation of critical habitat. Once finalized, a provision of the 10(j) regulation may be difficult to modify by amended rules. Therefore, the

adopted provisions of a 10(j) rule in 50 CFR §17.84(y) should be drafted with the upmost clarity and specificity as well as certainty about impacts on the species.

In this case, the change in ESA status is for the purpose of reducing “adverse socioeconomic impacts” in the NCE according to the DEIS. We understand your goal to address local communities' concerns and desire for management certainty. Your rule would help achieve that goal. However, we worry whether this re-designation will sufficiently protect the species and support the success of its NCE reintroduction particularly, as you say, the primary threat to the grizzly bear is human-caused mortality.

Conditioned lethal take authorization is unnecessary and should be eliminated.

We oppose the proposed 10(j) regulation's time-limited “conditioned lethal take authorization” permit provisions for livestock owners, other private landowners and commercial interests in Management Zones 2 and 3, §17.84 (y)(4) and (5). Simply put, this part of the regulation goes too far. Of course, people are and should be allowed to kill bears in self defense or in defense of others. But the lethal take provisions for private parties may result in unnecessary killing or injuring bears in contexts other than that of a human self-defense or defense of others. Livestock, agriculture, beehives, and other property loss can and should be addressed by compensation for the loss through a variety of already existing government and non-governmental organization (NGO) programs. Bears who may become “repeat offenders” damaging livestock or property or who become dangerously habituated to human settlements or activities must be managed by professional, qualified and authorized agency staff not private landowners and commercial entities. Private landowners may commit a “mistaken-identity” kill and may even injure rather than euthanize a “conflict bear,” making a dangerous situation even worse.

Please improve the 10(j) rule by only allowing trained, experienced and authorized Service, federal, state or Tribal experts to be entrusted with any lethal removal of “conflict bears” for not only Management Zone 1, but for Management Zones 2 and 3 as well. Those personnel, not private parties, should manage this important aspect of NEP bears' lives and death, humanely euthanizing the “right” conflict bear and only after non-lethal efforts have failed.

The provisions for conditioned lethal take permits are unclear.

As currently written, the proposed regulation is unclear about whether a conditioned lethal take permit for a private party must be preceded by concerted efforts to remove a bear by other means: deterrence (as defined in proposed rule) or live-capture, transportation and release to a remote area by authorized agency personnel. See your discussion in “Management Zones Proposed Management Actions,” p. 62710 and Relocation of Bears, p. 67216. To improve the rule, please clarify whether such non-lethal efforts would be required prior to issuance of a lethal take permit for a private party, as they most certainly should be.

The rule as proposed also appears to allow private livestock owners rather than agency personnel to make a determination about whether it is “not reasonably possible to otherwise eliminate the threat by nonlethal deterrence or live capturing and releasing the grizzly bear unharmed in a remote area.” Conditioned lethal take (y)(4)(ii)(B). Livestock owners are not trained or qualified to make such an impartial determination. Compare to the Conditioned lethal take provision in Zone 3 (y)(5)(ii)(A), in which the Service or authorized agency is to make this determination. Moreover allowing a livestock owner to make this determination would undermine the enforceability of the restriction should a violation of the provision occur. The provisions should be the same for both Zones 2 and 3 - only authorized Service, federal, state or Tribal personnel should make this determination. Please revise (y)(4)(ii)(B) accordingly.

Does “humane manner” for Zones 2 and 3 (y)(4)(ii)(C) and (y)(5)(ii)(C), mean “done in accordance with Service-approved interagency guidelines” as set forth in (y)(3)(vi) for Management Zone 1 or is a “humane” determination to be left up to private parties? There are likely vast differences of opinion among those private parties about what constitutes “humane.” Because of the importance of the humane manner requirement for lethal takes of these animals in Zones 2 and 3 we request that you add “done in accordance with Service-approved interagency guidelines” to (y)(4)(ii)(C) and (y)(5)(ii)(C) or other clear guideline or standard. Otherwise, as with the provisions discussed in the paragraph above, “the taking is done in a humane manner” may be unenforceable.

Resolution of whether these restrictions as proposed are enforceable when applied to the facts of a potential enforcement case may be left for a decision maker in a legal proceeding, but meanwhile a bear mistakenly identified or true “conflict

bear" has been lost. As the DEIS says, the additional bear mortality under Alternative C (versus Alternative B) from human-bear conflicts is "difficult to quantify." Since this is the case, why add the wild card of private party lethal take permits, especially with ambiguous provisions? Uncertainty about how these permits might impact bear mortality in the recovery program should be addressed in favor of the species.

Restoration can work here.

We have followed the plight of the grizzly bear for many years now and have studied it enough to know restoration is working in other places and have previously submitted comments to you in favor of returning it to its home here in the NCE. We believe restoration can work here. We have carefully considered application of a 10(j) regulation to the NCE. We believe that Alternative C presents the best alternative for reintroduction in the NCE, but please make the changes to the 10(j) rule that we have requested to clarify the regulation and avoid unnecessary bear mortality. Please seize this opportunity to right the wrongs of the previous centuries that resulted in near extirpation of the grizzly bear in the wild and led to its listing as threatened under the ESA. Please act expeditiously to begin restoration of the grizzly bear to the North Cascades Ecosystem. Thank you for your attention to our comment.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
Mount Vernon, WA

Correspondence ID: 13493Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lynnwood, WA 98036
United States of America
Outside Organization: US. citizen Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 18:11:08
Correspondence Type:Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Sir,
Bears kill people; please NO more bears in WA. state.
Thank you, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 13494Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sammamish, WA 98029
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 18:11:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Don't reintroduce grizzly bears. It is a waste of money & will reduce safety.

Correspondence ID: 13496Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sammamish, WA 98074
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 18:13:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am strongly against introducing Grizzly in this area. There are a lot of people living and recreate in this area. Even though encountering a grizzly is low chance, we should not increase the chance by introducing grizzly here. This will scare people and kids in this place. Please stop the plan. Thanks!

Correspondence ID: 13497Project:112008Document:132104

Address: ELY, NV, NV 89301
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 18:21:12

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Let the bears back in their range as much as possible. We have been killing for killing sake. Yes some bears might infringe on dangers areas for the bears and people. Perhaps a way to secretly track these bears would be helpful to limit bear/people conflict. Thank you

Correspondence ID: 13498Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mercer Island, WA 98040
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 18:23:01

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I fully support the reintroduction of Grizzly Bears to the North Cascade Ecosystem. I am a resident of the State of Washington and avid outdoorsman. The Grizzly Bear reintroduction will positively impact the North Cascade ecosystem, help create a significant number of jobs in the Washington outdoor economy, and greatly enhance outdoor tourism and recreation in the North Cascade range.

Correspondence ID: 13499Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Richland, WA 99354
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 18:27:24

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I would just like to state my full support for the plan to reintroduce grizzly bears to the North Cascades ecosystem. Doing so would go a long way towards helping to restoring the ecosystem as a whole, as well as benefitting the bears themselves.

Correspondence ID: 13500Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 18:28:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live in and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

Furthermore, the 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Thank you for taking the time to keep our North Cascades wild!

Correspondence ID: 13501Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98112
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 18:28:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to endorse Alternative A - no action with respect to grizzly bear re-introduction in the North Cascade Ecosystem. While I recognize these lands are historic grizzly areas and they play role in the natural ecosystem, as an avid visitor to the backcountry and one who plans to bring young children to these areas, I cannot endorse a human-driven re-introduction scheme. Human-bear interactions while rare do occur, and are occurring at higher rates. Re-introduction of grizzlies into the Cascades would change the risk-benefit calculus of recreating in this area.

Furthermore, the costs of this project also seems to outweigh the benefits. Shouldn't the funds go to better managing and increasing existing grizzly populations rather than re-introducing to an area that hasn't had a significant population (or any population of grizzlies) in decades?

Correspondence ID: 13502Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 18:30:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have spent my life in the woods and backcountry of the eastern cascades as a pack outfitter, rancher and for recreation. My past also includes stories and history of those way older than me. With the exception of one instance, I never saw, whitenesses or heard a story of a grizzly in this region. I have also never heard of some plot to exterminate, hunt or eradicate grizzly bears in the past history. Maybe that was because they were not there. This effort to introduce grizzlies into the eastern cascades because they might have been there is based on a false premise that they were there. Wildlife biologists have spent decades trying to locate or find traces of grizzlies in the eastern cascades to justify a reintroduction program. It borders on silliness.

We, the public, have enjoyed generations of experiencing wilderness places without the fear of a possible dangerous encounter of a bear. Now that experience is being jeopardized because of a plan based on some fantasy. We that have to live and work with this increased risk are the ones that pay the price, no the far remove supporter that think "Oh how nice it will be to be wild".

I am against the proposed grizzly bear reintroduction program and hope common sense will prevail.


Please withhold my comments from public review

Correspondence ID: 13504Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98126
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 18:32:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing in support of the draft plan to restore grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem. Grizzly bears are native to this ecosystem and they were a keystone species here. Their loss means a loss for the ecosystem as a whole. Humans are responsible for this loss, and we should correct it for the benefit of the land, for the indigenous people who valued them as co-inhabitants, and for our children who deserve to inherit an intact mountain wilderness with majestic animals in it so they have the opportunity to pass it on as well.

I have been hiking the North Cascades for 30 years. There is ample room for grizzlies and people to coexist. It seems to me that the support of the First Nations people of the Cascades is already there. The goodwill that reintroduction would generate, the benefits to the ecosystem (distributing seeds, creating and maintaining alpine meadows, maintaining prey populations) and also the tourism and recreation benefits outweigh any problems that might arise--which could be easily handled, as we've seen in Yellowstone, Alaska, and elsewhere.

As a parent, I would love to be able to take my kid hiking and see a grizzly bear. They are an important part of natural heritage and our regional culture, and the North Cascades are incomplete without them.

Correspondence ID: 13505Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Maple valley, WA 98038
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 18:32:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears have been naturally migrating back into Washington and already exist in the state. They do not need to be transplanted unless there is a requirement that they are open to hunting like black bears. Oregon and California could use them instead as they used to reside in these states before they were exterminated. California has the grizzly on their state flag, please help bring them back there.

Correspondence ID: 13506Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Shoreline, WA 98177
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 18:33:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support restoration of the natural ecosystem of the North Cascades including the reintroduction of Grizzly bears. I also have faith in the ability of humans to adapt to that reintroduction. People in those states where grizzlies currently occur have (for the most part) learned to coexist with them, just as Indigenous people did for millennia.

That said, reasonable compensation should be given for any unpreventable loss of livestock, etc. to grizzly predation.

Correspondence ID: 13508Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America

Outside Organization: None Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 18:34:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Howdy again

Another item in the Draft proposal that raises questions is exactly what the WDFW will be doing about grizzly issues off of Park Service lands, especially some years from now.

RCW 77.12.035 is accurately quoted in the draft and I believe that WA state Attorney General has interpreted that statute for the WDFW.

Two things to keep in mind. The first is that the AG interpretation, though likely is correct, has at least a small chance of not standing up. The AG, though usually correct, does now and then loose in court. One interpretation by opponants of reintroduction, is that the statute may prevent WDFW of being involved with any grizzly originating from out of state after being transported to the state, even many years after reintroduction. You need to have a plan in place for US Fish and Wildlife folks to jump in and take care of problem grizzlys on Forest Service and private land if WDFW gets its hands tied.

The second point is that the WDFW may not have the authority forever of dealing with grizzlies. There may be staffing, budget issues reducing their ability to respond. Also, laws and statutes may change, reducing or eliminating WDFW authority to deal with grizzlies. Solution is same as before in you need a fall back plan for someone other than WDFW to deal with grizzlies on Forest Service and Private lands.

Another issue is what exactly will the WDFW will be doing with the public about grizzly issues on private land. When Leavenworth had their black bear problems last year, the WDFW was unwilling to get involved until after the bear mauled the lady in town and put her in the hospital. I sent the WDFW two emails with concerns about garbage cans on several area roads being dumped overnight and garbage scattered. Waste Mgt is the garbage hauler and they sent out mailed flyer recommending that folks put their cans out the night before as they would start their pick up rounds at 5AM. About half of folks had their cans out at least one night before pickup. The WDFW did not respond to my first email. They did respond to my second email, but said that garbage cans being dumped by bears was not their problem and that I should report the problem to the County.

NOTE: I can confirm that several of the dumped garbage cans did have bear tracks around them, so were likely not dumped by dogs, people, or car bumps. Two of my neighbors suggested that they saw the problem bear in the vicinity of the dumped cans, so it seems that the bear became use to garbage foraging. (The bear had one of its cubs being distinctive white or blond, so it is likely the same bear that mauled the lady)

I believe I still have the WDFW reply to my garbage bear concern and may be able to forward it to you if you provide email address.

You need to be specific as to who is going to do what in dealing with grizzly/human linteraction.

Reply requested

Thank you

Correspondence ID: 13509Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 18:38:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: No. Do not introduce grizzly bears. They have been killed off for a reason. There are enough Apex predators without an adding dangerous grizzly bears.

Correspondence ID: 13510Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Portland, OR 97206
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 18:40:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I think that plan C or B should absolutely be put in place! Think of the benefits of reintroducing wolves to Yellowstone, though there were definitely some hesitations it ended up being good! This isn't exactly the same but I think it's way better to do something rather than nothing in this situation...

Correspondence ID: 13511Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Olympia, WA 98507-0257
United States of America
Outside Organization: Beverly Mountain Guides Business(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,12 2023 18:42:21

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: At this time I represent myself and the other mountain guides of Beverly Mountain Guides, LLC, a Washington licensed business using USFS permits. We do NOT support planting more grizzly bears in to the lower 48 states of the United States at this time. We appreciate the efforts of conservationists but cannot support moving forward with this plan.

Correspondence ID: 13512Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Deming, WA 98244
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 18:44:48

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live in and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

Furthermore, the 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Thank you,

Correspondence ID: 13513Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bothell, WA 98011
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 18:46:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Yes, I am supportive of the Alternative C restoration plan.

Correspondence ID: 13515Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98136
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 18:52:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support re-introducing grizzlies to the north Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 13516Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tacoma, WA 98443
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 18:53:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a park naturalist and a former bear specialist, I welcome the opportunity to comment on this proposal. Grizzly bears are apex predators and are also an umbrella species. This means that by protecting land and wildlife habitat for grizzlies, we also protect this same habitat for a host of other animals as well. In short, this is a good idea and an excellent example of good wildlife conservation. For many people, grizzlies are also the very symbol of wilderness both here in Washington state and nation-wide. While I am aware of concerns by some, there are many ways to mitigate any potential problems. Other states have learned how to have grizzly bears and manage them with minimal problems. We can do that here too.

I strongly support the proposal to bring in additional bears to supplement the handful of bears already here in Washington. I reject the no-action alternative. Based on surveys I have seen, I believe that the vast majority of Washington residents want to see grizzly bears continue to live in Washington state. I strongly urge you to consider one of the proposals to supplement the grizzly bear population here in Washington state.

Correspondence ID: 13517Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kirkland, WA 98033
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 18:56:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: NO GRIZZLES.....WAY TOO DANGEROUS FOR THE BEAUTIFUL AREA OF WASHINGTON USED BY FAMILIES TO HIKE AND ENJOY THE OUT OF DOORS!!!!

NO REASON TO DO THIS INTRODUCTION OF DANGEROUS GRIZZLIES!!!!
THANK YOU!!!!

Correspondence ID: 13518Project:112008Document:132104

Address: seattle, WA 98136
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 19:00:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: i am not in favor

Correspondence ID: 13520Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kennewick, WA 99338
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 19:03:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am opposed to the reintroduction of grizzly bears into the state of Washington. The grizzly bear will kill many other animals and even other bears. It will be a certain danger to farmers and their livestock. Also, the grizzly bears are known to migrate over large areas and will not stay in one location once the food supply is diminished. Washington state already has a problem with wolves. Another apex predator does not need to be added to the environment. There have been several people killed by grizzly bears this year. The people of Washington should not have to worry about this type of animal when we live in, work in, and enjoy the states great outdoor.s

Correspondence ID: 13521Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Edmonds, WA 98026
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 19:03:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not support the reintroduction of Grizzlies. There is too much unknown variables that could be detrimental to the already struggling ecosystem we have with the increase of apex predators in WA. If Grizzlies were introduced and started to increase in population and started to encroach on the places where ungulate populations, black bear populations, and cougar populations were in balance, what's the plan when the grizzlies impact them? What happens when they encroach human territories and kill livestock?

Ransom can be quoted saying "So, that might include, you know, getting bears and moving them back, if they stray outside of where we want them to be,". In what world is that fair to the bears? It's basically a glorified captivity. How is this humane? We set them up in an area and expect them not to go wherever they want? They're a wild, apex, animal, they do not solely eat roots and berries like people have said. What will happen to our fish populations?

I think our commission already has a hard time managing the populations we currently have, there is no trust from me they will adequately manage grizzly populations.

Correspondence ID: 13524Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Gig harbor, WA 98332
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 19:15:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live in and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

Furthermore, the 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Thank you for taking the time to keep our North Cascades wild!

Correspondence ID: 13525Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Monroe, WA 98272
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 19:19:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of grizzlies into the NorthCascades

Correspondence ID: 13526Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Redmond, WA 98052
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 19:21:47
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a Washington resident and national park lover, I strongly support the National Park Services preferred Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation. This plan will both effectively restore grizzly bears in North Cascades National Park and give people the tools they need to thrive in and around grizzly bear country. Grizzlies belong in the North Cascades, as they enhance the park's ecological integrity and contribute to its wildness. My family and I love the national parks and we spend a lot of time in them - primarily up at Rainier as it's a bit closer to where we live in Redmond, but also quite frequently in the North Cascades.

A restored population of grizzlies will boost the park's appeal and attract nature enthusiasts, scientists, and tourists from around the world. This would provide economic benefits to local communities and support the park's mission to protect park resources in perpetuity.

Alternative C, with the 10(j) rule, addresses safety concerns while protecting the grizzly population. It ensures coexistence between humans and bears.

Please consider the positive ecological and economic benefits and support Alternative C. Restoring grizzly bears will preserve the park's natural heritage and conserve an iconic species for current and future generations.

Thank you for your dedication to our national parks.

Correspondence ID: 13527Project:112008Document:132104

Address: East Wenatchee, WA 98802
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 19:21:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello, I am writing to express my opposition to the reintroduction of Grizzly Bears into the North Cascades of Washington State. I have many family members and friends that live in that area and I would be concerned for their safety should this plan move forward. With many of their homes, there is no way to adequately secure and prevent Grizzly Bears from being able to come onto their property. It's not as simple as building a fence and in their cases building a fence or taking other measures would be impossible due to the topography and other physical characteristics of the land in which they live. Bringing Grizzly Bears into the area would put them, their livestock, pets, etc. in danger. They have a hard enough time protecting against the predators that are already present in these lands, adding a new one would make it even harder and more dangerous. I urge you to reconsider this plan and perhaps find a different area to use as habitat for the bears.

Correspondence ID: 13528Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Carlton, WA 98814
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 19:27:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Comments on the North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan EIS:

The document failed to analyze the true impact of grizzly bear introduction and ultimate grizzly bear populations on the human environment.

- Public safety and other impacts were often approximated based on data from other Grizzly Bear Recover Zones (GBRZs), but unlike the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE) none of these are immediately adjacent a major population center like the Puget Sound Basin. Additionally, several heavily used highways access the very heart of the NCE namely, SR 20, US 2 and I90. The hundreds of overflow-vehicles lining SR 20 on weekends around trailheads is a testament to the intense recreational interest and use of these wild lands. Lines of hikers and their dogs use the popular trails along the crest of the Cascades. Estimates of use in this area are underestimated if only because not everyone signs the trail logs. The EIS seems to rely

heavily on Yellowstone Park statistics regarding bear/person interactions citing the park's large visitor use. However, the data doesn't reveal that the great majority of those visitors are primarily driving along the roads and hiking heavily used boardwalks to popular hot spring features. You can't compare experience at Yellowstone Park to the NCE, Yellowstone has been in the business of people & bear Management for over a hundred years. Also, unlike Yellowstone the NCE has no big herds of ungulates to prey upon.

- The EIS underestimates the likely impacts to access caused by the ultimate grizzly bear populations. Road closures are common in other GBRZs to protect the animals, especially during the spring season.
- Public education will not necessarily prevent bear/person interactions because prevention techniques are often ignored by recreationists (note innumerable photos posted to the web).

The EIS fails to fully analyze the potential for introducing invasive species into our most pristine wilderness and Park lands here in the Cascades. Bears and the traps will be transported from areas far away from the NCE, likely from areas know to have invasive weeds and animal/human diseases. What is the potential for spreading invasive species (plant & animal) and diseases (ie, tick-born or hoof/chronic wasting disease) on or in the traps or helicopters, or in the bear's feces or fur?

The document suggests that there is great value in returning the grizzly bear, a so-called apex predator, more quickly to the NCE than it would occur under the no-action alternative. This argument is not convincing. There exist no great herds of ungulates in NCE which are in desperate need of control. And, even so, healthy and widely distributed populations of other large predators are already present; black bears, cougars and wolves. The claim is made that some people will feel good just knowing the animal is roaming the country. There are those that get the same romantic feeling about free-roaming wild horse and burro herds ranging across the West. Unfortunately those populations are wreaking havoc on the range lands managed by the US Bureau of Land Management and US Forest Service. Despite real and ongoing resource impacts the agencies' attempts to manage that situation has utterly failed, stopped dead. (Perhaps there is where the grizzly bears should be shipped).

We fiercely support the No-Action alternative. If, as the EIS claims, the NCE is so attractive for grizzly bears, they will come on their own and there will be no guilt or blame. We have no confidence that the agencies will properly manage an "experimental population" of grizzly bears in the best interests of the people that are most likely to be affected, recreationists, ranchers, farmers and the local residents. Like Washington wolf "management" the effort and the cost will more likely be placed on the farmer or rancher to manage the bears. And any effective management action proposed by the agencies will no doubt be stymied by special interests welding the T&E Species Act.

Correspondence ID: 13529Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98117-5624
United States of America

Outside Organization: Retired Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 19:29:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly support restoring grizzly bears to the North Cascades. Grizzly bears need and deserve our help. We humans eliminated them from this area, so we have a moral obligation to restore them to their rightful place in the North Cascades ecosystem. Grizzly bears will play a vital role in maintaining the health of the ecosystem. By taking reasonable precautions, people can and already do elsewhere safely co-exist with grizzly bears and hike, camp and fish in grizzly bear country. Alternative C "Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation" appears to me to be the most reasonable and likely to succeed alternative. This alternative allows authorities greater flexibility to manage conflict and balance recovery goals with human safety and tolerance of grizzly bears. Thank you and best wishes for successfully restoring grizzly bears to the North Cascades ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 13530Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Victor, ID 83455
United States of America

Outside Organization: Center for Biological Diversity Conservation/Preservation(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,12 2023 19:29:37

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: November 13, 2023

Don Striker, Superintendent
North Cascades National Park Service Complex
810 State Route 20
Sedro Woolley, WA 98284

Submitted online and via USPS mail

Dear Superintendent Striker,

The Center for Biological Diversity ("the Center") is a nonprofit organization dedicated to the protection of native species and their habitats through science, policy, and environmental law. The Center has more than 89,000 active members, including members within the grizzly bear's current and historical range. The Center and its members have a long-standing interest in conserving native species in the American West and have routinely advocated for the conservation and protection of native species including grizzly bears in the North Cascades.

The Center has deep and longstanding interests in the restoration of grizzly bears in the North Cascades Ecosystem ("NCE"). To further these goals, the Center has participated in various agency proceedings, including previous and current proceedings under the National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA") to augment the North Cascades grizzly bear population. In December 2020, the Center filed a lawsuit challenging the Trump administration's sudden termination of the previous process, which was nearly finalized before being cancelled. We were pleased that the National Park Service ("NPS") and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service ("FWS") restarted the environmental analysis process in November 2022. We provided scoping comments in December 2022 and now submit comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

The 1993 Grizzly Bear Recovery Plan and the 1997 Grizzly Bear Recovery Plan Supplement providing the North Cascades Recovery Plan Chapter both acknowledge the need to restore and recovery grizzly bears in the North Cascades in order to recover the listed species in the lower 48 states. Moreover, as recently as 2022, FWS acknowledged that conservation efforts must increase to improve resiliency of bear in the North Cascades to in turn improve redundancy and representation of grizzly bears in the lower 48 states. For these reasons, we believe that the no action alternative contradicts the purposes of the Endangered Species Act and shall not be further considered.

In general, we are most supportive of Alternative B. In accordance with rule 50 C.F.R. § 17.40(b) under section 4(d) of the Endangered Species Act ("ESA"), Alternative B still permits the lethal removal of grizzly bears for self-defense; federal, state, or Tribal scientific or research activities; and removals of bears involved in conflicts as authorized by federal, state, or Tribal authorities. Grizzly bears across the lower 48 states have been managed under this rule to date and as a result have moved closer toward recovery goals in four out of the six recovery zones designated by FWS. Thus, we feel that managing grizzly bears in the NCE under this rule provides the best opportunity for successfully augmenting the population of grizzly bears to reach recovery goals.

However, recognizing that the agencies have identified Alternative C as the preferred alternative, and thus provide comments on both of these action alternatives.

I. The North Cascades Ecosystem is Prime Habitat for Grizzly Bear Recovery.

The 1993 Recovery Plan identified the North Cascades evaluation area as an area with "sufficient amounts of quality habitat to warrant grizzly bear recovery in the area." In the 1997 Supplement, FWS identified boundaries and recovery goals for the North Cascades Ecosystem. In it, FWS identified approximately 6.1 million acres, or 9,565 square miles, within north-central Washington as the North Cascades Grizzly Bear Recovery Zone. As identified, the recovery zone includes all of the North Cascades National Park, and most of the Mount Baker-Snoqualmie and Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forests. The area is ideal for grizzly bear recovery because it encompasses about 85% federal lands, including approximately 41% that is within wilderness or the North Cascades National Park.

The DEIS relies upon a recent carrying capacity model to suggest that “the most plausible carrying capacity for the US portion of the NCE is approximately 280 bears.” We encourage the agencies to give themselves the ability through adaptive management to change this figure should additional information become available. For example, whether the agencies determine the capacity is 280 bears or some other number in the future, we urge the agencies to consider this number as a minimum population in the NCE, not a population cap above which bears will be killed or parameters to keep bears alive will decrease.

The Lyons model, while the most current best available science analyzing carrying capacity in the NCE, has some limitations. Due to the lack of data on various issues--including, for example, the volume of traffic on roads in the NCE, grizzly home range data for the NCE, and the lack of quantifiable information on the relationship between survivorship and habitat quality--it is clear that there are many variables that should be assessed in the future before any final carrying capacity level is determined.

Due to the lack of data of numerous variables in the NCE, the authors in Lyons et al. (2018) had to make assumptions and adjustments to run its model. For example, the authors admit that they “addressed uncertainty by conducting sensitivity analyses of key variables of survival and home range estimates” and that they used a female-only (single-sex) model structure, in part, “to reduce the complexity of the model.” However, a single-sex scenario is not realistic, and thus this simplification may have skewed the accuracy of the results. Additionally, while the authors appropriately considered the import of how roads may impact carrying capacity, the authors assumed that all currently open roads will remain open into the future. But land managers have the option to close roads to benefit wildlife, especially when threatened and endangered species are at issue. Should roads currently open be closed and re-vegetated in the future, it follows that the carrying capacity for grizzly bears in the NCE is likely to increase. The authors also were not able to model road influences based on traffic volumes, because the data was not available for the entire ecosystem, but one would generally assume that traffic volumes in this relatively remote area is likely quite low.

Moreover, it is important to note that Lyon et al (2018) did not definitively conclude that the carrying capacity for grizzly bears in the NCE was 280 bears. Rather, the authors concluded a range of 108-379 females, or 215 to 758 total bears. 280 bears is just their estimate based on mid-range scenarios when manipulating multiple variables.

Thus, while we support the Lyons model as the best available science to date, we nevertheless feel that should more current science become available that supports a different carrying capacity, the agencies should take that new science into consideration and adaptively manage for whatever carrying capacity is best supported by the science.

In any event, if the agencies determine the capacity is 280 bears or some other number in the future, we urge the agencies to consider this number as a minimum necessary to create a sustainable population in the NCE, not a cap above which bears will be lethally removed from the population or parameters to keep bears alive will decrease.

We also encourage the agencies to protect connectivity corridors to support genetic exchange. Both alternatives allow for an adaptive management phase during which the agencies would consider the release of additional grizzlies if monitoring shows that releases are necessary to benefit, amongst other things, the genetic integrity of the population.

As seen on this map, the grizzly bear's historic range connected grizzly bears in the NCE to other grizzly bears in Idaho, including other identified recovery areas including the Selkirks, the Cabinet-Yaak, and the as of yet unpopulated Selway-Bitterroot area. We believe that it would be wise for the agencies to protect existing connectivity corridors to encourage genetic exchange between the NCE and other grizzly bear populations. Scientists have also championed the assessment and protection of potential linkage zones to alleviate potential population isolation of bears in the NCE.

Similarly, it may be important to work with officials in British Columbia to ensure that bears in the NCE that cross the Canadian boundary are adequately protected. Allowing for connectivity between the U.S. and Canada for these bears to roam is helpful and necessary to facilitate recovery and connectivity with other bears in the U.S. This is especially true whereas Canada is now considering a translocation effort to recover bears in the Canadian portion the NCE.

II. Alternatives B and C

A. The Current 4(d) Rule for Grizzly Bears is Sufficient to Manage of Bears in the NCE

We support Alternative B because as noted above, grizzly bears populations across the lower 48 states managed under the 50 C.F.R. § 17.40(b) under section 4(d) of the ESA have made successful steps towards recovery. This 4(d) rule maintains flexibility in that it still permits the lethal removal of grizzly bears for self-defense; federal, state, or Tribal scientific or research activities; and removals of bears involved in conflicts as authorized by federal, state, or Tribal authorities. Managing grizzly bears under this 4(d) rule is a proven strategy that may provide the best opportunity for successfully augmenting the population of grizzly bears in the NCE.

Moreover, although we do not necessarily disagree that it makes for FWS to designate grizzly bears as an experimental population under section 10(j) of the ESA, given FWS has concluded they are functionally extirpated from the U.S. portion of the NCE, such a designation does not need to be accompanied by a rule that increases opportunities to kill bears.

Because FWS treats a 10(j) population like a “threatened species, 16 U.S.C. § 1539(j)(2)(C), the ESA requires FWS to issue regulations “necessary and advisable to provide for the conservation of such species.” Id. § 1533(d); see also 50 C.F.R. § 17.82. The regulations may prohibit actions to conserve the species, including prohibiting all forms of take. 16 U.S.C. § 1539(d); id. § 1538(a)(1). We believe that the current 4(d) rule already allows for the lethal removal of bears involved in conflicts, without defining what conflicts should qualify for lethal removal. See 50 C.F.R. § 17.40(b). Thus, we do not believe the Service is under any obligation to issue a new rule to expand allowable take for grizzly bears in the NCE. With that in mind, we provide specific comments on the proposed 10(j) provisions below.

B. Geographic Extent of the Experimental Population

In our scoping comments, we noted that the boundary of a 10(j) designation needs to be carefully considered in the DEIS to prevent the possibility of grizzly bears in the Selkirk population being affected by the NCE 10(j) designation. The agencies must ensure the Selkirk population continues to receive full protection under the ESA. Thus, we suggested that the 1-10(j) boundary for the NCE extend to no more than 25 miles east of the North Cascades Recovery Zone.

The proposed geographic extent for the 10(j) designated population ensures that grizzly bears restored to the NCE would be separated from the nearest grizzly bear population in the lower 48 states - the Selkirk population - by at least 100 miles. Although long-term connectivity is the goal, we feel that given current connectivity obstacles this distance is sufficient to protect grizzly bears in the Selkirks as endangered, and thus we support the boundary designation.

The DEIS explains that the NCE boundary, however, is further divided amongst three management zones “based on suitability for occupancy by grizzly bears and the likelihood of human-bear conflicts.” The DEIS on page 37 contains a map of the management zones.

Management zone 1 includes the Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest and Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest north of Interstate 90 and west of Washington State Route 97, as well as the park complex. Management zone 1 would be the primary area for the restoration of grizzly bears and would serve as core habitat for survival, reproduction, and dispersal.

Management zone 2 includes the Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest and Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest south of Interstate 90, Gifford Pinchot National Forest, and Mt Rainier National Park. Management zone 2 also includes the Colville National Forest and Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest lands east of Washington State Route 97 within the NEP boundary. Management zone 2 is meant to accommodate natural movement or dispersal by grizzly bears.

Management zone 3 comprises all other lands not contained within management zones 1 and 2 within the NEP boundary. Management zone 3 contains large areas that may be incompatible with grizzly bear presence due to high levels of private land ownership and associated development and/or potential for bears to become involved in conflicts and resultant bear mortality; although, some areas within this management zone can support grizzly bears, and grizzly bears may occur in portions of this zone. The intent of management zone 3 is to allow more management flexibility than the other zones to minimize impacts of grizzly bears on landowners and other members of the public.

Although the Center is not opposed to the division of the NEP area into management zones in theory, the Center has serious

concerns about how the agencies propose to treat grizzly bears in the three zones, as explained below.

D. Excessive Authorization to Take Reintroduced Grizzly Bears

“Protective regulations” issued for reintroduced species, treated as threatened species, must “provide for the conservation of such species.” 16 U.S.C. § 1533(d); see also 50 C.F.R. § 17.82. Thus, as an initial matter, we wish to stress that as proposed, healthy, non-conflict bears will be taken from the wild and their native ecosystems from other populations - - likely the NCDE grizzly bear population - - for this reintroduction effort. As such, every effort must be made by the FWS to ensure that these healthy, non-conflict bears will be protected to the greatest extent in regard to any allowable take under an ESA section 10(j) rule.

Similarly, relocation of grizzly bears within the NCE or that leave the NCE after reintroduction should be carefully considered by the agencies. Doing so may disincentivize communities to use proper conflict prevention measures. Moreover, in order to minimize injury or death due to stress and complications surrounding capture and relocation, we propose that FWS approve live capture with culvert traps rather than restrictive foot traps.

Unfortunately, the proposed regulations authorize lethal take of reintroduced grizzly bears under numerous circumstances but fail to provide any scientifically based factual support that such killing would further grizzly bear conservation.

According to the DEIS, the following take of grizzly bears would be allowed in all management zones in the NEP area (see DEIS at 38):

1) Self-defense or the defense of others based on a good-faith belief that the actions taken were to protect the person from bodily harm.

We understand the need to provide humans with means to protect themselves from bodily harm and we support allowing one to kill a grizzly bear in self-defense. This is also in line with the current 4(d) rule applicable to grizzly bears in the lower-48 states. We have seen this self-defense provision abused, however, to cover up what appears to be poaching where self-defense was not a real concern, so we encourage authorized agencies to be mindful of that when investigating claims of self-defense. We also encourage the agencies to require people to carry bear spray in Management zone 1 to minimize grizzly bears being killed in valid self-defense situations. Areas where grizzly bear presence overlaps with game hunting or black bear hunting often represent an especially high number of self-defense killings.

2) Deterrence for the purposes of avoiding human-bear conflicts or to discourage bears from using areas in the immediate vicinity of homes and other human-occupied areas. Any person who deters a grizzly bear must use discretion and act safely and responsibly in confronting grizzly bears involved in conflicts. The FWS provides guidelines for safe and responsible hazing of grizzly bears. See FWS Grizzly Bear Hazing Guidelines (FWS 2020).

We support the general idea of hazing bears to discourage conflicts in areas near homes and human-occupied areas. However, FWS must be specific about what is allowed and what is not allowed, in order to minimize the potential for unintentional lethal take during hazing. Simply referencing hazing guidelines and telling people to “use discretion” without explaining that they must follow the hazing guidelines and tactics proposed in the guidelines is insufficient to minimize lethal take.

3) Research and recovery actions by a federal, state, or Tribal agency designated by the FWS to assist in implementing the section 10(j) rule.

We support limited take of grizzly bears for research and recovery actions, as supported by the current 4(d) rule applicable to grizzly bears in the lower-48 states.

4) Removal of grizzly bears involved in conflict, up to and including lethal removal, by qualified employees or designees at an agency authorized by the FWS, but only if: (1) it is not reasonably possible to otherwise eliminate the threat by nonlethal deterrence or live capturing and releasing the grizzly bear unharmed in a remote area; (2) the taking is done in a humane manner by an authorized agency, and after approval from the FWS; and (3) the taking is reported to the FWS.

While we appreciate the sideboards here describing when removal of grizzly bears involved in conflict is permitted, there is no explanation as to when and why it might not be reasonably possible to otherwise eliminate the threat by nonlethal deterrence or live capturing and releasing the grizzly bear unharmed in a remote area. We propose that FWS provide some examples explaining why relocation might not be reasonably possible.

5) Unintentional take of a grizzly bear, provided such take is non-negligent and incidental to an otherwise lawful activity, the take is promptly reported to the FWS, and if the take occurs on national forest lands, that the USFS has maintained its “no net loss of core” approach and implemented food storage restrictions throughout management zone 1.

The Center does not support this provision. As written, it seems to codify incidental take of an unlimited number of bears in connection with an unlimited variety of scenarios, including take as a result of any forest management projects. In Management zone 1, which is considered “the primary area for the restoration of grizzly bears” that would “serve as core habitat for survival, reproduction, and dispersal,” giving the Forest Service or others a free pass when grizzly bears are incidentally killed is unacceptable.

Additional take of grizzly bears allowed in management zones 2 and 3 would include (see DEIS at 38-39):

1) Relocation of grizzly bears. With prior agreement from the FWS, qualified employees or designees from FWS-approved federal, state, or Tribal agencies may live-capture grizzly bears in management zones 2 or 3 and transport and release those grizzly bears in a remote location agreed to by FWS, WDFW, and the applicable land management agency for any of the following reasons:

- a) When necessary for the purposes of enhancing their conservation.
- b) After depredation of lawfully present livestock or unnatural use of food materials that have been reasonably secured from the bear, resulting in conditioning of the bear or significant loss of property.
- c) After aggressive (not defensive) behavior toward humans results in injury to a human or constitutes a demonstrable immediate or potential threat to human safety.

The Center generally does not disagree with grizzly bear relocation under these circumstances. However, because grizzly bears can sometimes be unintentionally killed during relocation, we urge FWS and other agencies to fully investigate the circumstances, for example, by confirming that unnatural food was reasonably secure and that livestock owners took steps reasonably necessary to minimize predation of livestock by grizzly bears. Grizzly bears do sometimes return to areas where they received easy food rewards or found vulnerable prey (such as livestock), so we propose that livestock owners must be able to document and demonstrate the use of non-lethal deterrents before grizzly bears are removed and relocated for livestock predation. Non-lethal deterrents appropriate for the area that should be implemented before relocation is considered should be included in all grazing permits. This would encourage livestock owners in Management Zone 2, which includes large swaths of National forest land and is “meant to accommodate natural movement or dispersal by grizzly bears,” to take responsibility for keeping their livestock, and in turn grizzly bears, safe.

2) Conditioned lethal take. With prior written authorization from the FWS or an authorized agency, livestock owners may lethally take a grizzly bear within 100 yards of legally present livestock if a depredation has been confirmed by the FWS or an authorized agency, and it is not reasonably possible to otherwise eliminate the threat by nonlethal deterrence or live capturing and releasing the grizzly bear unharmed in a remote area. If, after two weeks from the confirmed depredation, no further depredations have occurred, the permit would expire. Any grizzly bear killed under this provision must be reported within 24 hours to the FWS and the carcass surrendered to FWS.

The Center does not support this provision. Livestock conflicts are one of the greatest causes of human-caused mortality to grizzly bears in the conterminous United States, yet most of these conflicts are preventable. Moreover, numerous scientists have found that lethal predator control is ineffective at curbing livestock predations.

First, killing grizzly bears to protect livestock should not be permitted on public land. We propose that this provision only

apply to private land.

Second, livestock owners should be required to document and demonstrate the use of non-lethal deterrents before grizzly bears are removed and relocated for livestock predation. Should FWS maintain this provision and apply it to public land, non-lethal deterrents appropriate for the area that should be implemented before relocation is considered should be included in all grazing permits, and livestock owners should be required to use all non-lethal deterrents listed in the grazing permit before receiving a permit to kill a grizzly bear. Preventative methods to minimize livestock conflicts include electric fences, guard animals, and human presence.

On private land, livestock owners should be required to document and demonstrate that they have exhausted nonlethal deterrents that may be effective at minimizing or halting conflicts before receiving a permit to kill a grizzly bear.

Additional take of grizzly bears allowed in management zone 3 would include:

1) Preemptive relocation of any grizzly bear. With prior approval from FWS, federal, state, or Tribal authorities may live-capture any grizzly bear occurring in management zone 3 and relocate as a preemptive action to prevent a conflict that appears imminent or in attempt to break habituated behavior of bears lingering near human-occupied areas.

Due to the risk of injury or death to grizzly bears during relocation, the Center does not support preemptive relocation of grizzly bears where no conflict has occurred.

2) Conditioned lethal take. The FWS, or authorized agency may issue prior written authorization to any person to kill a grizzly bear in management zone 3 when necessary for public safety or to protect property, but only if:

- a) The FWS or authorized agency determines that a grizzly bear presents a demonstrable and ongoing threat to human safety or to lawfully present livestock, working dogs, domestic animals, crops, beehives, or other property; and it is not reasonably possible to otherwise eliminate the threat by live capturing and releasing the grizzly bear unharmed;
- b) Once the FWS or authorized agency determines the threat is no longer ongoing, the FWS or authorized agency would notify the person, terminating the authorization;
- c) The individuals requesting the written authorization are otherwise authorized by the landowner or land management entity;
- d) The taking is done in a humane manner; and
- e) The taking is reported to the FWS, and the carcass is surrendered to the FWS.

The Center cannot support this provision for several reasons. First, FWS or an authorizing agency has absolutely no way to ensure that a person with a permit to kill a grizzly bear will be able to kill it "in a humane manner." Second, what constitutes a "demonstrable and ongoing threat" if no conflict has actually occurred? This is too discretionary and could potentially cover any grizzly bear within hundreds of feet or yards of a human, livestock, working dogs, domestic animals, crops, beehives, or other property. It is hard to imagine there are many places within management zone 3 that are not within proximity to one of these elements. Third, as similarly stated above, we propose that FWS include language to ensure that authorization for a person to lethally remove a bear under this provision includes review as to why relocation might not be reasonably possible. At the very least, the person who perceives a threat should be required to use nonlethal deterrents before receiving any such permit. Contrary to statements made in the DEIS, there is no scientific support for the notion that killing bears increases social tolerance.

Finally, I wish to note that some of the language in the DEIS noted above does not track completely to the language in the proposed 10(j) rule printed in the Federal Register. The agencies must ensure that the final DEIS and any finalized 10(j) rule are fully consistent.

Thank you for taking these comments into consideration. The references cited below will be sent to you on a USB drive via mail. If you wish to discuss this matter, please contact me at [REDACTED] or email me at

[REDACTED]

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Center for Biological Diversity
P.O. Box 469
Victor, ID 83455
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

REFERENCES CITED

- Barnes, Matt, Keystone Conservation. 2015. Livestock Management for Coexistence with Large Carnivores, Healthy Land and Productive Ranches. A white paper. Available at:
www.keystoneconservation.us/PDFs/KeystoneConservation_2015_WhitePaper.pdf.
- Eklund, A., J.V. López-Bao, M. Tourani, G. Chapron, and J. Frank (2017), Limited evidence on the effectiveness of interventions to reduce livestock predation by large carnivores. *Scientific Reports*, 7: 2097.
- Gaines, W.L., W.O. Noble, and R.H. Naney (2001), Grizzly Bear Recovery in the North Cascades Ecosystem. *Western Back Bear Workshop* 7:57-62.
- Lennox, R.J., A.J. Gallagher, E.G. Ritchie, and S.J. Cooke (2018), Evaluating the efficacy of predator removal in a conflict-prone world. *Biological Conservation*, 224: 277-289.
- Lyons, A.L., W.L. Gaines, P.H. Singleton, W.F. Kasworn, M.F. Proctor, and J. Begley (2018), Spatially Explicit Carrying Capacity Estimates to Inform Species Specific Recovery Objectives: Grizzly bear (*Ursus arctos*) Recovery in the North Cascades. *Biological Conservation* 222: 21-32.
- Miller, J., K. Stoner, M. Cejtin, T. Meyer, A. Middleton, and O. Schmitz (2016), Effectiveness of Contemporary Techniques for Reducing Livestock Depredations by Large Carnivores. *Wildlife Society Bulletin*. 40: 806-815.
- Montana Livestock Loss Board (2017), Safeguarding the Ranch, Farm, and Home from Grizzly Bears. Available at:
https://liv.mt.gov/_docs/LLB/Tool Kit - Grizzly Bear Conflict Reduction - 2017.pdf
- Treves, Adrian et al (2016), Predator control should not be a shot in the dark. *Front Ecol. Environ*, 14(7): 380-388.

Correspondence ID: 13531Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Issaquah, WA 98027-6705
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 19:33:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do not reintroduce grizzlies to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 13532Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 19:43:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: After studying the 3 Alternatives proposed by the FWS and Park Service, I support Alternative C, the Preferred Alternative, utilizing the 10(j) rule of the ESA. The research shows clearly that the North Cascades ecosystem is some of the very best habitat for bears in the lower 48 states; almost every climate model shows that Grizzly habitat will increase with advancing climate change. In recent research, 100 out of 124 plant species that Grizzly bears eat exist in the North Cascades. So many of the arguments against Grizzly bear reintroduction simply don't stand up to scrutiny- the claims that there will be a lack of food, that we can't coexist with bears, that the bears will terrorize the population and that nobody will be safe. . . . in the year 2021, over 5 million people visited the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem which supports a population of 1100 Grizzly bears. Since Yellowstone National Park was established in 1872, there have been 125 drownings in the park, 23 deaths by burns (falling into hot springs), and 8 deaths by run-ins with bears. This suggests strongly that we can and have coexisted with bears at Yellowstone, and that the sheer numbers of visitors each year contribute more to the encounters with bears than the bears themselves. In western Montana, the citizens of the Blackfoot River watershed have coexisted with Grizzly bears since the time of Lewis and Clark and before. They still coexist today in the Blackfoot. There are proven methods to enable coexistence with bears and these along with public education are an effective way to manage a bear population. Finally , the small numbers of bears to be reintroduced and the slow reproduction rates of Grizzly bears should enable the FWS and Park Service to manage the bears in a proactive, comprehensive, and adaptive way, making changes along the way as needed. With such a small population of bears in the first few years, this should be very manageable utilizing the flexibility of the 10(j) rule. Any conflicts with humans will almost certainly be very minimal in the beginning, giving the FWS and Park Service time to prove to the public that the reintroduction using 10(j) can be successful. I strongly support the Preferred Alternative, and the use of the 10(j) rule, in the re-introduction of the Grizzly bear to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 13533Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lakewood, WA 98498
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 19:46:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing in support of the restoration of grizzly bears to the Cascade Range. Of course as a hiker and conservationist I feel strongly about ensuring the future of grizzly bears in general, but I am also very interested in the restoration of the natural food webs in our region. We need the apex predators that evolved here to remain here, and reintroducing grizzlies will help to restore and maintain the proper ecological balance. The science is clear that the reintroduction of grizzlies to their native habitat is not only important to the region, but also poses very little threat to humans as long as we continue to adopt safe policies regarding areas where humans and bears may interact. Please bring back these symbols of our cultural and regional heritage, and help to restore the natural balance in the Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 13534Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Blaine, WA 98230
United States of America

Outside Organization: N/A Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 19:54:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm generally in favor of an introduction of a small stable population of grizzly bears, though the planned distribution timelines could benefit from a "pause and study" approach. I believe all could benefit from a slower introduction over a longer timeframe to analyze the ecosystem and human impacts of for example 10 bears in an area. A thorough study after 3-4 years could better inform the reality of bear introduction, so as to avoid problems wolf introductions have had unintended consequences in Washington and other western states.

Correspondence ID: 13536Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 19:56:10

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am a property owner in Okanogan County, within the North Cascades Ecosystem and near proposed grizzly bear reintroduction sites. I also have more than 35 years professional experience as a natural and social scientist in the Pacific Northwest. I use the affected area for hiking, backpacking, horseback riding, snow travel, fishing, wildlife viewing, sightseeing, overnight camping, and other recreational activities. I also maintain a residence and keep livestock on my property seasonally. I have obvious potential to be directly affected and harmed by the reintroduction of grizzly bears in the North Cascades Ecosystem.

I have reviewed the Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan Environmental Impact Statement North Cascades Ecosystem, dated Sept 2023. I would like for my comments here to be entered in the official record. I am concerned by a number of the EIS's assessments and conclusions related to human, socioeconomic, and Wilderness impacts. I am absolutely in opposition to both Action Alternatives "B" and "C". The adverse impacts and risks of the action alternatives as acknowledged in the EIS are excessive relative to the benefits, and many of the adverse impacts are unavoidable. No Action is the only prudent and reasonable alternative based on the EIS.

The EIS is especially flawed at its foundation because it fails to develop and explain with adequate and convincing rigor the "need" for the proposed action. The need must be clearly supported for the public and other agencies to understand and consider a range of reasonable alternatives. The current purpose and need is clearly circular and self-serving as it claims that the need is to "Restore grizzly bears to the NCE" and the purpose is the same - to "restore the grizzly bear to the NCE". No adequate explanation or support for this need is developed or presented.

The adoption of the purpose and need statement is one of the most consequential decisions that a lead agency makes in the National Environmental Policy Act process, because the purpose and need provides the foundation for determining which alternatives will be considered and for selecting the preferred alternative. See: *Citizens against Burlington, Inc. v. Busey*, 938 F.2d 190, 196 (D.C. Cir. 1990) "an agency may not define the objectives of its action in terms so unreasonably narrow that only one alternative from among the environmentally benign ones in the agency's power would accomplish the goals of the agency's action, and the EIS would become a foreordained formality."

The CEQ regulations require an EIS to "rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives" and to "[d]evote substantial treatment to each alternative considered in detail so that reviewers may evaluate their comparative merits." See: 40 CFR 1502.14(b). The narrow and unsupported statement of purpose and need make suspect whether the lead agency adequately developed other potential reasonable alternatives.

In addition, the Draft Minimum Requirements Decision Guide Workbook decisions are flawed. No motorized vehicles or tools should be allowed within the Wilderness during the reintroduction consistent with the Wilderness Acts' intent to maintain and protect the Wilderness natural character and untrammelled quality. There are viable means of reintroduction acknowledged by the lead agency that must be attempted prior to violating the Wilderness and its solitude. The suggestion that the Wilderness is currently not "natural" is self-serving and not defensible.

Correspondence ID: 13539Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Westminster, CA 92683
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 20:08:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The draft EIS fails to comply with Code of Federal Regulations Title 40 Chapter V Subchapter A, Part 1502.2(b) insofar as it's noncompliance to proportionately document the risks to public safety. While the classification of the Grizzly is easily identified by laypersons as having dangerous and unpredictable behavior and is well known as the top-of-the-food-chain apex predator, nevertheless the draft EIS fails to discuss the consequences to humans of such dangerous and unpredictable behavior. Moreover, the draft EIS fails to discuss in proportion the well documented significant risks to the public as required by 40 CFR 1502.2(b). While Grizzly attacks have been frequent news headlines for communities located near existing Grizzly recovery zones, this same information is not easily available by heretofore unaffected communities. This is why the draft EIS is required to inform the communities that are in the crosshairs of these actions proposed by the

Lead Agencies, however this has not been done. The safety of the public deserves to be a principal consideration during the draft EIS process when proposing to put apex predators onto public lands. Clearly this is not the case. Instead, impacts to public safety are disproportionately represented, in fact are silent in the draft EIS through omission of relevant information concerning Grizzly attacks on humans. The fact is the draft EIS fails to include the well documented grizzly-to-human conflicts resulting from frequent Grizzly attacks occurring inside and outside existing recovery zones. Existing research shows the majority of human-grizzly bear conflicts occur outside recovery zones, according to the draft EIS Page 60 which states, "Approximately 90% of the recovery zone is in federal, Tribal, or state ownership, with only 10% on private lands (Dood, Atkinson, and Boccadori 2006). However, the majority of human-grizzly bear conflicts and bear mortality occur on private lands, especially as grizzly bears expand their ranges." In other words, while the draft EIS admits to the predominant destination of Grizzlies to private lands, by omission it conceals from the public the tragic consequences of Grizzly attacks on humans, including the frequency of such attacks, proximity to population centers, as well as severity of resulting injuries and deaths. As an example, at the end of my comments is a partial list of recent human deaths and injuries resulting from Grizzly attacks inside a brief 4-month period, and is a partial list because the season for Grizzly activity extends into late November.

(2) Failure to Comply:

Pursuant to Title 40 Chapter V Subchapter A, Part 1502.2(f) which states, "Agencies shall not commit resources prejudicing selection of alternatives before making a final decision."

Correspondence ID: 13540Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 20:14:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To Whom It May Concern:

I believe bringing grizzlies back to the Cascades is the best option. Please do the best for our environment and support alternate C.

Best,


Correspondence ID: 13541Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Snohomish, WA 98290
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 20:15:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No to grizzly bears! Dangerous to people, livestock, and wildlife. Deer and elk already have wolves and plenty of cougars eating them. Those Grizzlies will eat children, pets, horses, just about anything they want. Lots of bears in Alaska and Canada, don't want them in Washington.

Correspondence ID: 13542Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bentonville, AR 72713
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 20:21:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Bears should be reintroduced. It's better for the ecosystem, which will benefit everyone, including farmers.

Correspondence ID: 13543Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Snohomish, WA 98296
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 20:21:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please reintroduce the grizzly bears. They are vital to the sustainability of the north cascades. Humans have been able to coexist with grizzly bears for centuries and we can learn it again.

Correspondence ID: 13546Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Chicago, IL 60647
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 20:27:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a resident of the United States who uses and loves our parks I urge you to support the Bear Restoration Plan. Bears are emblematic of this land as recognizable symbols of our parks. Development patterns, climate change, and habitat loss are pushing bears out and it is our duty to keep them safe and act not only as stewards of their homes, but as stewards of their populations. It is our responsibility to ensure the longevity and health of bear populations. This plan is an important step in the right direction to protect and preserve bears.

Correspondence ID: 13547Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Walla Walla, WA 99362
United States of America
Outside Organization: Whitman College University/Professional Society
Received: Nov,12 2023 20:35:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: When I read this proposal, the question is whether it is possible to continue to manage this in the long term. If this is a long-term project, there will be someone to take over the plan's details. The plan would have to consider so many factors that tracking them all would take much work. It must also consider the impact of human life on the environment in changing times, not just the plan itself.

Correspondence ID: 13549Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bothell, WA 98012
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 20:37:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzlies are an important, natural part of the North Cascades ecosystem. Bringing them back would help restore balance. I love hiking in the North Cascades and can use precautions like bear spray just like I have hiking in Yellowstone.

Correspondence ID: 13550Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Snohomish, WA 98290-6306
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 20:37:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: It is my understanding the our State does not require that we reintroduce endangered or species that have disappeared from our State. The Grizzly Bear does not qualify as an endangered species under the Endangered Species Act. Removing bears from other regions of the USA or CANADA is very expensive and has no value to the bears being captured or to the habitat they would be released into.
Bears have legs to releasing into a very remote area of a National Park or Wilderness area does not assure that they will stay

put.

If the decision were to be made to remove bears from their current homes. You should seek out bears that have had not contact with people. "dart"; them and transport by helicopter to an area with a road so they could be hauled away.

Leave the bears along and let them repopulate new habitats naturally if that habitat attracts and supports them.

Correspondence ID: 13553Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Cincinnati, OH 45202
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 20:42:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please approve restoring grizzlies to the Northern Cascades. They are a critical part to maintaining balance in this ecosystem. It's a shame that we do not have them in this great region currently.

Correspondence ID: 13554Project:112008Document:132104
Address: seattle, WA 98146
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 20:45:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Restore ecosystem and save from extinction.

Correspondence ID: 13555Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 20:49:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a fairly new resident to Bellingham and former wildlife rescue volunteer (sea lions, elephant seals, otters, etc.) who believes animals have every right to thrive in their native habitats, this is not an issue I take lightly and I am only offering input after much contemplation, and despite ultimately feeling torn on the matter.

I've spent the past two years in Whatcom County, and spent this past summer exploring the absolutely breathtaking trails that the North Cascades and Mt. Baker have to offer. While my plans for next season include a lot more exploring and a few backpacking and overnight trips, the idea of grizzlies in these forests would give me pause to say the least.

I've previously worked in government and took calls from members of the public reporting white shark sightings at the harbor where I worked in California. There had been a fatal attack in the harbor several years before I worked there, when a woman was diving with sea lions and was attacked by a white shark, and several other fatal attacks in local waters in that county and neighboring counties in previous and subsequent years. White sharks are obviously an invaluable part of the ecosystem and I wouldn't hesitate to support any measures set forth to protect their species' survival (despite having regularly tended to their pinniped victims). That said, absolutely no human was forced to enter an ocean teeming with white sharks. This proposal however; is obviously a bit different in that land is also human habitat (where water is not), and many residents may not have a choice in being exposed to a deadly predator.

I'm sure we've all read reports about families (including children) being mauled to death by grizzlies in Alaska after the animals entered their homes and property. While it may be rare, it's enough to keep me from booking a camping trip to Alaska anytime soon. I worry that the voices of residents who may be negatively impacted by local grizzlies have been glossed over and misidentified as supportive of this proposal. While I'm sure many of them are supportive (perhaps even a

majority), the idea of even one rural resident being mauled by a grizzly is enough to counteract my excitement about reintroducing a native species to the area. Which isn't to say I'm not supportive at all, but I do think the idea is a bit rushed (or at least seems to be presented that way), and that perhaps it should be attempted on a very small scale to start, with tracking collars and scientists monitoring behavior in a small group of animals for quite some time to rule out dangerous behavior before re-establishing populations all in one go (I don't know the current plan, so these are just my thoughts).

Additionally, in areas to the north where grizzlies reside, will data be collected and presented to the public regarding the number of attacks on residents, animals and hikers, etc., along with documented negative impacts on the community if there have been any? On the other side of that, supportive data showing the beneficial impacts of reintroduction in real numbers, with scientific data, would be helpful in supporting the claim that this will be of benefit to the environment. While I suspect it will be beneficial as stated, it would be helpful to look at data before taking a side, and it should be the responsibility of those proposing this endeavor (hopefully biologists and appropriate personnel) to present the information to the public instead of expecting us to do the research ourselves. Perhaps this information has already been made available and I overlooked it, in which case I apologize.

I was stunned by the number of eager hikers at Artist Point and other trailheads throughout this past summer. I met so very many (amazing!) dogs on the trails. As the pet parent of a small, senior fur baby, I know that even my little guy would charge a grizzly if it meant protecting me, and I worry that each and every dog on these trails would react in the very same way. I will confess I don't know much about grizzly behavior, but I imagine dogs may be seen as a meal or territorial threat which could lead to some very awful consequences for both canines and their humans. I know mountain lions and other bear species present an occasional risk, but none seem as truly terrifying as a grizzly. Big cats do show mercy by killing their prey before consuming it, grizzly bears do not offer that same courtesy. I also wonder if the fire activity we've consistently seen in recent years would bring these animals closer to smaller towns in search of food as they attempt to escape flames along with the animals they usually consume.

My last point is a matter of comparison. Yosemite National Park used to be full of grizzly bears, as did much of California and the Pacific Northwest. I can't imagine Yosemite reintroducing grizzlies, as it would create a potentially unsafe experience for the several million visitors to the park each year. While North Cascades National Park certainly sees far less human recreation activity, I do think it's important to consider both the economic impact of the affect on tourism, as well as the potential for loss of life and limb for recreational visitors (and please don't forget about the brave PCT thru-hikers and the final leg of that journey which will take one through the area in question). I would certainly struggle if I made the call to bring dangerous animals to an otherwise relatively safe environment and someone suffered greatly, or a life (or many) were lost due to that decision. On the other hand, human activity has utterly ravaged animal populations in recent history in the most shameful of ways, and trying to achieve a more balanced habitat that humans can safely adjust to over time is obviously ideal.

In summation, I support a modified approach to the idea of the reintroduction of grizzlies to North Cascades National Park, with a small number of consistently monitored animals released and with data regarding those monitored animals to be provided to the public for review before further measures are taken; with education campaigns that provide hikers and campers with adequate information about safety, risks and known bear location. Providing a website with tracking of grizzlies in real-time for the general public to follow could be fun and cut risks to human safety (though I understand it could also unfortunately present a problem with poachers and irresponsible people hoping to catch a glimpse - or worse, a selfie).

Thank you for receiving my comment.

Correspondence ID: 13556Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Tonasket, WA 98855
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 20:55:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To The NPS, FWS, and decision-makers on the question of reintroducing grizzly bears to the North Cascades,

An important reason that I and my family have chosen to live in Okanogan County is for the strikingly beautiful, resilient, diverse ecosystems that are found here. Grizzly bears are (historically) a part of these ecosystems, and their extirpation is a result of colonization that can and should be remedied. As wolf populations have recovered in the West, most notably perhaps in Yellowstone, ecosystems are healing in unexpected ways and to unexpected extents. While wolves and grizzlies are quite different, both are apex predators and grizzlies too have an impact on and a role in their place, where their role and ecosystem services cannot be filled by other species.

I believe that concerns about potential dangers to people and livestock, while understandable, originate from fear of the unknown. Education and outreach to communities and people of all ages will go a long way in both reducing the actual potential for conflict with grizzlies (and all wildlife) and in reducing people's worry about potential conflict. Those who go into the backcountry, as we do as a family to hike, are already prepared for encounters with wildlife. Adding grizzly bears to the list of potential encounters does not add any extra complication or concern.

I write in support of Alternative C, with the 10(j) designation in order to launch this grizzly reintroduction effort with as many management tools as possible. I believe this will provide the greatest level of flexibility, appease the most people, and still allow grizzlies to be reintroduced to the North Cascades, allowing this important step toward restoring and healing ecosystems in the North Cascades to move forward.

Thank you.

██████████

Correspondence ID: 13557Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Buckley, WA 98321
United States of America
Outside Organization: BCH Non-Governmental
Received: Nov,12 2023 21:03:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Good evening,

I do not think bringing grizzlies back to the north cascades is a good idea. With all of the fire devastation the North Cascades have seen over the last decade I don't believe the animals that would need to be their prey for them to survive, are plentiful enough to keep a balanced ecosystem. Along with people trying to enjoy the deep back country. With an under fed and possibly malnourished grizzly bear to be concerned about. Thank you for the opportunity to share our thoughts. Hope to enjoy many more years in the back country.

Thanks,

██████████
BCH volunteer
Pack support / Trail work

Correspondence ID: 13558Project:112008Document:132104
Address: North Bend, WA 98045
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 21:03:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As an avid backpacker and outdoor recreationalist, I am absolutely opposed to having these predators reintroduced to the North Cascades. I fail to see how they are a benefit to our ecosystem- no experts I've asked can answer that except by saying "well, they used to be here". I have no interest in carrying bear spray and possibly a weapon when I just want to enjoy the backcountry without that threat. It seems to me the biologists just need a project and want to

meddle in the way of "how things used to be"- when we didn't have the population we do now. We have way too many people in our backcountry now for this type of threat/predator. Leave things as they are- no grizzly bear reintroductions.

Correspondence ID: 13559Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98122
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 21:05:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live in and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

Furthermore, the 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Correspondence ID: 13560Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Everson, WA 98247
United States of America

Outside Organization: Citizen Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 21:05:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We owe a debt and it's time to pay. Bring grizzlies back. They belong here.

Correspondence ID: 13561Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98178
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 21:13:15

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No reintroduction.

Correspondence ID: 13562Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Camano island, WA 98282
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 21:21:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Our family has been an outdoor family for generations, that loves to hike, camp and cross country ski. My wife and I spend much time with our daughter's family in Twisp. They are an avid outdoors family, and we fear for them if grizzlies are allowed into the North Cascades. We know of families who have lost loved ones by grizzly attacks in Glacier National Park. Please keep grizzlies out and f the North Cascades so that we and our family can enjoy the outdoors without fear of such an attack. Thank you. [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 13563Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lynden, WA 98264
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 21:24:37

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This seems like a terrible idea, and I am surprised it is even being considered. British Columbia already has plans to introduce additional Grizzly Bears to their lower Cascades--it is just a matter of time before they cross the border, and if Washington has to ecosystem to support them, they will naturally populate the area. For Washington to introduce even more before we find out the consequences of potential bear from Canada seems hasty and reckless. Ecosystems are delicate things, and introducing too many large predators at once could wreak havoc on other species. In addition, our Cascades are used heavily by hikers and for recreation--Grizzlies are more aggressive than the black bear we are used to seeing out there, and tragic interactions between Grizzlies and people seems almost inevitable.

Correspondence ID: 13564Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Port Townsend, WA 98368
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 21:34:01

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am an avid outdoors person and hiker. I oppose the re-introduction of grizzly bears into the northern cascades at this time. There are many areas of our Washington ecosystems that should, in my view, be receiving funding priority and attention before the consideration of the reintroduction of grizzly bears. Examples of these include vital and necessary stewardship for the existing and threatened southern resident orca whale population, and the preservation of tracts of old growth legacy timber. Let's focus on preserving the literally irreplaceable aspects of what make Washington wilderness so worth living near, and show that we can be responsible and effective there, before we tackle non-essential projects. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 13565Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 21:41:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly support the reintroduction of grizzly bears into North Cascade National Park.

An analogy is the reintroduction of wolves into Yellowstone. Famously, this has been an environmental success story. Grizzly bears are in many ways similar: they are also a top predator, feared by many humans, and pushed out of their habitat. The species is endangered, and could benefit from additional habitat. Also, they could have beneficial impacts on other species, restoring natural predator-prey relationships.

Black bears are well known within North Cascades, so visitors should be taking bear precautions already. I expect the impact on visitors to be minimal.

Correspondence ID: 13566Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98274
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 21:41:15

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the recovery of grizzly bears in the North Cascades Ecosystem as described as Alternative C: Restoration with 10j Designation. Because grizzly bears were extirpated from the North Cascades Ecosystem by humans

through a variety of lethal means, the population of these magnificent creatures must be recovered through the planned, deliberate approach described in Alternative C. Additionally, designation of the future grizzly population as a non-essential experimental population through the 10J rule will allow for more flexible management in areas where conflict could occur between landowners and bears.

I have a question about the lack of an updated MOU with the USFS regarding the "no-net-loss-of-core" approach on USFS lands in Management Zone 1. If the MOU is not updated with USFS, what will happen to the 10J rule? Will it be rescinded? Will it be changed? Will the preferred alternative then become Alternative B: Restoration with Existing Endangered Species Act Protections?

In regard to the conditioned lethal take of grizzly bears allowed under Management Zones 2 and 3, I have concerns. Ranchers or property owners may not own a rifle of sufficient power to kill a grizzly bear. Also, a rancher or landowner may only injure a bear when they try to kill it and that would create a new problem with an injured, possibly agitated bear in the area. Consider changing the authorization of a lethal take to be completed by a qualified agency representative rather than a rancher or landowner.

Correspondence ID: 13567Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Okanogan, WA 98840
United States of America

Outside Organization: City of Okanogan Town or City Government(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,12 2023 21:41:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My comment to draft EIS of the proposed plan to restore Grizzly Bears to North Cascades Ecosystem Alternative A (no-action alternative) is the only one I can support for these reasons:

- 1) Alternatives B and C will both have negative impacts to Okanogan County's agriculture and tourism industries.
- 2) The habitat of the NCE does not contain sufficient food sources to support a viable grizzly population. There would already be a population of grizzly bears if there was the needed habitat. It has been over 100 years since they have been hunted. There have been many sightings of grizzly bears in the region during this time, but they did not stay.
- 3) The grizzly bears will go elsewhere seeking food. Some you should expect will be eating endangered or threatened species including salmon. They will also go to fruit orchards doing damage to bee hives, threaten laborers, and damage fruit trees.
- 4) This paragraph from your document acknowledges the safety hazard of bringing in grizzly bears: "Negative interactions between humans and grizzly bears, while rare, do occur. Every situation is dynamic, and a grizzly bear's reaction depends on a variety of factors, including the proximity between a bear and a human, the type of encounter (i.e., whether the bear is behaving in a defensive or offensive manner), and whether cubs or a valuable food resource are involved, among other considerations. The restoration of grizzly bears in the NCE has raised concerns about safety risks to backcountry recreational visitors and residents of the NCE because of the potential for negative human-grizzly bear interactions. In addition, the capture, release, and monitoring of grizzly bears could affect employee safety given the dangerous nature of the activity."
- 5) This whole process conflicts with Washington State Law RCW 77.12.035. It appears questionable if this process is even constitutional. In proposing to violate Washington State Law this neglects the 10th Amendment's reservation principal of the United States Constitution, which states: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, not prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Sincerely,

██████████
██████████ City of Okanogan

Correspondence ID: 13568Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lynden, WA 98264
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 21:51:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I believe that reintroducing grizzly bear in the cascade is a terrible idea. We have a beautiful state with tons of trails and recreational sites across the cascade where we have lots of people that take the the mountains to enjoy it all.

We do not need grizzly bear to balance the eco system. We already have a terrible problem with predators from cougar and black bear. Maybe we should take care of other problems then just add another. I love to head to the hills and I do not want to look over my back in fear of being attacked by a grizzly. It has already been proven that they are a problem when looking a Montana and all the attacks that have been continuing been happening. As a life long resident of Washington I strongly oppose the reintroduction of grizzly bear here in Washington.

Correspondence ID: 13569Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Aberdeen, WA 98520
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 21:51:58

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I feel that this is totally irresponsible and posing a serious danger to horsemen, hikers and anyone enjoying the backwoods. We already have grizzly bear in our area. There is absolutely no reason to introduce more into the area. I go back to completely irresponsible. Please seriously rethink this idea. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 13570Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98107
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 21:53:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My initial question is WHY? Why would you introduce into our forests a creature that has been known to attack humans. Grizzly bears are not afraid of people as black bears are. Whereas black bears will generally leave the area if confronted unless they are caring for cubs, grizzly bears will attack humans even when not in a cub-protection mood. Even if bear spray has proven effective in deterring grizzly bears, do you really want to be that close to a grizzly to see if the spray will do the job?

For anyone who is just dying to see a grizzly bear, please just visit a zoo! We don't need them in the North Cascades.

[Please release the results of the comments. I am curious to see how many people want to visit or camp in a forest with grizzly bears.]

Correspondence ID: 13571Project:112008Document:132104

Address: East Wenatchee, WA 98802
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 21:56:52

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I moved to Washington State 22 years ago from Hawaii. I came for the mountains and have stayed for the mountains and other diverse landscapes. I am a devoted hiker and enjoy hiking in the Cascade foothills during the shoulder season and hiking in the Cascades during the summer and fall. Hiking is my therapy and my life. I live in Wenatchee so I hike often around Snoqualamie Pass and Stevens Pass, up the Teanaway Valley, in the Mount Rainier area, and in the North Cascades. I often hike 3-5 per week. I sometimes hike alone on popular trails. I backpack and camp at least once a year in the mountains. I forage for berries and mushrooms during the spring and fall. Depending on the remoteness of the hike, I carry bear spray. I feel comfortable hiking in black bear country and have had some encounters with them. I respect them but I don't fear them. I am very fearful of grizzly bears. I have hiked in Denali, Yellowstone, and Glacier National Park. I can honestly say that I did not enjoy my hikes in grizzly bear country because of the constant fear. Bear spray doesn't always work. The recent deaths in Banff National Park are an example of prepared hikers dying despite carrying bear spray and behaving properly in grizzly country. I don't think I will ever feel comfortable hiking in grizzly country.

Our ecosystem has alpha predators: wolves, black bears, and humans. Hunting is very popular in Central WA and they help curb the deer population. I do not see the necessity of adding another alpha predator to the Cascades. I understand their historical importance, but I don't think they need to be reintroduced. California isn't reintroducing grizzly bears to Yosemite National Park.

I work in a hospital and have seen patients come in after black bear attacks. I do not want to see a patient that was attacked by a grizzly bear. Washington is a very "outdoorsy" state. People love to hike. During Covid and after Covid, the trails became too crowded. I don't even hike on the weekends because of the crowds. The human population density is high and grizzly encounters are bound to happen. Please consider people safety first and foremost.

I DO NOT want grizzlies introduced to the North Cascade. I am in full support of "Alternative A" where there is no action to introduce grizzlies. I strongly disagree with the thought that restoration of grizzly bears to the NCE would increase visitation and recreational use because visitors would seek to experience grizzly bears. That is a delusional thought. People will be afraid. Every hiker I have talked to in Central Washington thinks that reintroducing grizzlies is a bad idea. A dangerous idea. I know I will not be hiking. I would consider moving away to another state that has great and safe hiking.

Correspondence ID: 13572Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Port Angeles, WA 98362
United States of America
Outside Organization: Back Country Horsemanship of Washington Non-Governmental
Received: Nov,12 2023 21:59:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As members of Back Country Horsemen of Washington (Peninsula Chapter) we are very concerned about the future of recreation in the North Cascades Ecosystem if grizzly bears are translocated to areas used by large numbers of humans. The Pacific Coast Trail carries thousands of hikers and horseback riders every season. The Action Alternatives contain no substantive analysis of the impacts to recreation that will result from introducing grizzlies to this area. There are also many horse camps and heavily used trails just outside the NCE that would conceivably also be impacted. Safety for the recreating public and avoidance of trail closures are the worries that plague us. Therefore, we ask that the No Action Alternative be selected at this time.

Correspondence ID: 13573Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mazama, WA 98833
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 21:59:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am opposed to grizzly restoration in the North Cascades. With the PCT backpackers, the many hundreds of hikers, including my wife and I and our 3 sons, inadvertently passing between mother and cub, unleashing the fury of an attack, would be tragic. Though an unprovoked attack of a black bear is possible, it is not probable. Grizzlies don't need provoking. I do not want to carry a firearm when hiking. I will be pressed to do so if this restoration is implemented.

Correspondence ID: 13574Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Lynden, WA 98264
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 21:59:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly oppose the reintroduction of grizzly bear in the cascade. I believe it is in safe for all of us recreating in the mountains.

Correspondence ID: 13575Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Yakima, WA 98902
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 22:00:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly support the reintroduction of any native animal to our state including the grizzly. We owe it to the bears to bring them back to their historic habitat.

Correspondence ID: 13576Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Aberdeen, WA 98520
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 22:03:48

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is completely reckless and irresponsible!! This is simply another attempt to keep people (hikers, horsemen, etc) out of the forest. BCHW are maintaining trails for the enjoyment of horseman and hikers alike. We have every right to enjoy the forest in as safe a manner as possible. By introducing more grizzly into the area you are just asking for serious injury or death to those out in the woods. PLEASE reconsider this reckless plan!!!!

Correspondence ID: 13577Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Okanogan, WA 98840
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 22:03:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My comment to draft EIS of the proposed plan to restore Grizzly Bears to North Cascades Ecosystem Alternative A (no-action alternative) is the only one I can support for these reasons:

- 1) Alternatives B and C will both have negative impacts to Okanogan County's agriculture and tourism industries.
- 2) The habitat of the NCE does not contain sufficient food sources to support a viable grizzly population. There would already be a population of grizzly bears if there was the needed habitat. It has been over 100 years since they have been hunted. There have been many sightings of grizzly bears in the region during this time, but they did not stay.
- 3) The grizzly bears will go elsewhere seeking food. Some you should expect will be eating endangered or threatened species including salmon. They will also go to fruit orchards doing damage to bee hives, threaten laborers, and damage fruit trees.
- 4) This paragraph from your document acknowledges the safety hazard of bringing in grizzly bears: "Negative interactions between humans and grizzly bears, while rare, do occur. Every situation is dynamic, and a grizzly bear's reaction depends on a variety of factors, including the proximity between a bear and a human, the type of encounter (i.e., whether the bear is behaving in a defensive or offensive manner), and whether cubs or a valuable food resource are involved, among other considerations. The restoration of grizzly bears in the NCE has raised concerns about safety risks to backcountry recreational visitors and residents of the NCE because of the potential for negative human-grizzly bear interactions. In addition, the capture, release, and monitoring of grizzly bears could affect employee safety given the dangerous nature of the activity."
- 5) This whole process conflicts with Washington State Law RCW 77.12.035. It appears questionable if this process is even constitutional. In proposing to violate Washington State Law this neglects the 10th Amendment's reservation principal of the United States Constitution, which states: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, not prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Respectfully,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 13578Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Black Diamond, WA 98010
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 22:06:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This plan does not consider the increased population of the western side of washington state and increased usage of the North Cascades. For over 20 years this land was listed as Grizzly Habitat land with no Grizzlies making it a natural home. This seems to add to the forced addition of Grizzlies to this area which do not belong here. Adding Grizzly bears to an increased human population does not make sense. Yellowstone Park and Montana can show a history of negative interactions between grizzlies and people.

Correspondence ID: 13580Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bothell, WA 98011
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 22:08:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of Grizzly bears into the North Cascades. This area was formerly their territory and humans need to do their part in ensuring species survival. With the remoteness of the Cascade range, the bears will be seldom seen and will have minimal human interaction. Its important for hikers to stay vigilant and carry spray in case of an encounter as every walk in the wilderness is a risk that one takes. Regarding the delisting of the bears, their Endangered status should not be changed unless the population is thriving to prevent hunters from taking advantage of the situation.

Correspondence ID: 13581Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Longview, WA 98632
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 22:11:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Restoring the grizzly population to the North Cascade ecosystem is vitally important. It is our responsibility, as the cause of their absence, to restore this ecosystem. Grizzly bears are a keystone species and play a major role in the overall health of an ecosystem they belong or belonged to. Even a small population of them being reintroduced to the region would have a huge impact in as few as 2-5 years. This would make strides in returning the North Cascade ecosystem to its former healthier state. This area already hosts other large predators so there would be little adjustment needed from locals living and working in the area. Educating the human population on bear and wildlife safety is already necessary and should continue to be with the reintroduction of a species. We only have things to lose from not pushing forward with this plan but could make a huge change for the better if we move forward.

Correspondence ID: 13582Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98512
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 22:14:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: November 12, 2023

Dear US National Park Service :

I am a lover of nature, in all its forms. One of the most wonderous of those forms is the magnificent Grizzly Bear. Thanks to the Endangered Species Act and US Fish and Wildlife Service, and your agency, we may be able to reintroduce the grizzly bears into the North Cascades National Park system.

I am so happy about that eventuality, if it is allowed to take place.

I have lived in the state for 67 years, and have roamed our parks many times. Especially cherished were the times in our National Parks. Bears have been present, but humans have been made aware of the dangers, and the care to be taken to avoid encounters. I understand that grizzly bears in Montana and other areas have done well overall within the parks.

Please, please let our fellow mammals, the beautiful grizzlies, (back) into the territories they once traveled.

Thank you for this opportunity to offer my opinion.

██████████

Correspondence ID: 13583Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Shoreline, WA 98133
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 22:18:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I fully support the introduction of Grizzly Bears into the North Cascades range. It is beyond time to bring them back into the habitat.

I support a modified version of alternative C in the document ("Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation (Preferred Alternative)").

I do believe that 10(j) designation provides greater allowance for monitoring and managing the new population(s). I would like to see it modified so that "incidental taking" is highly restricted (if not totally).

Correspondence ID: 13584Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98026
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 22:18:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Alternative A: no action

Correspondence ID: 13585Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98177
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 22:19:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I fully support the introduction of grizzlies back into the North Cascades. It's an important step in bringing back wildlife that are native to our area. It would be a great privilege to be able to have these powerful animals back in our woods.

Correspondence ID: 13586Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 22:24:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am writing to express my concerns and reservations about the proposed grizzly bear restoration in our region, particularly from the perspective of a hunter who has spent my entire life enjoying the outdoors. From bird hunting in eastern Washington to turkey in Okanogan, elk in the Colockum, black bear and deer during the high hunt in the Methow. A variable like the grizzly bear is something I am absolutely against.

While I understand the importance of wildlife conservation and the desire to implore natural ecosystems, I believe that introducing grizzly bears could have significant negative impacts on both the hunting experience and the safety of outdoorsmen. The ramifications will fall on the Washington hunters and recreationalists. People voting in favor of grizzly introduction do not understand nor have they lived with such predator's before.

Safety Concerns:

Grizzly bears are known for their size and potentially aggressive behavior, especially when they feel threatened. This raises concerns about the safety of hunters who venture into the backcountry. Increased encounters with grizzly bears could pose

serious risks to human safety, leading to potential conflicts and accidents. Just this year, a deer hunting, scouting for a deer was mauled by a Grizzly Bear outside of Big Sky, Montana. Between 2022 and 2022 there were 8 fatal bear attacks. Yellowstone itself has one bear attack per year.

Impact on Game Populations:

Grizzly bears are omnivores, and their diet includes a variety of vegetation, insects, and, at times, large mammals. The presence of grizzlies in hunting areas will affect game populations, disrupting natural prey-predator dynamics and potentially reducing the availability of game species that hunters pursue.

Hunting Tradition:

Hunting has a deep-rooted tradition in our community, contributing not only to local economies but also to the cultural fabric of our region. The introduction of grizzly bears will alter the dynamics of hunting and outdoor activities, discouraging hunters and impacting the broader outdoor recreation community. The Pittman- Robertson Act provides funding for wildlife habitat, so I consider all hunters natural conservationists. A decline in hunters will threaten how the US decides on how to pay for conservation.

Livestock and Agriculture Impact:

Beyond hunting, the presence of grizzly bears could lead to increased conflicts with livestock and agricultural operations. This could create challenges for local farmers and ranchers who rely on these lands for their livelihoods. Eastern Washington and rural Cascade Range Washington is almost entirely dependent on agriculture.

Resource Allocation:

The financial and logistical costs associated with grizzly bear restoration are substantial. I strongly believe that these resources could be better utilized for other conservation efforts or addressing pressing issues within our communities.

Washington state previously passed a law banning the introduction of grizzly bears. This is the federal governments attempt to go around the wishes of the state of Washington. This is being done on a technicality. Please listen to those who will live out the consequences of these decisions.

In conclusion, while I appreciate the goals of wildlife conservation, I urge careful consideration of the potential consequences of introducing grizzly bears. It is crucial to strike a balance that ensures the safety of outdoor enthusiasts, maintains the hunting tradition, and supports the well-being of our local communities.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Correspondence ID: 13587Project:112008Document:132104

Address: North Bend, WA 98045
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 22:27:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I firmly oppose the introduction of Grizzly bears to the north cascades. I've yet to hear anyone present a compelling reason how this will benefit the ecosystem in WA. It only adds risk to people recreating in the mountains, especially those out solo.

The facts are indisputable, grizzly bears kill humans. It happens regularly in AK, MT, and WY. Why should we add WA to this list?

This is a terrible idea and I'm shocked it's even being considered by the NPS.

Correspondence ID: 13589Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Darrington, WA 98241
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 22:33:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The following updates are needed to the assessment to better guide decisions.

I support option A for the following gaps and failures of coverage of the current analysis:

1. Vegetation maps used to assess quantity of vegetation are of 30 years old and the landscape has changed significantly since then as clear cuts have filled in and many meadows have also grown in. A recent comprehensive analysis is needed. This vegetation study should include the abundance and not just the presence of these species listed. Many of those species are present but not abundant as they are in other ecosystems. The placement of the Skagit River Dams have further destroyed prime riparian lowland habitat that would sustain grizzly bears.

2. Identify the traditional diet of grizzly bears in the North Cascades. This is not covered in the EIS. WSU Bear lab has data and has tested bones where in the Puget Sound areas grizzly bears are 30-90% dependent on salmon for growth. What is covered in this EIS is the Isotope and diet analysis of potential introduced grizzly bear populations. I find it a failure that the prospective introduced population analysis is included but not the historical population's diet.

For references:

http://faculty.washington.edu/stn/ess_501/reading/Hilderbrand_Bear_stable_isotopes_Can_Zoo_1996.pdf "Information on the historical importance of salmon in the diet of grizzly bears would benefit the drafting and implementation of grizzly bear recovery plans"

"Historical use of salmon by Pacific Northwest grizzly bears While the recovery of historic spawning areas would benefit grizzly bear populations reintroduced to regions with reduced salmon runs, salmon are not essential for bear survival (Davis et al. 1986). In other ecosystems lacking salmon as a food resource, grizzly bears feed on vegetation, insects, ungulates, freshwater fish, and small mammals (Hamer et al. 1991 ; Mattson et al. 1991 ; Clevenger et al. 1992). However, studies have identified a strong positive correlation between the autumn mass of female bears and their reproductive success during hibernation (Rogers 1976; Stringham 1990). Bears' reproduction rate, one of the slowest of any terrestrial mammal (Bunnell and Tait 1981), is a critical factor in longterm population viability. Because spawning salmon are more nutrient dense than virtually any other food resource available to bears in the Pacific Northwest, grizzly bear recovery would be enhanced by simultaneous salmon recovery in the North Cascades and Bitterroot Ecosystem."

Currently, salmon populations are less than 10% of historical.

Furthermore, if grizzlies are introduced from non-salmon areas, yet there are salmon present, it increases the likelihood of failure due to Salmon Poisoning Disease. It is stated in the EIS about the Skagit and the number of salmon present attracting birds.

" Current recovery plans for grizzly bears in the North Cascades of Washington and the mountains of central Idaho, where infected salmon currently occur, call for using bears from several interior populations. We hypothesized that such bears with no history of salmon consumption will be sensitive to SPD."

<https://www.jstor.org/stable/26610350#:~:text=Although the current report is,the east side of the>

It would be better to introduce grizzlies from a salmon dependent species. .

3. In introducing grizzly bears not dependent on salmonids, we are creating our own idea of the "wild" and not trying to create the basis for the ecosystem that once existed that was able to support Grizzly Bears.

4. I find it concerning that the EIS includes fails to incorporate analysis of [ublished articles from the WSU Bear Lab that specifically researches large carnivores around North Cascades Grizzly Bears and how that may impact introduction.

5. There is no funding for the USFS to manage this, their staff has been cut over the last 30 years. The largest land manager

in the recovery area is the USFS. The USFS staffing has been decimated. No campgrounds on USFS lands on the west slope of the Cascades have bear boxes, bear hangs or bear infrastructure. There should be funding to go directly to the communities and agencies to adapt the infrastructure for this endeavor.

Correspondence ID: 13590Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 22:36:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in favor of restoring endangered and threatened species, but I am not in favor of restoring Grizzly Bears to the North Cascades.

Grizzly Bears can be vicious animals. Human encounters, if they go bad, can result in severe injury or death.

The Draft EIS underestimates the severity and frequency of human encounters with Grizzly Bears.

There are several stories of Grizzly Bear attacks and human death in the Banff, Canada area. The plan overestimates the increase in visitation and recreational use due to seeking Grizzly bears. There will likely be a decline in visitation due to safety concerns over encounters with Grizzly bears.

I have encountered several Black bears in the Lake Wenatchee area and the North Cascades while hiking. My concern over these encounters was minimal because Black bears do not tend to attack humans and I made sure to not provoke the bears. However, an encounter with a Grizzly might result in an unprovoked attack or chase if I accidentally entered a Grizzly bear's territory.

My neighbor at Lake Wenatchee was attacked by a Black Bear and sustained severe injury. If that bear was a Grizzly bear, my neighbor would likely be dead.

I request that Alternative A be adopted, which is the no action plan.

If the NPS goes ahead with placing Grizzly Bears in the North Cascades, I request that serious efforts to track Grizzlies, as outlined in the plan, are made. Furthermore, there should be a real-time website that informs the public of where the bears are located so that the public can be prepared if they encounter a Grizzly, or to avoid an area where Grizzly bears are. I would hope that efforts would be made to prevent Grizzly bears from entering residential areas.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 13591Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Arlington, WA 98223
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 22:36:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I prefer Alternative A, no further action. Allow Grizzly Bears to repopulate the North Cascades Ecosystem on their own. I would also prefer that the 10-j rule applied to option A, based on the plans to reintroduce Grizzly bears into the Canadian portion of the NCE.

The reasons for my preference are based on my study of the Selkirk Mountains Grizzly Bear Recovery area 2021 progress report and the North Cascades Ecosystem Draft Restoration Plan EIS. The introduction of bears into the Selkirk area has been marginally beneficial to the overall recovery efforts at best. The financial costs and the costs to the bears that were moved into the area or had to be relocated due to bear/human conflict post introduction is far too high for the nominal benefits. I think that the bears will suffer and conflict with humans will be more significant than the Draft EIS and FAQs are

acknowledging.

I do not think that the reintroduction plan is likely to be successful.

Habitat connectivity in the U.S. portion of NCE is increasingly fragmented and populated by humans. Grizzly bears face as many or more challenges immediately north of the U.S. border as they do to the south. The studies on the possible effects of climate change on an introduced population do not convince me that this plan has a high enough probability for success to justify the costs. More work needs to be done on habitat improvement and stabilization before a reintroduction is undertaken. Thank you for your consideration.

Correspondence ID: 13592Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98122
United States of America
Outside Organization: Seattle Hiking and Professional Networking Group Recreational Groups
Received: Nov,12 2023 22:37:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Subject: Urgent Plea to Prevent Grizzly Bear Reintroduction in Washington

To whom it may concern,

I am Grace. Im the Organizer of the Seattle Hiking and Professional Networking Group at Meetup.com. We are a hiking group with professional tech workers from Amazon, Microsoft and other professionals. We go hiking every weekend.

On behalf of the hiking group's 1105 members, Im writing to you with a sense of urgency and deep concern about the proposed reintroduction of grizzly bears in the North Cascades region, Washington.

While I understand the importance of conservation efforts, I firmly believe that reintroducing grizzly bears in Washington carries significant risks to the safety of hikers and people living around the areas and should not proceed.

Human Safety is Paramount:

Grizzly Bear Attacks: The potential for grizzly bear attacks on humans is a grave concern. Grizzly bears are formidable apex predators, known for their strength, unpredictability, and territorial nature. Encounters between bears and humans can lead to life-threatening situations. The safety of hikers and residents in reintroduction areas must be our top priority.

Evidence: Extensive studies and historical data show that grizzly bear attacks on humans are often severe and can result in injuries or fatalities.

Recent data and evidence from areas where grizzly bear populations have been reintroduced suggest an increased frequency of bear-human encounters, leading to a rise in grizzly bear attacks.

According to wikipedia.org, which shows a list of fatal bear attacks in North America, incidents of grizzly bear attacks have seen a noticeable surge in regions where reintroduction programs have been implemented.

For instance, Yellowstone National Park, states like Alaska and Montana, and places in Canada, which are homes to a grizzly bear population, have witnessed numerous bear-human conflicts, with several resulting in injuries and even deaths.

The safety of hikers should be a top priority, and we fear that the presence of grizzly bears in popular hiking areas could lead to unavoidable conflicts. These conflicts not only endanger human lives but also pose a threat to the bears themselves, as human-bear interactions often result in the euthanization of bears involved in attacks.

Please let hikers and the residents living there stay in peace. Why would you want to inflict fears and worries to people's life? The fears and worries of potential bear attacks because of the reintroduction of grizzly bears in human life just outweigh the

benefits of environmental conservation.

Economic Impact: The potential for bear-human conflicts not only endangers lives but also carries economic ramifications. In regions where grizzly bears are reintroduced, the fear of attacks can deter tourists, hikers, and outdoor enthusiasts. Businesses that depend on these activities could suffer financial losses, and local economies may face declines in revenue.

Alternative Conservation Strategies:

Habitat Preservation: Conservation efforts should prioritize the protection and restoration of existing grizzly bear habitats. This can be achieved in regions with less human population density, reducing the likelihood of conflicts.

Supporting Existing Populations: Instead of reintroducing grizzly bears into areas densely populated by humans, we can allocate resources to support existing bear populations in less inhabited regions. This would help ensure the survival of the species without exposing local communities to unnecessary risks.

Community Opposition:

Local Concerns: Many local residents and communities have voiced their opposition to grizzly bear reintroduction. They have legitimate concerns about the impact on their safety and way of life. It is imperative that these concerns are acknowledged and addressed.

Resource Allocation:

Efficient Resource Use: The financial and logistical resources required for grizzly bear reintroduction could be better spent on alternative conservation efforts. By investing in less risky strategies, we can protect the species without endangering the lives and livelihoods of those residing in reintroduction areas.

In light of these detailed concerns and the evidence of the danger that grizzly bears pose to human beings living around the area and hikers, I implore you to reconsider the reintroduction plan.

The responsible choice is to find alternative conservation strategies that do not jeopardize the lives and well-being of those residing in these areas. It is our duty to prioritize human safety while advocating for the conservation of these magnificent creatures.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. I look forward to hearing your response and hope for a reconsideration of this decision in the best interest of our communities and the grizzly bear's conservation.

Sincerely,

██████

References:

https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_fatal_bear_attacks_in_North_America

<https://komonews.com/news/local/grizzly-debate-over-bear-reintroduction-proposal-washington-pushback-national-park-service-fish-wildlife-federal-plan-darrington-danger-ecosystem-conflict-animal-mammal-public-comment-concerns-legislation-human-safety>

2021 Has Been a Year of Brutal Bear Attacks--And the Worst May Be Yet to Come
<https://www.fieldandstream.com/conservation/fatal-bear-attacks-2021/>

Correspondence ID: 13594Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 22:38:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have been a backpacker in the cascades for over 50 years. This included week long trips in wilderness with my child when he was as young as 5.

Don't ruin our forest for future generations!!!

I am completely against placing brown bears in Washington state.

I know that some are entranced by the Romantic Notion that we should walk in fear in wilderness.

Let them have that experience in Alaska. For a real thrill they can strap a dead salmon to their backs!

Correspondence ID: 13595Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98116
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 22:41:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a hiker I'm opposed to grizzly bear reintroduction in the North Cascades. They are not nearly as ecologically important as the wolf, while being much more of a liability for humans.

Correspondence ID: 13596Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98125
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 22:41:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm a female hiker, climber and backcountry skier. Introducing grizzlies in the North Cascades will fundamentally change the feeling and experience of recreating. They are apex predators. Even if the chance of a fatal encounter for any individual is low, it is a scary feeling knowing that it might happen, even if you're just lying in your tent at night like the couple in Banff this October. I'm worried this will reduce the hard won equity in the outdoors. I have little doubt that young guys and hardened gun carrying men will be not particularly worried about recreating in grizzly country. I know I would be scared, and many of my female friends would be too, perhaps because we are inherently more cautious even though we crush in the mountains. I would likely still venture into the mountains but not on my own and likely not on longer, harder more remote trips. I have been in Grizzly country in Alaska and Canada on backcountry expeditions. It is something I would undertake once a year with a larger group and experienced people, mostly guys. It would make me sad to see the growing equity in the outdoor community that welcomes people of all genders, experience levels and abilities curtailed, however unintentionally. I totally support Grizzlies having a habitat where they can thrive. However I feel Canada and Alaska with their vast areas of wilderness are more suitable for this. I support Option A. Even with that we will have some rare grizzlies in Washington given the Canadians will likely introduce some across the border. Let's see how that goes first before rushing things. Give us a chance to adapt.

Correspondence ID: 13597Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kingston, WA 98346
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 22:55:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzly bears are an essential piece of Pacific Northwest wilderness and should be restored and protected in their native habitat.

Correspondence ID: 13598Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Rockport, WA 98283
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 22:55:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a citizen who lives very near the area of consideration to restore the grizzly bear population, I am in hope that the bears will someday exist in the North Cascades range. But given the EIS plan to add the USFWS 10(j) rule and this being the preferred plan by the NPS as well, I do not support the EIS to capture and move grizzlies to the North Cascades.

Under a 10(j) rule, grizzlies that are fully protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in places like Montana could be taken from their homes, released into the North Cascades, and lose their previous protection. This is unethical and must not be allowed to happen.

The fact is, grizzly bears in the lower 48 states are threatened, and we don't have extra grizzly bears in the lower 48 states to capture and ship to the North Cascades, only to be killed.

A 10(j) rule makes it much easier to kill grizzly bears and treat a grizzly bear population in a way that the USFWS would not treat other grizzly bears in the lower 48 states.

A 10(j) rule also allows the USFWS to preclude any habitat protections which are necessary if bears are going to recolonize this landscape and eventually link up with other recovery areas.

A 10(j) rule also allows the federal agencies to avoid the normal ESA Section 7 consultation requirements, which otherwise require consultations among the federal agencies (in this case, especially the U.S. Forest Service) to avoid jeopardizing the grizzlies.

Unfortunately, USFWS hasn't done the legwork for preparing communities and recreationists for the arrival of grizzly bears through basic Bear Smart and coexistence measures, which just means that conflicts will be more likely--and the results will inevitably be dead grizzly bears.

For all these reasons, I oppose the reintroduction of the grizzly bears due to the planned use of a 10(j) rule for the proposed grizzly bear restoration work in the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 13599Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tulalip, WA 98271
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 22:59:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I feel that the population of Washington state has grown to a significant extent in recent years and with this population growth we've seen an enormous increase in the number of people recreating in remote areas. For this reason, I do not think that grizzly should be re-introduced to the North Cascades. There are just too many people now.

Correspondence ID: 13601Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 23:05:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am strongly in support of restoration of a viable grizzly bear population in the North Cascades Ecosystem and support Alternative #3.

As a naturalist, hiker and backpacker, I have spent a lot of time hiking in the North Cascades and also in places with grizzly populations like Yellowstone. I believe that the health of the ecosystem depends on restoration of as many of our native species as possible and that both natural systems and human beings are deprived without keystone species such as grizzlies. It is not very difficult to learn to look for bear sign, to carry bear spray, and to keep a clean camp, and I feel this is a small price to pay for the chance to glimpse a grizzly bear in our mountain meadows.

Thank you for working to restore grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 13602Project:112008Document:132104
Address: East Wenatchee, WA 98802
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 23:05:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE 'A' is the only reasonable path forward - "Continue with existing management practices".

The National Park Service and US Fish and Wildlife Service are proposing actions involving Grizzly bears that if enacted will have been implemented only through the agencies' willful contravention of Federal law, NPS Management Policy, and Washington state law. Both agencies are official Lead Agencies in the administration of the North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Environmental Impact Statement (September 2023).

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires Federal agencies to assess the environmental effects of proposed major Federal actions prior to making decisions. Federal law further mandates lead agencies that are privileged to publish Environmental Impact Statements to comply with the requirements of Code of Federal Regulations PART 1502 (Environmental Impact Statement). This process is required so that full and fair discussion of significant environmental impacts occurs. Clearly the public have been denied this opportunity. By its conduct and practice of omission of relevant information, and having concealed information from the public, intentional information hiding that has direct consequences to public safety, the National Park Service and US Fish and Wildlife Service are in violation of both NEPA and CFR Part 1502.

Grave consequences resulting from any agency Record of Decision that would place Grizzly bears onto public lands will include unnecessary human deaths and injuries to the public. Despite the available statistics of historical injuries and deaths available to NPS and FWS both of these agencies have been silent on these threats in the subject EIS as well as in public meetings that are now concluded. Withholding relevant information from the public, especially where that information is material to, and represents threats to public safety, is a serious breach of the public trust, one which will result in tragic outcomes to those who have been led astray by these agencies.

Examples of "information hiding" include empty bear spray canisters having been found next to the dead bodies of those killed by grizzlies; or despite viable populations of Grizzlies in Montana, Wyoming, and Idaho, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has ignored petitions by these three states to delist the Grizzly; or that the previous Director of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services stated before Congress that the grizzly is biologically recovered. The Director stated this based on the thousands of Grizzlies in Montana, Wyoming, Idaho, and Canada. In other words, for many years the Grizzly bear species has enjoyed a full recovery in these recovery zones and through their prolific breeding and enormous range expansion the management programs of NPS and FWS have been shown to be completely inadequate as evidenced by the increasing deaths and injuries, the majority of which are occurring outside recovery zone boundaries on private lands.

Citations of NEPA, CFR Part 1502, NPS Management Policy, and Washington state law:

Pursuant to CFR Title 40 Chapter V Subchapter A, Part 1502.2(b) states, "Environmental impact statements shall discuss impacts in proportion to their significance."

Pursuant to CFR Title 40 Chapter V Subchapter A, Part 1502.2(f) states, "Agencies shall not commit resources prejudicing selection of alternatives before making a final decision."

In accordance with NPS policy at Section 4.4.2.2 of the 2006 Management Policies Manual states: "The Service [NPS] will strive to restore extirpated native plant and animal species to parks whenever all of the following criteria are met: 2) The species does not, based on an effective management plan, pose a serious threat to the safety of people in parks, park resources, or persons or property within or outside park boundaries."

Section 1.9.1.4 of the 2006 NPS Management Policies manual emphasizes that human life must not be compromised, rendering analysis in the final NCE/EIS a necessity, and states: "The safety and health of employees, contactors, volunteers, and the public are core Service values. In making decisions on matters concerning employee safety and health, NPS managers must exercise good judgment and discretion and, above all, keep in mind that the safeguarding of human life must not be compromised."

The Revised Code of Washington (RCW 77.12.035) unambiguously prohibits transplantation or introduction of grizzly bears into the State, including Federal initiatives. RCW 77.12.035 states in part - "Grizzly bears shall not be transplanted or introduced into the State. Only grizzly bears that are native to Washington State may be utilized by the department for management programs."

Consequences of Grizzly bear attacks

As indicated herein, the following news reports are the consequences of Department of Interior out-of-control Grizzly bear

recovery programs, yet they represent a small subset of the number of actual incidences and severity of Grizzly attacks against humans and livestock.

2023 Grizzly / HUMAN CONFLICTS

OCTOBER 01, 2023 BEAR COMES OUT OF BRUSH AND ATTACKS 73-YEAR-OLD

SEPTEMBER 13, 2023 GRIZZLY CHARGES HUNTER UNTIL HE SHOOTS IT

SEPTEMBER 24, 2023 Persistent grizzly and her cub euthanized after break-ins

SEPTEMBER 11, 2023 Deer hunter shoots at attacking grizzly

SEPTEMBER 02, 2023 Grizzly killed hiker near Yellowstone

SEPTEMBER 06, 2023 Grizzly charges at hunters in thick brush, shot dead

AUGUST 30, 2023 Spooked grizzly charges anglers in Montana wilderness

SEPTEMBER 07, 2023 GRIZZLY KILLED WOMAN, EUTHANIZED AFTER BREAKING INTO HOME

SEPTEMBER 12, 2023 NAVY VETERAN, JAW TORN OFF IN HORRIFYING GRIZZLY ATTACK (AMBUSHED)

SEPTEMBER 10, 2023 GRIZZLY BEAR MAULS HUNTER IN CUSTER GALLATIN NATIONAL FOREST

AUGUST 30 2023 MONTANA MEN SURPRISE MOMMA BEAR WITH CUB

JULY 24, 2023 WOMAN FOUND DEAD IN MONTANA FOLLOWING GRIZZLY BEAR ENCOUNTER

ADDITIONAL GRIZZLY ATTACKS, PRIOR YEARS

SHED HUNTER KILLED BY GRIZZLY IN FIRST ATTACK OF 2022

Oct 21, 2022 GRIZZLY ATTACK ON 2 BOYS

WOMAN KILLED BY GRIZZLY IN CITY LIMITS, ripped from her tent, killed by a grizzly bear while camping

IN MONTANA, DEPT OF INTERIOR SECRETARY HEARS CONCERNS OVER GRIZZLY BEARS (OCT 7, 2019)

FIVE GRIZZLY DEATHS LAST WEEK ALL INVOLVED BEARS THAT WERE FEEDING ON CATTLE (OCT 14, 2019)

GRIZZLY ON ROCKY MOUNTAIN FRONT EUTHANIZED (OCT 11, 2019)

GRIZZLY BEAR EUTHANIZED AFTER GUNSHOT WOUND (OCT 8, 2019)

A FOURTH HUNTER IS ATTACKED BY A GRIZZLY BEAR WITHIN DAYS IN MONTANA (September 26, 2019)

GRIZZLY BEAR ATTACK IN WESTERN GRAVELLY MOUNTAINS (SEP 25, 2019)

SEARCH ENDS FOLLOWING BACK-TO-BACK GRIZZLY ATTACKS (SEP 20, 2019)

GRIZZLY BEAR ACTIVITY CLOSES GLACIER PARK CAMPGROUNDS, TRAILS (AUG 20, 2019)

OFFICIALS RELEASE DETAILS ON CABINET MOUNTAINS BEAR ATTACK (JUN 21, 2018)

INVESTIGATORS RECOUNT NOVEMBER GRIZZLY BEAR ATTACK (FEB 17, 2019)

14 GRIZZLIES EUTHANIZED THIS YEAR, DOUBLE THE 10-YEAR AVERAGE. (SEPT 11, 2019)

Correspondence ID: 13603Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Oakville, WA 98568
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 23:08:21

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live in and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

Furthermore, the 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Thank you for taking the time to keep our North Cascades wild!

Correspondence ID: 13604Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sultan, WA 98294
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 23:11:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: NOT in favor of reintroduction of Apex predator.
Please do not do this.

Correspondence ID: 13606Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Graham, WA 98338
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 23:16:10

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I oppose the reintroduction of grizzly bears into the North Cascades. Bad idea!

Correspondence ID: 13607Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 23:17:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I live in an area where Grizzlies are wanting to be re introduce. First, after reading the report, I don't see any proof that it will help our eco system. Where is the proof that it will help and bring balance?

Second, one of the only reasons I see the the benefit of re introducing grizzlies is because they were here before. When they were here, there were no major roads, increases population, and tourism. The eco system has also changed since they have lived in the area.

Third, what is the cost benefit of bringing them back. It will take a lot of man hours and money we do not have.

With these reasons, I am in favor of not reintroducing grizzlies to Washington State

Correspondence ID: 13608Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Woodland, CA 95695
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 23:22:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The purpose of the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE) Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Environmental Impact Statement (Plan/EIS) is to restore the grizzly bear to Washington's NCE, preferably with Alternative C, which includes a 10j-designated nonessential experimental population (NEP). Alternative C provides greater management flexibility in managing grizzly-human conflict situations.

My comments are:

- The Plan/EIS is responsive to NEPA requirements. It involved a great deal of communication, responding to earlier comments, and thorough evaluation. In my opinion, a great deal of dedicated effort by many people went into preparing the Plan/EIS and 10j documents, and identifying Alternative C (10j) as the Preferred Alternative.
 - I too prefer Alternative C for restoring the grizzly bear to the NCE. It seems to be the most effective plan and therefore has the best chance of succeeding.
 - Please move quickly to complete the ROD and 10j rulemaking.
-

Correspondence ID: 13609Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Maple Falls, WA 98266
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 23:23:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in favor of the Grizzly Bear Restoration plan. Grizzlies are indigenous to the North Cascades and its ecosystem. They can thus thrive there, and help the ecosystem thrive as well. Reintroducing them will also help to restore the Grizzly Bear population in North America more generally and reduce their endangerment. These are beautiful spiritual species and their presence benefits us all.

██████████
Maple Falls, WA

Correspondence ID: 13610Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98506
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 23:25:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears belong in the North Cascades. They lived on those lands and waterways long before the devastating impacts of colonization. Traditional knowledge and western science supports reintroduction as means to revitalize the ecosystems that are always under threat. Grizzlies are an essential predator to north cascades and with collaborative co-management with the tribes, state agencies, ranchers and rural residents, there is a pathway for living near and with them.

I grew up in the Cascades - hiking, fishing and camping. As an adult, I spend my entire summer in the North Cascades climbing in the most remote parts of the mountains. The forests, talus slopes, rivers and peaks are not mine to possess or control, they are the grizzly's - I'm a visitor. Rather than operating from a place of fear, I hope folks will support the reintroduction of these vital predators to their original homelands.

Correspondence ID: 13611Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Redmond, WA 98052-7219
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 23:25:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears should not be re-introduced to the North Cascades. There are two reasons for this:

1. Grizzly bears, by any objective measure, are no longer endangered. The population of grizzlies in the area of Yellowstone National Park has increased from 136 at their low point to an estimated 728 today. That's more than a five-fold increase. Meanwhile, there are some 16,000 grizzlies living in British Columbia and 31,000 in Alaska. By no stretch of the imagination can populations of these bears in such numbers continue to be considered "endangered." Thus, there is no compelling reason for the re-introduction of grizzlies into the North Cascades.

2. Grizzly bears threaten human hikers and campers. Yes, it is true that encounters between grizzly bears and humans are very rare. However, when such an encounter does occur, the likely result is death to the human. Furthermore, even in the absence of any actual encounters, the fear factor is significant and carries its own weight. Even those who advocate for the re-introduction of grizzly bears advise hikers to "be aware," to stay alert to the terrain and to whether it's possible to see around the next bend, to lookout for bear tracks, to stay away from noisy streams that could drown out the sound of approach, to make noise like hand clapping or bell ringing, and finally, to carry bear spray. None of this advice comes for free. Doing any of these things carries a real cost in degrading the experience of a pleasant, anxiety-free, and peaceful hike. Wildlife experts are, in effect, asking hikers and campers stay on high-alert while in the backwoods, to engage in behaviors that meaningfully reduce their enjoyment, and to be apprehensive rather than serene. None of this would be significant were grizzlies actually endangered but, since they are not, it cannot be justified.

Please do not make the hiking and camping experience in the North Cascades materially worse in pursuit of an unnecessary goal.

Correspondence ID: 13612Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Carnation, WA 98014
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 23:30:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Comments on the North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan EIS:

The document failed to analyze the true impact of grizzly bear introduction and ultimate grizzly bear populations on the human environment.

- Public safety and other impacts were often approximated based on data from other Grizzly Bear Recover Zones (GBRZs), but unlike the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE) none of these are immediately adjacent a major population center like the

Puget Sound Basin. Additionally, several heavily used highways access the very heart of the NCE namely, SR 20, US 2 and I90. The hundreds of overflow-vehicles lining SR 20 on weekends around trailheads is a testament to the intense recreational interest and use of these wild lands. Lines of hikers and their dogs use the popular trails along the crest of the Cascades. Estimates of use in this area are underestimated if only because not everyone signs the trail logs. The EIS seems to rely heavily on Yellowstone Park statistics regarding bear/person interactions citing the park's large visitor use. However, the data doesn't reveal that the great majority of those visitors are primarily driving along the roads and hiking heavily used boardwalks to popular hot spring features. You can't compare experience at Yellowstone Park to the NCE, Yellowstone has been in the business of people & bear Management for over a hundred years. Also, unlike Yellowstone the NCE has no big herds of ungulates to prey upon.

- The EIS underestimates the likely impacts to access caused by the ultimate grizzly bear populations. Road closures are common in other GBRZs to protect the animals, especially during the spring season.
- Public education will not necessarily prevent bear/person interactions because prevention techniques are often ignored by recreationists (note innumerable photos posted to the web).

The EIS fails to analyze the potential for introducing invasive species into our most pristine wilderness and Park lands here in the Cascades. Bears and the traps will be transported from areas far away from the NCE, likely from areas know to have invasive weeds and animal/human diseases. What is the potential for spreading invasive species (plant & animal) and diseases (ie, tick-born or hoof/chronic wasting disease) on or in the traps or helicopters, or in the bear's feces or fur?

The document suggests that there is great value in returning the grizzly bear, a so-called apex predator, more quickly to the NCE than it would occur under the no-action alternative. This argument is not convincing. There exist no great herds of ungulates in NCE which are in desperate need of control. And, even so, healthy and widely distributed populations of other large predators are already present; black bears, cougars and wolves. The claim is made that some people will feel good just knowing the animal is roaming the country. There are those that get the same romantic feeling about free-roaming wild horse and burro herds ranging across the West. Unfortunately those populations are wreaking havoc on the range lands managed by the US Bureau of Land Management and US Forest Service. Despite real and ongoing resource impacts the agencies' attempts to manage that situation has utterly failed, stopped dead. (Perhaps there is where the grizzly bears should be shipped).

We fiercely support the No-Action alternative. If, as the EIS claims, the NCE is so attractive for grizzly bears, they will come on their own and there will be no guilt or blame. We have no confidence that the agencies will properly manage an "experimental population" of grizzly bears in the best interests of the people that are most likely to be affected, recreationists, ranchers, farmers and the local residents. Like Washington wolf "management" the effort and the cost will more likely be placed on the farmer or rancher to manage the bears. And any effective management action proposed by the agencies will no doubt be stymied by special interests welding the T&E Species Act.

Correspondence ID: 13613Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98107
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 23:34:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in support of the re-introduction of grizzly bears to the north cascades ecosystem, however I think that there are some issues that need to be seriously considered in relation to the re-introduction. I think that human disturbance to the ecosystem from monitoring should be as limited as possible to prevent the disturbance of organisms living in the north cascades that could be sensitive to noise or other human disturbances. Also, I think increase public education about grizzly bear safety is crucial to preventing harm to humans and bears.

Correspondence ID: 13614Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Onalaska, WA 98570
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 23:35:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Both alternatives B and C have a goal of 200 bears. The whole purpose of the EIS is to work toward a population of 200 bears yet the EIS does in no way support that number. I see nothing in the in the EIS that supports the longer term goal of 200 bears or the 5 to 10 year goal of 25 grizzly bears. I would think with the stated goals of alternatives B and C that the EIS should clearly justify those numbers in great detail. I don't see that in the EIS.

The accepted definition for a population is evidence of 2 adult females with cubs or 1 adult female tracked through two litters. A reasonable alternative may to introduce of 2 adult females with cubs or 1 adult female tracked through two litters and manage them under section 10(j) of the ESA. After the initial relocation to meet the accepted definition for a population there would not be any need for more relocations. Maybe the longer term population would be better at 10 bears rather than 200 bears. With something like 60,000 wild grizzly bears are already located throughout North America it makes no difference if there are 10 or 200 bears in the north Cascades and 10 would be easier to manage and have less of an adverse impact on other uses in the area. The EIS should clearly support the number of bears relocated and the goals of the project.

The EIS does not adequately address the impact on recreation that introducing 200 bears will have. I see that in the bear management areas in Yellowstone that there are significant multiple month periods of use restrictions on recreational faculties. In Yellowstone to reduce encounters between bears and humans, the park restricts certain activities in many areas. Restrictions may include area closures, trail closures, a minimum group size of four or more people, day use only, or no off-trail travel. I don't see any place in the EIS where any similar restrictions were discussed. I would think that introduced grizzlies in the north Cascades would come with significant impacts on recreation.

See: <https://www.nps.gov/yell/learn/management/bearclosures.htm>

Correspondence ID: 13615Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98116
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 23:38:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Bad idea. Keep the grizzlies where they are already managed. Not in Washington. If they migrate here then great but don't interfere and try and over correct. Washington is too populated

Correspondence ID: 13616Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98506
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 23:43:41

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Reintroduction of grizzlies to the north Cascades is an important step in restoring large predation and the benefits that come from that for an ecosystem. As a regular recreator in the area, it is exciting and also adds an additional layer of thoughtfulness to my visits. I hope that the fear and vitriol some feel toward the plan doesn't keep the reintroduction from moving forward. Thanks for your thoughtful planning of this long term habitat and ecosystem maintenance and improvement.

Correspondence ID: 13617Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Issaquah, WA 98027
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023 23:46:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think bringing the grizzlies back and restoring the balance of nature is a good idea.

Correspondence ID: 13618Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mill Creek, WA 98012
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 23:47:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a resident of WA state I am vehemently against this, I do not think this is a good idea at all to reintroduce grizzly bears into the ecosystem. It is very sad that they do not freely roam anymore in WA, but the answer is not to then unnaturally add them back in. As a former resident of WY I know well how detrimental it was to wild life when wolves were reintroduced and know there have been issues in CO for the same reason. Reintroducing grizzlies would have a major impact on the existing wildlife (leading to a decrease in the natural prey in the areas) in WA and most likely the human population as well. Sadly, the people of WA are not accustomed to grizzly bears and I think it would be dangerous to reintroduce them, this is already an issue in WY especially with non locals not understanding the danger of these wild animals.

Correspondence ID: 13619Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 23:49:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am opposed to the restoration of grizzlies in the North Cascades. One inevitable outcome of a negative human to bear interaction will be trail closures and reduced access. Alberta pursued a similar initiative in Banff in a high human use area and indeed lengthy closures ensued. The North Cascades region already has a rather short practical visitation season that is shrinking as the duration of smoke season lengthens. Meanwhile, the population of Washington State, and therefore visitation and recreation in the area, will only continue to rise. I believe resources will be better spent preserving the existing populations of thousands of grizzlies in places such as rural Alaska, British Columbia, Yukon, etc. where fewer humans reside rather than spent attempting to establish a new very small population in the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 13621Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,12 2023 23:58:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a hiker and backcountry user throughout North Cascades National Park, I fully support a full reintroduction effort.
Thank you

Correspondence ID: 13622Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98506
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I understand the benefits to habitat of reintroducing grizzly bears to the North Cascades. However, I have great concerns about the benefits to the grizzly bears if reintroduced to the North Cascades. Their "original" territory is no longer what it once was. It is now cut by a highway as well as many smaller roads. There are more people living in what was once bear country. There are myriads of hikers traipsing throughout the North Cascades, particularly the 1000+ annual PCT hikers. Inevitably, there will be human-bear encounters that will not work out well for neither the humans nor the bears involved. Any negative outcome from a human point of view will result in the destruction of the bear. Or the bear who the humans think is the bear involved, but may, in fact, not be said bear. Bears who become problems, due to their encounters with humans, will be killed. Bears who are mistaken for problem bears will also be killed.

Another consideration that the "original" territory and habitat is being markedly altered by climate change. While there are over a half million acres in the North Cascades, there have also been massive fires that have destroyed the habitat and made it unlivable for bears (and others) for many years. Who knows if these burned areas will ever restore themselves to good bear habitat or if the population of bears will find themselves with less and less available territory. This will not bode well for the bears themselves and will push them into increased encounters with the humans who will also have less territory for recreation and living.

I have concerns that this effort to reintroduce grizzlies to the North Cascades is being done to make the humans feel better rather than to truly benefit the bears. We need to be honest about the current situation and look at the grim future that lies before us.

I support Option A: do nothing. However, if grizzly bears do find their way into the North Cascades, I would support enacting a rule under section 10(J) of the Endangered Species Act at that time to allow agencies more flexibility in dealing with the bears.

I do not support Option B at all.

If it is inevitable that grizzlies are reintroduced, it must be with the additional rule under section 10(J) to allow best possible outcomes for the bears.

Thank you for considering my remarks.

Correspondence ID: 13623Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Washington state has the most dense population of all western states. Even the most remote parts of the state receive droves of outdoor recreation seekers. Therefore it is my opinion that the forced re-introduction of the grizzly bear will lead to a loss of human life. I think it is inevitable that grizzly and humans will cross paths often, an example of this occurred in Stevens County this fall, when a juvenile grizzly broke into a hobby farm chicken coop. Also, the re-introduction of grizzly bears would only further polarize, small communities against government " idealist" policies (they already think we have a predator management issue in this state).

I am a hunter that is for gun control. I am concerned that the re-introduction of grizzly bears would also give Second Amendment radicals another reason to claim they need semi automatic weapons to protect themselves. I do not own a handgun, but even myself would have concern venturing into grizzly country with only bear spray and a hunting rifle.

Correspondence ID: 13624Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Selah, WA 98942
United States of America

Outside Organization: BCHW Non-Governmental

Received: Nov,13 2023

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not support bringing in grizzly bears into Washington State. I believe it is an irresponsible thing to do. For the safety of all users of our back country trails and surrounding private lands, livestock, etc. I must voice my concerns.

If these bears were not born in our state, then why should they be relocated here, in an area where the people who live here clearly don't want them.

I don't understand the reasoning. Many users don't want the bears and it makes me wonder who benefits from this? It's certainly not the public. And it's not the confused bears, being disrupted from the only environment they know, to an

unknown location.

How many of these bears will die because they cannot adjust to the unknown area? How many will try to return to where they were born. How many will need to be killed because they became a killer of livestock, just trying to survive? How many will be illegally hunted for sport? How many will injure or kill innocent people using public lands?

Why don't the public have a solid voice in making decisions? Why does a few individuals get to decide for the rest of us who actually live and use these public lands, who oppose the relocation of bears?

For several years, I packed tools for the Naches Forest Service. I also packed thousands of trout into the high mountain lakes for the Naches Hatchery. I continue to volunteer with BCHW, doing trail maintenance work parties throughout the year. I'm an avid packer and packing instructor. And I do not want to see the introduction of grizzly bears that weren't born here.

Correspondence ID: 13625Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of grizzly bears in the North Cascades. We have a responsibility to try to recover their populations. I believe it can be done with minimal risk to humans. As a hiker and backpacker, I'm willing to take greater precautions in the backcountry. It's important to work to restore wildlife populations and their habitats through this type of action. It must be accompanied by actions to reduce and mitigate climate change.

Correspondence ID: 13626Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kirkland, WA 98083
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a person that enjoys backpacking and hiking in the North Cascades I do not want to encounter more grizzly bears in the area. If you want families to enjoy the area with small children and make it accessible to all please do not introduce more grizzly bears to the area. I don't want to have to carry a gun to protect my family. Even environmental groups are advising against the introduction of Grizzly Bears.

It seems like you have already made up your mind but Grizzly Bears are not the solution to the problems you are trying to solve. We don't need more attacks on humans. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 13628Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Omak, WA 98841
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: TO: NATIONAL PARK PLANNING/NCE GRIZZLY
RE: RE-INTRODUCTION OF GRIZZLIES, TO WA

I am against it. Though I know, that sometimes Grizzly bears have positive interactions with humans, this is exceedingly rare.

We are trying to do our salmon recovery. I personally think that this would be far less controversial, and far less dangerous. I have native American relatives: a niece, nephew in law and great nephew, who are native Americans. And, they love fishing for salmon.

It really does seem to me, that re-introducing Grizzly bears would hurt our salmon recovery, because Grizzly bears love

eating salmon.

Also, the North Cascades Forest is near the North Cascades Highway. And, this could cause some fatal auto crashes.

Bears do not have a good sense of personal boundaries. They have been known to enter homes, even with closed and locked doors. They will not stay within the boundaries of the forests. They will go where they want to go.

I do not think that people would feel safe, to go camping, in the Met-how area, or in the Conconully area, if bears were re-introduced here. I know, that I personally would not.

I personally would have no problem with some of the bears wandering here on their own, from Canada. But, I would not wish to have them intentionally placed here, in a group.

Though our state law is not legally binding, at a federal level, I think that this should make our feelings and wishes quite clear. We do not want them here. We are the ones who would have to deal with the results of this, because they would be in our area.

I think, that what we resent, is having this imposed on us, by unelected bureaucrats. This is very hurtful to us. We feel a bit forced, and exploited, by this.

Sincerely,


Omak, WA

Correspondence ID: 13629Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Kirkland, WA 98034
United States of America
Outside Organization: None Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do not reintroduce Grizzly Bears into WA. These animals are too dangerous for farmers, hikers, rural area children, and live stock. I need not say anymore.

Correspondence ID: 13630Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please please please please don't add more grizzly bears to the region. Just the thought of that gives me crippling anxiety

Correspondence ID: 13631Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Environmental Impact Statement for the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE). As someone who lives and recreates in the heart of the NCE recovery zone, I am keenly interested in this project, and recognize that it may affect me personally. My property is in the

Twisp River watershed, and adjoins U.S. Forest Service (USFS) land. When not at home, I can often be found hiking, running, skiing, and backpacking on USFS lands throughout the northeastern portion of the NCE.

I support restoration of the NCE population of grizzly bears, but have some concerns about your proposed action. First, the biggest threat to grizzly bear recovery in the NCE as it see it is conflict with humans - specifically, conflict arising from predator intolerance and people's reluctance to change their behavior for the protection of humans and bears alike. I feel the EIS glosses over this important issue. Second, I am concerned about the proposed 10-J rule for this population, as it provides a loophole for people opposed to the plan to lawfully kill grizzly bears, and for the USFS to implement large-scale land management projects without needing to consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) regarding these actions' effects on this species.

To flesh out my first concern, the NCE recovery zone is not yet very "bear aware," and I do not see any consequences in place for people whose actions lead to black bears getting habituated and ultimately killed. Here in the Methow Valley, while some landowners and communities have made a concerted effort to minimize bear conflicts through proper food and garbage storage, electric fencing, and other means, countless others have not. Last year, a neighbor shot and killed a black bear who walked into their carport, where their garbage was stored (Methow Valley News 2022). As far as I know, they did not receive a citation of any kind - and in fact, I am not aware of any food storage orders in place where I live. According to the EIS, both action alternatives will entail "improved sanitation on public lands," but few actual changes are proposed. The short discussion of this project element on page 32 mostly identifies measures that will "continue to be implemented"; the only new measures I could find were required signage at developed campgrounds and prominent trailheads, along with the suggestion that food storage orders by the USFS "may be required."

This is not enough. The proposed action should include focused collaboration with the USFS, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), county agencies, and other decisionmakers to ensure that grizzly bears will not be introduced into a population sink of bad human behavior. The outcome will hopefully be a combination of incentives (e.g. bearproofing assistance), legal mechanisms (e.g. food storage orders and enforcement thereof), and public awareness campaigns to prime people for coexistence with grizzly bears and improve outcomes for people and bears alike.

On to my second concern, about the 10-J rule. The EIS implies that the 10-J rule is necessary to allow for "deterrence, incidental take, research and recovery actions, relocation of grizzly bears, preemptive relocation to prevent a conflict that appears imminent or in attempt to break habituated behavior of bears lingering near human-occupied areas, and conditioned lethal take" (see Executive Summary page iv). But in reality, all of these actions are permitted under existing ESA mechanisms applicable to grizzly bears, i.e. the Section 4(d) special rule, Section 10(a)(1)(A) recovery permit program, and Section 10(a)(1)(B) incidental take permit program. In other words, these actions may be lawfully undertaken without the proposed 10-J rule, and are routinely done so in other ecosystems where no 10-J rule is in effect.

But where the proposed 10-J rule departs from existing ESA mechanisms is on the "conditioned lethal take" front, in that it establishes more scenarios in which private citizens can kill bears or ask wildlife managers to kill bears at their behest. In Washington, this is no small thing. A vocal minority of ranchers has taken a serious toll on wolves, both within and outside of the law. A single rancher rattling cages at WDFW resulted in that agency's lethal control of 29 state-listed wolves between 2012 and 2020 (National Geographic 2020), notwithstanding a generous compensation program for livestock depredations (WDFW 2023), and the fact that the rancher's cattle are grazed on the Colville National Forest. Another prominent ranching family close to my own home in Twisp are convicted poachers of ESA-listed wolves (Seattle Times 2012). Anti-predator sentiment is alive and well in and around the NCE, and I think that resource agencies are too focused on appeasing these interest groups. The proposed 10-J rule feels like an example of this -- and it sets the stage for more appeasement in the future.

That the 10-J rule means the USFS can skip Section 7 consultation for grizzly bears in their large-scale land management projects is also an issue for me. Locally, I've been quite concerned about several forestry projects being implemented by the Methow Valley Ranger District. Although the projects all have restoration components, they also establish extractive commercial thinning operations, the results of which may now be viewed in the Buttermilk and Libby Creek drainages and resemble clearcuts more than selective harvest. . These projects will result in landscape-scale modification of NCE grizzly bear habitat, and may conceivably also result in the take of individual bears. It is critical that the USFS be required to consult

with the USFWS on the potential effects of these projects on grizzly bears, and that the USFWS be given a mechanism, through the Section 7 process, to impose project-specific protective measures for this species.

In conclusion, I support Alternative B, but with additional project elements folded in to improve human behavior in the NCE recovery zone prior to and during the translocation effort. Thank you for your time and consideration.

References:

Methow Valley News. 2022. A 'desperate year' for bears in search of sustenance. Available at: <https://methowvalleynews.com/2022/09/28/a-desperate-year-for-bears-in-search-of-sustenance/>

National Geographic. 2020. Controversial killing of wolves continues in Washington State. Available at: <https://www.nationalgeographic.com/animals/article/washington-state-wolf-killing-controversy>

Seattle Times. 2012. Three sentenced in wolf poaching case. Available at: <https://www.seattletimes.com/seattle-news/3-sentenced-in-wolf-poaching-case/>

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW). 2023. Compensation rules for depredation events. Available at: <https://wdfw.wa.gov/species-habitats/at-risk/species-recovery/gray-wolf/compensation#:~:text=For confirmed depredations by wolves,that multiple animals are missing.>

Correspondence ID: 13632Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Gig Harbor, WA 98335
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We had a Cattle Ranch near Loomis, WA and our 400 head of cows grazed on BLM land just South of the Canadian Border.

We had enough trouble with Cougars, so introducing Grizzly Bears as well is a very bad idea,

Just release them in Washington DC!

Correspondence ID: 13633Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Loomis, WA 98827
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 01:04:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am very strongly opposed to air dropping grizzly bears in the Cascades which includes a major portion of Okanogan County. It is certain that the bears will migrate to the Sinlahekin and Similkameen Valleys in search of food. Which is where we live, work raise our families and food to feed the city people who think this such a nifty idea. As a livestock producer I already deal with three predators, cougars, wolves and black bears. I have livestock losses each year from cougars and every few years from black bears. We do not need another apex predator in our county. Our family moved to this valley about 110 years ago and it has only been in the past few years we have faced wolf and cougar predation and now it is increasingly frustrating our government and the enviors are dumping another apex predator on us.

This seems to just be another loosing battle in the war on the West, and is frustrating because the interviews and press releases would have us believe this already a done deal, and this comment process is just so the agencies can check a box and the concerns of folks who will have to live with bears really have no say in the matter. We passed a state law to prevent this from happening and this disregarded as well.

The arguments for grizzly are weak, subjective and silly "It will complete the wilderness" or "it will cultivate the wilderness leading to greater biodiversity". What it will do is make the agencies and folks in their condos feel warm and fuzzy, while those of in the recovery area face livestock and human predation, regulations on our day to day activities and a sense of caution or fear as we go about our lives. And understand we will defend our families and livestock from these predators if necessary.

Correspondence ID: 13634Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Walla Walla, WA 99362
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 01:20:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think introducing grizzly bears to the north cascades would be great. I definitely think that most people would be and are scared of the grizzly bears attacking them and their animals, but under the ESA section 10(j) it would be easy to take out bears that attack people or who are aggressive. Seeing and knowing that grizzly bears are roaming free in the mountains would make me very happy, because traveling in the backcountry of the north cascades is an incredibly rewarding experience mostly due to the animals and wildness that they foster, and grizzlies would only add to that appeal. Grizzly bears would create a very healthy and ecologically rich environment for everyone to enjoy, and my pride for my home mountains would skyrocket; I would not hesitate to recreate in the north cascades.

Correspondence ID: 13635Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98101
United States of America

Outside Organization: Private citizen Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 01:22:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The salmon runs that sustained the original Cascade Grizzly bear populations no longer exist in sufficient quantities. Grizzlies prefer to reside in valleys along waterways. Given the human population density in the lower areas adjoining the Cascades, confrontations will be a big problem. I am very familiar with the growing Grizzly problem in the State of Montana. There are now too many bears. Bringing more to the Cascades at this time is asking for trouble.

Correspondence ID: 13636Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Walla Walla, WA 99362
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 01:23:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think Alternative C is a good option as it still allows for the beginnings of the restoration process but at a more monitored state that many are concerned about. However I am worried about what impacts classifying this plan as a nonessential experimental population will create logistically and legally.

Correspondence ID: 13637Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 01:23:41

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am thrilled and fully endorse the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascade range in Washington State. These magnificent creatures were once a natural part of this habitat until extensive hunting nearly wiped them out. For thousands of years, they played a crucial role in this ecosystem. Let's responsibly steward the natural beauty of this region and restore the biodiversity that was present until recently.

To that end, I give my support to the proposal "Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation." The proposal would bring up to 25 non-problem grizzly bears into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade and manage them as an experimental population.

Thank you,
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 13638Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Nordland WA, WA 98358
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 01:23:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzlys need to reclaim their NW territory and we need to help them! I whole-heartedly support restoring this Apex predator's neighborhood. We can co-habitate. The wilds will be a better place.

Sincerely,
[REDACTED]

Environmental Warrior

Correspondence ID: 13639Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Kirkland, WA 98034
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 01:32:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hello, though I do not live in the area impacted by the return of grizzly bears to the area I am an avid outdoors person and visit often
. I believe it is in the best interest of the ecosystem to return these apex animals to the environment.
. Thank you

Correspondence ID: 13640Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mukilteo, WA 98275
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 01:35:19
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The reasons for releasing an apex predator into the North Cascades if lame. The few bears released will make no differences in the spreading of seed. Hunting can help manage animal populations, and hunters will pay for the opportunity. The threat to park users, and the potential for the bears to leave the park and threatening landowners and livestock is not worth the risk. Do not do it. Stop wasting taxpayer dollars on poor ideas.

Correspondence ID: 13641Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98125
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 01:48:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I oppose entirely to the plans of re-introducing grizzly bears in Washington state. The re-introduction of grizzly bears in Washington raises legitimate concerns for our safety and enjoyment of outdoor activities, such as hiking and backpacking in the beloved North Cascades.

Grizzlies, considered more dangerous than black bears, pose a higher risk due to their larger size, aggressive behavior and greater strength. Their confrontational nature sets them apart from the generally more cautious black bears. Furthermore, grizzly bears have longer claws and robust build, potentially leading to more lethal attacks.

Incidents, such as the recent tragic case in Canada where a couple was fatally mauled by a grizzly bear despite using bear spray, highlight the inadequacy of such deterrents against grizzlies. The prospect of needing to carry firearms for personal safety during hikes is an unwelcome consideration. It not only disrupts the peaceful enjoyment of nature but also introduces additional dangers on the trails.

I would like to continue enjoying the beauty of the North Cascades and all the hikes in WA without concerns about encounters with aggressive and dangerous wildlife. The possible re-introduction of grizzly bears could deter us from exploring and enjoying these areas / national park.

Correspondence ID: 13642Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98125
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 02:02:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly oppose the plans to reintroduce grizzly bears in Washington state. The prospect of grizzly bear reintroduction raises valid concerns regarding safety and the enjoyment of outdoor activities, including hiking and backpacking in the cherished North Cascades.

Grizzlies, known to be more dangerous than black bears, present heightened risks due to their larger size, aggressive behavior, and greater strength, setting them apart from their generally more cautious counterparts. Additionally, grizzly bears' longer claws and robust build increase the potential for more lethal attacks.

Incidents like the recent tragic case in Canada, where a couple was fatally mauled by a grizzly bear despite using bear spray, underscore the inadequacy of such deterrents against grizzlies. The idea of needing to carry firearms for personal safety during hikes is unwelcome, disrupting the peaceful enjoyment of nature and introducing additional dangers on the trails.

I wish to continue savoring the beauty of the North Cascades and all the hikes in Washington without concerns about encounters with aggressive and dangerous wildlife. The potential reintroduction of grizzly bears could dissuade us from exploring and enjoying these areas or the national park.

Correspondence ID: 13643Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mount Vernon,, WA 98273
United States of America

Outside Organization: Self Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 02:13:08

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to support Grizzly Bear recovery efforts In the great North Cascades Ecosystem including the National Park and adjacent wilderness and recreation areas. As I have written to support past efforts to restore this fascinating and charismatic bear to it's former range in past years, I do so again today. I have lived with brown and grizzly bears working for Katmai and Denali National Parks as well as southeast Alaska, where the bears are abundant. I know the joy as well as the challenges it takes to coexist with such mighty creatures. The beauty and fascination of sharing space with Brown Bears in Katmai at close range, as well as McNeil River Brown Bear Sanctuary, make me a constant advocate for bringing back the bears to the North Cascades and importantly educating the public about them, not letting fear-mongering or foolishness misinform the public. It is critical the public understand the real animal, not just the exaggerated stories and worst outcomes some would have one believe are every day experiences in bear country . I was in contact with brown bears daily at Katmai for four full summers and Denali for a summer working and daily hiking as well as five summers visiting and backpacking there. Interactions with the bears were always exhilarating, and some of the very best times in my life in the

backcountry as well as around the camp community. People and bears can coexist with a little effort to learn about their habits and ours.

I support The Alternative C proposal with the 10j designation and rule to best bring back the bears. To find a bear or two some day on a slope in the high cascades, back in a place they once roamed is an objective worthy of all the repeated efforts of supporters who refuse to give up. Count me in.

Thank you for the opportunity to make my voice heard,


Former backcountry ranger and Naturalist in Katmai, Denali and volunteer at McNeil River, naturalist guide in Prince William sound and southeast Alaska.

Correspondence ID: 13644Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 02:31:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am a hiker who loves seeing wildlife in the beautiful spaces of this state. Humans eradicated the grizzly bears from this area and it's time that we worked to carefully bring them back. There is plenty of space for humans and grizzlies to share.

Correspondence ID: 13646Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98109
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 02:44:52

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a frequent visitor of the NCNP, I support what is best for the ecosystem and the return of the native Grizzly

Correspondence ID: 13647Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Monroe, WA 98272
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 02:45:58

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No thank you. We want to safely enjoy the outdoors. No grizzlies please

Correspondence ID: 13650Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Renton, WA 98059
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 03:00:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Although I consider myself a wildlife and habitat conservationist, I do not approve of this move to reintroduce the grizzly bear to the North Cascades. I'm a huge supporter of introducing wolves, supporting the wolverine population, etc. I even feel that natural reintroduction of grizzlies is fine, (i.e., if they cross in from Canada or Idaho). However, I simply know that grizzlies are much more aggressive to humans than the typical black bear. In Idaho, Montana, Alaska, and Canada (grizzly bear zones), these areas all have greater contiguous wild lands to support grizzlies and prevent less people-bear contact. There are many more hikers and recreators (i.e., Western WA population) in a smaller land mass.

Likely, there will be more encounters. Importantly, many of these recreational hikers have little knowledge of grizzlies and their more aggressive behaviors, as compared to black bears, (particularly mothers/cubs; during mating season; searching for food before winter). There is a reason that hunters and hikers in Idaho, MT, and Alaska all carry guns. Bear spray is only effective when a grizzly is not determined.

I think this policy is naive. Black bear do many of the same things that grizzlies do - dispersing seeds, digging grubs, omnivorous behaviors. However, they typically don't threaten human life during encounters. Obviously, grizzlies don't always threaten human life, but their huge size and more aggressive behaviors create unnecessary risks. For Wa State and U.S. Forest Services not to add bear boxes and places to raise backpacks on hikes and camping areas, if there is a reintroduction is also irresponsible.

Correspondence ID: 13652Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Edmonds, WA 98020
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 03:51:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To Whom It May Concern:

I'm an avid hiker and a hike leader for hundreds of folks through Meetup and Facebook groups. I love feeling safe outdoors, but strongly believe we should reintroduce grizzlies to their former home(s) and use whatever strategies likely successful to see if we can replenish their populations. I have come to understand the difference between "selfish" and "self-care." Selfish is what some simplify to mean putting one's "wants" above others' (and other species' or the ecosystem's) "needs", while self-care is putting one's needs above another's wants. This concept helps me know where I stand when thinking about the impact and waged power differentials of humans upon each other and the world in which we live, including when talking about the reintroduction of grizzlies into their former home of Washington.

Grizzlies and other wildlife that are endangered are often largely (if not entirely) in a state of decline because of our arguably "selfish" human behaviors. We build and build and build, and hunt and push indigenous species into smaller and farther corners as we propagate and take over, eat up their food supplies, and so on -- almost parasitically. For centuries, others who acted as better environmental stewards lived with the idea of looking back and forward "seven generations," taking only what they needed and nothing more so that they could honor the past and sustain the future. This helped maintain a balance and harmony with and respect for wildlife, showed gratitude to our ancestors and cared responsibly for our progeny.

While I love to finish a hike alive so I can go again the next week, I hike knowing there are always risks -- from black and brown bears to wild cats to wildfires to rolling my ankle and falling off a cliff. While grizzlies are no joke, I do not think my or anyone else's comfort and safety trump their survival. If they were declining absent unnatural human impact, that would be one thing. But it is because of us that we have this issue, and we can't keep making the same selfish decisions. We also cannot do nothing and act like we aren't complicit if grizzlies don't show an uptick in their numbers despite being given a bear version of a reservation to adapt to.

We must make reparations for the past and be better stewards of the earth -- including for each another and across species. Otherwise, how are we any different from a bully doing whatever they want because they hold more power? How is this different than pushing the indigenous peoples from their lands onto other lands and expecting them to adapt? Why is our thriving more important than their survival? Our comfort and convenience more important than their existence? And what eventual larger, unknown impact might this have on the overall ecosystem that ends up biting us back?

I recognize that we are built with an innate lizard brain and the fight or flight response, and shifting towards higher risk is unnerving. That said, I also greatly fear a world where we recklessly solve complicated issues with regard for our wants over others' needs, where we seek the greater safety of the rampant species over the one spiraling towards extinction.

Absent other solutions and alongside a responsible implementation of their reintroduction into Washington State and elsewhere, I SUPPORT bringing grizzlies back here to their previous home. I thank you for your consideration of my opinion and through review of the evidence and others' arguments for or against this policy.

Correspondence ID: 13653Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Vashon, WA 98070
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 04:27:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Not only are they predators - but also: they haven't been in the Cascades for a very long time now: so just what is the rationale all of a sudden to having them in the Cascades??? Only because you are a biologist who is overly fascinated and absorbed and all wrapped up in this thing. WELL - OTHERS AREN'T!!!!!!
STOP IT!!! CUT IT OUT!!!

I want to be able to hike in the Cascades WITHOUT BEING MAULED TO DEATH BY YOUR STUPID GRIZZLY BEARS - and every deer, every other animal & livestock likewise!!!!!!

Correspondence ID: 13655Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Yakima, WA 98904
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 04:43:55

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly oppose the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem because of the negative impacts on people. People will not be able to enjoy the North Cascades National Park when they have to worry about being attacked by a grizzly bear. Grizzly bears will cause stress and anxiety in people who never see a grizzly bear. We are already living in stressful anxious times. We do not need another source of stress on people. The human population of Washington state was much lower when humans and grizzly bears coexisted here.

Correspondence ID: 13656Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Vashon, WA 98070
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 05:01:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Why do you want to reintroduce grizzly bears in the Cascades???
Just what is your problem???

Why do you think that this would be necessary???

Not only are they predators - but also: they haven't been in the Cascades for a very long time now: so just what is the rationale all of a sudden to having them in the Cascades??? Only because you are a biologist who is overly fascinated and absorbed and all wrapped up in this thing???

WELL - OTHERS AREN'T!!!!!!!!!!

STOP IT!!! CUT IT OUT!!!

I want to be able to hike in the Cascades WITHOUT BEING MAULED TO DEATH BY YOUR STUPID GRIZZLY BEARS - and every deer, every other animal and livestock likewise!!!!!!

Why do you want to reintroduce grizzly bears in the Cascades???

Just WHAT is your problem???

Why do you think that this would be necessary???

Not only are they predators - but also: they haven't been in the Cascades for a very long time now: so just what is the rationale all of a sudden to having them in the Cascades??? Only because you are a biologist who is overly fascinated and

absorbed and all wrapped up in this thing???
WELL - OTHERS AREN'T!!!!!!!!!!
STOP IT!!! CUT IT OUT!!!

I want to be able to hike in the Cascades WITHOUT BEING MAULED TO DEATH BY YOUR STUPID GRIZZLY BEARS - and every deer, every other animal and livestock likewise!!!!!!

What a weird, inconsiderate notion and frame of mind - honestly!!!!!!
Have them in your fenced backyard, if you think you cannot live without them!!!

Correspondence ID: 13660Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Vashon, WA 98070
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 05:18:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Why do you want to reintroduce grizzly bears in the Cascades??
Just WHAT is your problem???
Why do you think that this would be necessary, or desirable???

Not only are they predators - but also: they haven't been in the Cascades for a very long time now: so just what is the rationale all of a sudden to having them in the Cascades?? Only because you are a biologist who is overly fascinated and absorbed and all wrapped up in this thing???

WELL - OTHERS AREN'T!!!!!!!!!!
STOP IT!!! CUT IT OUT!!!

I want to be able to hike in the Cascades WITHOUT BEING MAULED TO DEATH BY YOUR STUPID GRIZZLY BEARS - and every deer, every other animal and livestock likewise!!!!!!

What a weird, inconsiderate notion and frame of mind - honestly!!!!!!
Have them in your fenced backyard, if you think you cannot live without them!!!

Correspondence ID: 13671Project:112008Document:132104
Address: North Bend, WA 98045
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 07:10:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am a hard NO!

It's absurd to call this a "Reintroduction", grizzlies reside along the border now, nothing good will come of having more grizzly's in Washington. We already have major ISSUES with predator's, black bears, cougar, Wolves, even the coyote population has increased. All while the ungulate population decreases. The amount of interactions between black bears, cougars, Wolves and people has increased. Why would we want to further complicate this problem, this proposed plan lacks common sense and is based on emotion.

The "reintroduction" and management of Wolves is deceitful. It's not difficult to image this project going any different.

We most certainly don't need more grizzly's in Washington,

Correspondence ID: 13673Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lewes, DE 19958
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 07:48:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I fully support the return of Grizzlies to the North Cascades. This must be done in a way that is compatible with the Wilderness Act and the Endangered Species Act(ESA). I oppose the use of a 10(j) rule for the restoration of Grizzly bear populations. Grizzly bears deserve full ESA protections, in the lower 48 states. Helicopter flights and collaring for continuous harassment of bears that have been abducted, drugged, and stranded in an unknown Wilderness with no protections from would-be slayers, is no way to ensure the restoration of healthy bear populations. Stealing Grizzly bears from their home range and forcing them upon an unsuspecting ecosystem would hurt both environments, while stifling population recovery efforts that have taken generations to come to fruition.

Stop installing infrastructure in Our wilderness areas!
Stop taking motorized vehicles beyond the borders of Our Wilderness!

Before long, Grizzlies may soon repopulate the North Cascades of Washington by their own accord. So, recovery efforts would be better spent ensuring sufficient wildlife corridors are present, for bears to freely traverse the U.S./Canada border. Aid communities in the region, and visitors, by providing resources and training in BearSmart practices.

We will never be in a better position than the Grizzly bear itself, to decide the best place to roam. Any Grizzly in "the Lower 48" deserves full protections under the ESA. Stop managing Our Wildernesses and utilize ethical stewardship practices! Include all locally relevant Tribal nations and communities in decision making, especially as it pertains to Grizzly bear population recovery efforts.

Thank you for your attention.

Correspondence ID: 13674Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Chelan, WA 98816
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 08:15:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please reintroduce grizzlies. They are an important part of the health of our forests and alpine regions. I am an avid outdoors recreationalist and I spend plenty of time in the backcountry. Our high alpine regions will never get the proper fertilization and soil tilling without this keystone creature. We must reverse the damage that our previous generations have done.

Correspondence ID: 13676Project:112008Document:132104

Address: camano island, WA 98282-6618
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 08:21:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Comments on the North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan EIS:

The document failed to analyze the true impact of grizzly bear introduction and ultimate grizzly bear populations on the human environment.

- Public safety and other impacts were often approximated based on data from other Grizzly Bear Recover Zones (GBRZs), but unlike the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE) none of these are immediately adjacent a major population center like the Puget Sound Basin. Additionally, several heavily used highways access the very heart of the NCE namely, SR 20, US 2 and I90. The hundreds of overflow-vehicles lining SR 20 on weekends around trailheads is a testament to the intense recreational interest and use of these wild lands. Lines of hikers and their dogs use the popular trails along the crest of the Cascades.

Estimates of use in this area are underestimated if only because not everyone signs the trail logs. The EIS seems to rely heavily on Yellowstone Park statistics regarding bear/person interactions citing the park's large visitor use. However, the data doesn't reveal that the great majority of those visitors are primarily driving along the roads and hiking heavily used boardwalks to popular hot spring features. You can't compare experience at Yellowstone Park to the NCE, Yellowstone has been in the business of people & bear Management for over a hundred years. Also, unlike Yellowstone the NCE has no big herds of ungulates to prey upon.

- The EIS underestimates the likely impacts to access caused by the ultimate grizzly bear populations. Road closures are common in other GBRZs to protect the animals, especially during the spring season.
- Public education will not necessarily prevent bear/person interactions because prevention techniques are often ignored by recreationists (note innumerable photos posted to the web).

The EIS fails to analyze the potential for introducing invasive species into our most pristine wilderness and Park lands here in the Cascades. Bears and the traps will be transported from areas far away from the NCE, likely from areas know to have invasive weeds and animal/human diseases. What is the potential for spreading invasive species (plant & animal) and diseases (ie, tick-born or hoof/chronic wasting disease) on or in the traps or helicopters, or in the bear's feces or fur?

The document suggests that there is great value in returning the grizzly bear, a so-called apex predator, more quickly to the NCE than it would occur under the no-action alternative. This argument is not convincing. There exist no great herds of ungulates in NCE which are in desperate need of control. And, even so, healthy and widely distributed populations of other large predators are already present; black bears, cougars and wolves. The claim is made that some people will feel good just knowing the animal is roaming the country. There are those that get the same romantic feeling about free-roaming wild horse and burro herds ranging across the West. Unfortunately those populations are wreaking havoc on the range lands managed by the US Bureau of Land Management and US Forest Service. Despite real and ongoing resource impacts the agencies' attempts to manage that situation has utterly failed, stopped dead. (Perhaps there is where the grizzly bears should be shipped).

We fiercely support the No-Action alternative. If, as the EIS claims, the NCE is so attractive for grizzly bears, they will come on their own and there will be no guilt or blame. We have no confidence that the agencies will properly manage an "experimental population" of grizzly bears in the best interests of the people that are most likely to be affected, recreationists, ranchers, farmers and the local residents. Like Washington wolf "management" the effort and the cost will more likely be placed on the farmer or rancher to manage the bears. And any effective management action proposed by the agencies will no doubt be stymied by special interests welding the T&E Species Act.

Correspondence ID: 13677Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 08:24:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am not in favor of reintroduction of grisly bears into the Cascade Mountains. Why would you do that? They will be a danger to recreationists forever if you do that. Not even one human life is worth reintroducing them, nor even a serious mauling. Its like allowing people to own weapons of war/automatic machine guns. What a stupid idea. I can't be bothered to try and find it but is there is of the number of people will be killed and mauled by grislies when the have reached full population? That would be a sobering statistic. I did see one statistic where, I think in Yellowstone, the chance of being killed by a grisly is 1:2.7 million. But that includes every car bound visitor to that park. What is the chance for those who enter the wilderness backcountry; backpackers, hunters, birders, etc..... Those who want to see grislies in the wilderness can go there (to Yellowstone) with its sparse population. Don't put them so close to a major urban center with throngs of people seeking solice in the mountains of Washington. As the population continues to explode in this region we will need all open space we can save from development and industrial interests and it should not have man eating bears. We have done fine without Grislies for 100 years. Continue that success.

Correspondence ID: 13678Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ephrata, WA 98823
United States of America
Outside Organization: ██████████ Farms Inc. Business
Received: Nov,13 2023 08:29:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The reintroduction of a second Apex predator would be another blow to the Ag industry, not to say the everyday folks that like to play in the hill of the evergreen state, just watch the news and see what the other states are dealing with that already have the Grizzly bears, the wolves have already worked on the ungulate population's, so we add one more predator in there they will becoming down into our backyards, where our kids now are free to roam as they please, so what is the cost to bring them into our state, someone's child? the family pet, our maybe a family member? or a dear friend!!!!

But the biggest impact will be on the cattle producers. we are already having losses to wolves, cougars, So why one more?

Correspondence ID: 13679Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Addison, TX 75001
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 08:41:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please bring Grizzly bears back to the Cascades! Help nature by balancing the ecosystem and give the bears another home.

Correspondence ID: 13681Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellevue, WA 98008
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 08:48:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am against the reintroduction of grizzly bears into the North Cascades. We must protect the safety of the people and visitors of the area.

Correspondence ID: 13682Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826-9371
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 08:48:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I've reviewed the draft and given this matter a lot of thought. I wholeheartedly support bringing the grizzly bear back to the North Cascade region and I believe Alternative C will offer the best path forward for humans and grizzlies.

I've listened to arguments against this proposal. They primarily rely on fear of potential harm, to people or livestock. I understand, however, that grizzlies eat mostly plants and want nothing to do with us humans. I've hiked where grizzlies live in Alaska and Montana. In Alaska, I was lucky enough to see a grizzly while hiking. I'll never forget the experience. It was unadulterated awe. Something like seeing Mount Rainier for the first time on a clear day. Can you imagine our region without Tahoma? We are imaginatively impoverished without grizzlies here. By reintroducing them, we nurture our ecology of awe.

The paradox is that we'll be safer by accepting a small potential for risk because there is no question in my mind that we are in trouble without grizzlies in the region. They belong here. They were here until we shot, trapped, and poisoned them to extinction. I've studied ecology for many years in my job and understand well that every species has a role to play in the ecosystem. An ecosystem is like a body in which wholeness is essential. In other words, our North Cascades ecosystem has

been missing an organ for about 30 years. We have a chance to make our region healthy. Who will benefit from bringing grizzlies back? We humans will. Our children and our grandchildren will, in addition to all the beings of our region.

As they live their essential lives, grizzlies till the soil as get dig for rodents, disperse nutrients, and help huckleberries and other plants spread to new areas. As they come back to where they belong we humans will learn to live with them like all the other people who live alongside grizzlies in other areas.

Beyond this reasoning, I believe that we have a moral obligation to bring back a species we extirpated. Like my Native friends whom I've talked to about this issue, I view reintroduction as a kind of reparation.

Thank you for the chance to comment.

Correspondence ID: 13684Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Saint Paul, MN 55108
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 08:52:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I recently learned about the Grizzly Bear restoration plan for the North Cascades. As someone who grew up in Central Washington and as someone who will return to live there next year in retirement, I'm thrilled at the prospect of grizzlies returning to Washington State. I've had the good fortune to see grizzlies in Alaska, Montana and Wyoming where their presence greatly enriches the hiking and backpacking experience. During the years I lived in Montana I was happy to see that people of most political stripes were thrilled to have grizzlies around. They knew it gave places like the Bob Marshall Wilderness a sense of the wild. Grizzlies are animals to treat with respect and caution, but that's no reason to not have them as a part of the ecosystem where they lived for thousands of years. I believe, with care and caution, conflicts with landowners nearby will be minimal. I wince when I see media sources depict bears as some sort of serial killers. They are not. The bears I've encountered have either ignored me or run away when I passed nearby. Please go forward with your recovery plan. I believe Alternative C would be my first choice.

Sincerely,


In Minnesota where we only have black bears

Correspondence ID: 13685Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Hoffman Estates, IL 60169
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 08:55:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: For the long-term success of grizzly restoration, natural recovery measures must also be included in both action alternatives thus reducing the need for wilderness degrading activities that are also ultimately bad for bears. This requires work with partners in British Columbia to ensure that grizzlies have corridors to move back and forth across the international border and to prevent a small North Cascades grizzly population from shrinking over time and becoming inbred.

An alternative that combines natural recovery with population augmentation under full ESA protections should also be analyzed.

The no action alternative has many good Bear Smart components on how people and communities can coexist with grizzly bears and these coexistence measures should also be included in both of the action alternatives. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents and visitors for bears, particularly given the dramatic growth of the human population in the region and rapidly increasing recreation pressures in the Park.

Correspondence ID: 13686Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 08:56:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support grizzly bear recovery to the North Cascades region. The grizzly bear is an iconic species and belongs. The hazards to humans though not inconsequential are small in the big picture of things. I have spent time camping, hiking, and canoeing in grizzly bear country and accept the risk as a price to pay for a chance to see one of these creatures.

Correspondence ID: 13687Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Anacortes, WA 98221
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 09:02:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm concerned about the advice to wear bear spray and carry a hand gun, combined with reminding people to wear bear bells, make noises, look around in heavy brush (what else is there in NC except in upper alpine meadows), etc. I have friends who already brings guns on hiking and skiing trips - this seems like an invitation for more and more such behavior , and a setup for many accidental shootings- someone pulls the trigger out of fear of a grizzly around every corner. Let's be honest with ourselves- who among us who has spent weeks in grizzly county hasn't had that constant fear and jitters? It's the lack of having a gun that kept me from foolishly shooting myself in the foot or, much worse, shooting a friend. A friend did have hikers pull a gun on his dog in bear country in the sierras - they told him "they thought it might be a grizzly." The population has soared here over past few decades. I'd like people to weigh the benefit for bear recovery against the cost of likely stressful and dangerous human behavioral changes in response to just the idea of grizzlies being here now in Washington.

Correspondence ID: 13689Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lynnwood, WA 98087
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 09:07:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear National Park Service,

I am writing to express my sincere concerns regarding the proposed reintroduction of grizzly bears into the North Cascades ecosystem. As an avid hiker and a mother, my experiences in the North Cascades have always been enriching and fulfilling. However, the prospect of encountering grizzly bears in these trails is deeply unsettling.

As a solo female hiker who often hikes with my young preschool-aged child, safety is my utmost priority. The presence of grizzly bears significantly raises the risk of potentially dangerous encounters, which could deter many hikers, especially those with children, from enjoying this pristine wilderness.

While I understand and appreciate the ecological importance of grizzly bears and the efforts to restore natural balance, I believe it is also crucial to consider the safety and concerns of the park's visitors. Many individuals, like myself, who have always considered the North Cascades a safe and peaceful retreat, will now be faced with the fear of these formidable predators.

I urge the National Park Service to consider alternative solutions that balance ecological restoration with the safety and well-being of park visitors. Perhaps more extensive studies could be conducted to find a compromise that ensures both the preservation of wildlife and the safety of hikers.

Thank you for considering my concerns. I hope a harmonious solution that respects both the natural world and the visitors who seek to enjoy it can be found.

Sincerely,

Correspondence ID: 13690Project:112008Document:132104

Address: St. John, WA 908
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 09:16:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am strongly against the grizzly bear restoration plan. Releasing grizzly bears in Washington state would be detrimental to every agricultural industry of the state. Grizzly bear are going to destroy our deer and elk herds that are already being destroyed by the wolves that were reintroduced. In my opinion we need to be stewards of our land and we won't be able to do that when the cattle rancher is run out of business because he can't deal with the wolves and bear killing his animals. Wildfires will get to be worse in the region because the cattle that used to graze and manage the forest will be run out of business. Grizzly bear are going to travel where the food is and the food as in deer and elk are of very few numbers across the whole state. So with that being said where are the grizzly's going to go? They are going to go into more populated areas to find food like horses sheep goats or anything you might have around your house. All in all I feel that releasing the grizzly bear is very dangerous and the whole idea of it needs to be abolished completely.

Correspondence ID: 13691Project:112008Document:132104

Address: SedroWolley, WA 98284
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 09:16:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not support this proposition. The north Cascades have long been a world class recreation retreat. Already featuring diverse wildlife. By re-introducing grizzly bear there become a risk to the millions of people that visit each year.

Currently the north Cascades has both black bear and cougar as it's top predators. As we all know black bears are scary cats and not a big deal. Cougars are selective predators. As long as you take the right precautions they leave you alone. Grizzly bears on the other hand are monster killing machines.

Also seems like a waste of money.

Correspondence ID: 13692Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lynden, WA 98264
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 09:16:55

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not support the re-introduction of the Grizzly, an apex predator, into the North Cascades ecosystem. There will be many deleterious unintended consequences.

Correspondence ID: 13695Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Vashon, WA 98070
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 09:31:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: You see: IT'S JUST YOU!!!

YOU want this.

YOU would get an absolute kick out of it - it would be YOUR sugar high!!!!

And - YOU would totally freak out if they then finally "procreate" - and small predators would maul and feast on their prey that they just killed!!!!

Some summer, when I went to Montana, I took a few salmon hatchlings with me from the Puget Sound to let them out in the lake bordering the home of the elderly couple whom I took care of.

That was absolutely sound - and not such a bizarre, weird idea as reintroducing predators in our precious Cascades.

The predatory Grizzlies are not needed there. They have no right to be there anymore.

----- Servheen has spent 54 years living in grizzly country. As a former bear biologist for the Fish & Wildlife Service, he has had a front-row seat to pitched battles over grizzly reintroduction.

-----Servheen: Look for long claws on the front feet. The size is pretty impressive compared to a black bear.

----- For recreationists, Servheen's advice is simple: The first thing to do when you hike in grizzly country is be aware - he said.

Awareness, to Servheen, means not wearing headphones, oblivious to the world, but rather staying in tune with your surroundings. He recommends asking yourself questions, like: Are you in a meadow with good visibility or are you on a brushy trail where you can't see around the next bend? Are you hiking near a noisy stream that might inhibit a wild animal from hearing you approach? Have you seen any bear tracks or scat on the ground?

----- McEwan: I carry bear spray like I carry a headlamp and first aid kit. It's just part of the outfit. I've always got it on the chest band of my pack, ready to rock and roll.

----- Matt Bowser's advice (director of Wild Montana Stewardship) is, "Carrying a handgun is a popular choice for bear defense among recreationists in Montana".

BUT - I HAVE NO HANDGUN.

AND IT IS NOT GRIZZLY COUNTRY ANYMORE - it's our precious little bit of refuge and recreation space!!!!!!

And when I am hiking, I don't want to constantly be aware and in anticipation of that there might be a grizzly around the next corner - or having to rely on bear spray (which is NOT 100 percent reliable!!!).

And I don't want to constantly clap my hands, or use bells - I just want to have my PEACE and quiet - absorbing the wonderful surroundings, the fresh clean air, the wildlife - and recharge my spirits, recover, and just enjoy the pristine ambience - TOTALLY without predatory bears!!!!!!

Correspondence ID: 13696Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 09:31:55

Correspondence Type:Web Form

Correspondence: No thank you-

Correspondence ID: 13697Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98501
United States of America

Outside Organization: Washington Forest Protection Assoc. Non-Governmental(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,13 2023 09:33:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: November 13, 2023

Superintendent
North Cascades National Park Service Complex
810 State Route 20
Sedro Wooley, WA 98284

Re: Public Comment on Draft North Cascades Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Environmental Impact Statement

Dear National Park Service:

Washington Forest Protection Association (WFPA) is a forestry trade association representing large and small forest landowners and managers of more than four million acres of productive working forests, including timberland located in the coastal and inland regions of the state. Our members support rural and urban communities through the sustainable growth and harvest of timber and other forest products for U. S. and international markets. For more information about WFPA, please visit our website at www.wfpa.org.

WFPA appreciates the opportunity to comment on the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) proposal to establish a nonessential experimental population (NEP) of the grizzly bear within the U.S. portion of the NCE in the State of Washington under section 10(j) of the Endangered Species Act (ESA). WFPA is also submitting these comments on the National Park Service (NPS) Draft North Cascades Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/Environmental Impact Statement ("Draft Grizzly Restoration Plan").

WFPA has several members who manage working forests adjacent to Management Zone 1 in the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE) as well as Management Zone 2 in NE Washington and the South Cascades. We previously submitted written comments to the NPS dated October 21, 2019, on the Draft Grizzly Restoration Plan and ask the NPS and FWS to consider that comment letter as well as this letter. Previously, WFPA requested the NPS and FWS ensure that non-federal landowners receive assurances to minimize their legal risk from voluntarily supporting grizzly recovery efforts, either through a 10(j) rule or programmatic safe harbor agreement. WFPA appreciates the FWS and the NPS proposing an alternative consistent with that request. Therefore, if the FWS and NPS opt to proceed with an action alternative under the Draft Grizzly Restoration Plan, we strongly recommend the preferred Alternative C, which designates a NEP of grizzly bear in the NCE under Section 10(j) of the ESA.

While we recommend Alternative C, we believe there is opportunity to further clarify assurances for WFPA members and other nonfederal landowners conducting otherwise lawful activities consistent with the Washington State Forest Practices Act and Rules or pursuant to an approved Habitat Conservation Plan, Enhancement of Survival Permit, or similar federal authorization.

Specific recommended clarifications include:

- Any nonfederal lands within the proposed boundary of Management Zone 1 and Management Zone 2 should be explicitly identified as Management Zone 3, relying on a definition rather than the Figure 1 map.
- Forest managers, loggers, and others conducting otherwise lawful forest management activities, including persons engaged in supplemental feeding or depredation control of nuisance black bears in accordance with applicable state laws and rules should be included in the list of those authorized to conduct non-lethal deterrence activities.
- Permissible incidental take on nonfederal lands should include any habitat modification resulting from otherwise lawful forest management activities consistent with the Forest Practices Act and Rules and/or pursuant to an approved Habitat Conservation Plan, Enhancement of Survival Permit, or similar federal authorization.
- The nonlethal incidental take reporting requirements due to habitat modification resulting from otherwise lawful activities are impractical and should be exempted from reporting
- Finally, road use permits granted from U.S. Forest Service to nonfederal entities where the road in question is not located on National Forests should not need ESA Section 7(a)(2) consultation. At present the exemption appears to apply only to National Forest Lands.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment, should you have any questions I can be reached at [REDACTED].

Correspondence ID: 13700Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 09:36:48

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I understand that the Grizzly Bear is and was an important part of the North Cascade Ecosystem. Reintroducing the bears would seem like a good thing to do. Unfortunately, I don't see that plan working out very well for recreation in the North Cascades. I foresee that there will be much conflict and perhaps even deaths because of it.

I will have to comment in a selfish manner in that respect and say that no, I don't think that the reintroduction of the Grizzly Bear into the North Cascades is a good idea.

Thanks for considering my comments.

Correspondence ID: 13701Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 09:43:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Park Service,

I am writing in support of the Alternative B plan to reintroduce grizzly bears to the North Cascades. I am an avid backpacker and hiker who has spent countless hours on the trails in North Cascades National Park. I also run a nonprofit, Reconnect Earth, that organizes summer backpacking trips for college-age students in the park and in Mount Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest. As someone who is very familiar with the North Cascades ecosystem and its value as a recreational, educational, and conservation resource, I believe it is time to bring the area's top predator back.

Restoring grizzly bears to the North Cascades will fill a gap in the food chain that has been left empty for decades. While the presence of these bears will mean park users need to take some additional precautions, we know that people and grizzlies can co-exist peacefully. I spent four years living in Montana, where I backpacked in grizzly country in places like Gallatin National Forest near Yellowstone. I know that it is possible to live with grizzlies by following common-sense practices, and that there is no reason this couldn't be done in the North Cascades.

Grizzlies have been virtually extinct in Washington State for too long, and it is time to return them to the North Cascades, which has a basically healthy wild ecosystem ready to support their needs. Please implement Alternative B and return the top native predator of this stunning mountain range to its rightful place in the food chain.

Thank you for considering these comments,
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 13702Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lake Stevens, WA 98258
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 09:46:56

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The reintroduction of Grizzly Bears will have an environmental and social impacts on the ecosystem. In addition to impact on the public safety given the increased recreational activities in the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 13703Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Vancouver, WA 98661
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 09:48:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No grizzlies! Leave them where they are they do not need to bothered anymore. Keep the area safe for humans.

Correspondence ID: 13705Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 09:54:15

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to express my support of Grizzly Bear restoration in the North Cascades Ecosystem. The grizzly bear has been an integral part of the ecosystem in the North Cascades for thousands of years prior to the predator eradication programs by humans in the 20th century. I have lived in Washington State for my entire life and in the the Methow Valley since 2017. Many of us choose to call this place home due to a love of big, wild places, places where the grizzly bear belongs. Due to decreased habitat and natural/human-made barriers (rivers, interstates, railway, etc.), there are few suitable places in the US (and even fewer in the lower 48) that provide a habitat where the grizzly can thrive. The NCE is one of these special places! As an avid backcountry traveler, I understand that humans are apprehensive about recreating in grizzly habitat. However, the wilderness is their home and a place that we are fortunate to be able to visit. Humans can easily adapt their behavior to maintain safe practices in grizzly country. We have many examples of these successes in Glacier National Park, the greater Yellowstone ecosystem, the Bob Marshall Wilderness, the Tetons, and of course Alaska!

There are a multitude of reasons to reintroduce the grizzly, including ecological benefits, creating greater genetic diversity in the threatened grizzly population and honoring the heritage and history of this region.

Please move forward with grizzly reintroduction!

██████████

Correspondence ID: 13706Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Federal way, WA 98023
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 09:59:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am absolutely AGAINST of this idea.

There is enough predators in forest.

Correspondence ID: 13707Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Darrington, WA 98241
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 10:02:56

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Environmental Impact Statement, North Cascades Ecosystem

Comments:

Historical information used for estimated past NCE grizzly bear (gb) populations is inaccurate and not representative of the westside, north cascades. Hudson Bay trading records would reflect a much larger area than the NCE. River travel was common for the era, the Columbia River and its tributaries go into British Columbia and Montana. Skins records would reflect a much larger area than the EIS uses. Cash or goods were paid only at the trading posts and sellers would travel very long distances to deliver skins. Past population estimates are too speculative for analysis in an EIS.

The historical westside NCE gb population was likely roaming bears from the eastern, more suitable habitat. Gb do not get much mention in local westside accounts. Personally, knowing one person treed by a gb in 1949 and knowing how far and often he ranged in the backcountry does not give me confidence that gb were a significant part of the westside NCE.

Food sources in the westside North Cascade mountains are not likely sufficient to support the desired grizzly bear population. The information on available food for westside North Cascades in the EIS is inadequate. The likely outcome of gb introductions will be the seeking of most plentiful food sources which means human food and garbage. Estimated carrying capacity for gb is not accurate enough for determining suitable recovery populations. Once bears associate humans with food, problems will occur.

Mortality of transplanted gb is underestimated. Capture and transport of gb will adversely impact existing populations through social losses. Mortality of transplants will mean more are needed to accomplish population goals. Disturbance estimated due to transport and drop off of transplants will be greater than the EIS states.

Acres of NCE available to support gb are inaccurate. The whole of the NCE is not useable/preferred habitat for gb. Land in the NCE is not equal. The EIS fails to break out the most suitable meadow, open forest conditions in acreage figures.

Environmental justice. This section is condescending and superficial, not suitable for an EIS. It fails to address issues that will impact rural communities near the NCE boundaries. It is dismissive of potential impacts.

Suggestions that gb may increase tourist visitation are not backed by fact. If Yellowstone NP is used as a basis for those statements, the EIS fails to note that most tourism in YNP is by car. In Alaska, Denali bus tours and viewing platforms above salmon runs provide the most opportunities for bear viewing. NCE is not comparable. The EIS fails to use appropriate figures in the analysis.

Human interactions with gb are not well analyzed in the EIS. Historically humans have hunted in groups and are the apex predators. Hunting interactions with humans change bear behavior as do interactions with armed humans. Transplants from nonhunted gb populations will see humans are prey or food sources. Most humans in the NCE are not armed and do not wish to carry firearms or even know how to use them. Human and gb interactions are not adequately analyzed in the EIS.

The EIS fails to document that humans have used what is being called "wilderness and untrammled" since time immemorial. This is either willful ignorance or condescending towards the first peoples.

If the ESA intent is to restore functional populations of listed species in their historical range perhaps California, which features a grizzly bear on its flag, would be more appropriate as a restoration area.

There are robust populations of gb in the greater Yellowstone ecosystem, Alaska and northern British Columbia. The case for successful population augmentation in the NCE is weak and speculative. The EIS fails to take an impartial hard look at the consequences of the proposed action and does not contain enough factual analysis to draw realistic conclusions.

██████████
██████████
Darrington, WA 98241

Correspondence ID: 13708Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98125
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 10:06:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I've been hiking and mountaineering in the Cascades for 15 years. I have enjoyed the feeling of safety knowing that I don't have to be on alert for grizzly bears. Some of the rationale is concerning to me. I don't understand what exactly is being gained here. For those that want to reintroduce the animal, if and when there is a death due to a grizzly encounter, are you willing to live with this on your conscious? Please do not do this so that we can recreate these beautiful areas safely.

Correspondence ID: 13709Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98190
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 10:08:03

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am against the reintroduction plan. It will needlessly endanger people using the wilderness for recreation or professional activities.

Correspondence ID: 13711Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lakewood, CO 80215
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 10:14:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I want to begin by saying that I fully support the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades ecosystem. I think this is an important step in restoring historically degraded ecosystems at the hands of Americans and the US government. I would like to see the USFWS implement Alternative B with full ESA protections. The proposed timeline for recovery of 60-100 years is already far too long that allowing non-essential harassment and killing of reintroduced grizzly bears will have far too great of an impact on recovery. These are incredible animals that can thrive if humans put the effort in to minimize conflicts. A few things I would like to see to this end: 1) end cattle grazing leases in wilderness areas that are or could be impacted by reintroductions. It would be unreasonable to reintroduce grizzlies in areas with livestock and expect there not to be conflicts. There are plenty of opportunities for grazing outside of wilderness areas, but there are not plenty of opportunities for grizzlies to survive outside of those same areas. 2) Implement a livestock compensation plan for the case that a grizzly bear does kill livestock. We (the public) can afford to compensate ranchers that are impacted by reintroductions and make it clear that this is a group effort. This also reduces the incentive for grizzlies to be killed due to livestock conflicts. I'm excited for USFWS's plan to reintroduce grizzly bears to the North Cascades. I hope that you will take this opportunity to restore this incredible species and correct the historical wrongs that have been committed against it.

Correspondence ID: 13712Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kirkland, WA 98033
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 10:16:31

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We don't need dangerous animal like grizzly in our state. I'm going hiking all the time into the woods, sometimes solo. We would feel very unsafe to continue. Black bears are already walking our street in Kirkland and vicinities. I can not imagine having a problem like grizzly walking on the streets and backyards on the east side.

Correspondence ID: 13713Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 10:18:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I oppose the reintroduction of grizzlies into the North Cascades. Since their removal, the population of Western and Central Washington has greatly increased, as has the popularity of the North Cascades and the surrounding recreation areas. With these increases in population and usage, the chances of human-grizzly or livestock-grizzly encounters also increases, potentially leading to fatal outcomes. The number of trails, forest roads, and their proximity to populated areas further increases the odds of such encounters. The ecosystem of the North Cascades is healthy and thriving, and reintroducing grizzlies serves no purpose other than to appease the desires of various environmental groups and activists. This plan has far too many risks to the surrounding population, with little to no benefit to the interests of the ecosystem that this plan claims to serve.

Correspondence ID: 13715Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mercer Island, WA 98040
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 10:22:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support reintroduction of the grizzly bear in the North Cascades. I have hiked and camped in Yellowstone National park, Bear Tooth wilderness area of Montana and the N. Cascades with my husband and small children man times over the years and have never encountered a grizzly bear. It is not a problem to use precautions, such as carrying bear spray, packing food in bear tight containers, etc. Coexisting with wildlife in nature is essential to the whole experience. I believe the argument that the grizzly bear is a marker species and must be protected. Its extinction would dire.
Thank you.

██████████

Correspondence ID: 13716Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Auburn, WA 98092-2149
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 10:23:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Voting against reintroduction of the grizzlies to the N. Cascades. Frequent encounters humans will lead to elimination of the aggressive bears one by one. Let things be the way they've been for years.

Correspondence ID: 13717Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Gardiner, MT 59030
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 10:25:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Proposal C is the best way to improve the social tolerance towards the bears. Our ranchers, herders, and residents on the American West are comfortable with the lack of predator presence. It's safe for families, for livestock, and for tourism. No matter the financial influx from tourist visitation or the compensation provided for predated livestock. Proposal C gives the weary the feeling of more control over their environment because of the increased management tactics

available to managers. Those opposed to any reintroduction, let us see how the North Cascade ecosystem changes with the reunited carnivore. Traditional knowledge, today's science, and personal experience may help even the skeptical to understand the for ranging impacts of complete ecosystems.

Correspondence ID: 13718Project:112008Document:132104

Address: kirkland, WA 98034
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 10:27:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I frequent the North Cascades both alone and with my family and this effort will significantly impact my decision to recreate in the area. I do not feel comfortable risking my families wellbeing taking them into areas where Grizzly bears are present. These bears do not have a fear of humans and will attack when surprised. Even though the risk is low, I cannot fathom willingly bringing my family into potential danger. We love to observe wildlife and my children love pointing out different animals on our hikes. There is already plenty of biodiversity in the region, adding an apex predator is not in the best interest of the people who visit the park. I strongly urge the committee to reconsider adding Grizzly bears to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 13719Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Fircrest, WA 98466
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 10:28:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live in and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

Furthermore, the 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Thank you for taking the time to keep our North Cascades wild!

Correspondence ID: 13720Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bothell, WA 98012
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 10:30:48

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not reintroduce grizzly bears in PNW. We hike a lot with kids and dogs. Sometimes we know the brown bears are near, and we know if we do not disturb them they will not come close. I believe grizzly bears have a

different approach and I do not want to meet one on the trails.

Thank you

Correspondence ID: 13721Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98501
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 10:31:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly Bears were in Washington and in the North Cascades long before white settlers came here. Those white settlers eradicated Grizzlies in the North Cascades, and now it is our job, as the current inhabitants of Washington -- native, immigrant, and settler descendants alike -- to restore these incredible creatures to their rightful habitat. Just as we must decolonize our impacts on the stunning ecosystems that Washington is home to, Grizzly Bears must be allowed to re-establish themselves in the North Cascades, where they once thrived before white settler intervention.

I am a hiker, and I recognize the risks associated with spending time in our great outdoors. It is not a playground. It is dangerous, it is wild, and it should remain wild. Bringing Grizzlies back supports that wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 13722Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Cle Elum, WA 98943
United States of America

Outside Organization: Retired psychologist Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 10:35:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Since retirement I have lived in Cle Elum and Wilson, WY. The latter is 4 miles from Grand Teton National Park. Grizzlies are part of the ecosystem there. I hike and ski in WY, and have back packed in grizzly country. While aggressive bear encounters are terrifying to read about, they are actually extremely rare. I think these animals should be restored to their former habitat. If their numbers become too great, a small number could be hunted to manage the population as they are in GTNP. The large mammals are a tremendous draw for tourists (a mixed blessing) but might actually benefit the small towns dependent on tourism near the North Cascades National Park.

My scariest experience with a bear was in the North Cascades with a huge Black Bear who would not vacate the trail. Back country travelers need to practice better safe camping and travel due to the black bear population already. These same practices protect them from grizzlies as well. The bear safe lockers already in campgrounds make it easy to protect against bears. The problems are rarely the bears, but humans who won't use bear safe practices, and common sense.

I hope these magnificent mammals are restored, they have a right to exist in their native habitat. I would like my grandson to be able to know the mountains and wilderness as it was before it was over run by too many people. The North Cascades are a crown in this great state, The Grizzly bears would add another valuable gem to that crown.


Retired Clinical Psychologist

Washington Resident

Lifelong Mountain Lover

Correspondence ID: 13723Project:112008Document:132104

Address: KIRKLAND, WA 98033
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 10:35:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I would not like Grizzly Bears to be reintroduced in PNW.

Correspondence ID: 13724Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98133
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 10:36:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Restoring these apex predators to their rightful land will boost biodiversity and support the glory and majesty of the north cascades. This is critical work and I thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Correspondence ID: 13725Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Sammamish, WA 98074
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 10:40:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: It is very bad idea, the area is highly popular for hiking, fishing and camping. Grizzlies are dangerous and we are not interested to have uncontrolled population of dangerous animals around us. The change will force people to purchase weapon to feel safer, and it will end with injuries and killing of non dangerous black bears. Washington already has uncontrolled wolves population, why do we need grizzlies?!

Correspondence ID: 13727Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bozeman, MT 59771
United States of America
Outside Organization: People and Carnivores Conservation/Preservation(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,13 2023 10:43:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To the National Park Service and U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan and Environmental Impact Statement.

To preface our comments, we'd like to briefly highlight our orientation to the shared work of conserving and managing grizzlies. For the last fifteen years, People and Carnivores has worked in the field to reduce conflicts between large carnivores and people. We mostly work in Montana, but have had projects in Wyoming (primarily rangeland conflict prevention projects) and Idaho (assessing infrastructure on public lands to prevent conflicts with grizzlies). We are the only organization in Montana focusing solely on conflict prevention as a means of safeguarding people and property, supporting rural communities and livelihoods, and conserving large carnivores. We partner with agencies and landowners to design, implement, and maintain proactive, on-the-ground solutions that keep carnivores separated from people or attractants. We value our strong relationships with federal agencies, including the USFWS.

People and Carnivores' Support for Alternative B

From the proposed alternatives, we urge the Service to adopt alternative B--restoration with existing Endangered Species Act protections--as the most successful path for restoring grizzlies to the NCE.

We have seen that grizzlies will not recolonize the NCE on their own. Despite the sufficient grizzly bear habitat it provides, only one grizzly has been detected in the NCE in the past 10 years, making alternative A unviable for grizzly bear restoration in the NCE. Human intervention is required if grizzlies are to return to this historic habitat.

Designating NCE grizzlies as a nonessential experimental population under section 10(j) of the ESA, as done under alternative C, is not necessary and may undermine the success of this reintroduction program. Alternative C allows for

"greater management flexibility," yet most of the management actions under alternative C are already allowed under the full protections of the ESA as described in alternative B, because they will be determined to be needed lethal control actions. Those added under alternative C, like the allowance of incidental take, will delay the recovery of the species and can lead to situations where conflicts are more likely to occur as it may delay the need and reality for people to learn how to live with grizzlies. A similar situation occurs with the issuance of lethal control permits to livestock owners. This should remain with management specialists, as the rules around these permits are not effectively enforceable, create situations of increased risk (e.g., injured bears), and delay the implementation of conflict prevention methods. Most importantly, these additional management methods are unnecessary. Conflict prevention tools are an effective way to protect people, livestock, and crops from potential grizzly bears conflicts. If and when additional tools and actions are needed, they should be provided by trained professionals using protocol and regulation to guide their actions.

Alternative B allows grizzlies to be reintroduced to the NCE while allowing agencies to manage the species in ways that will protect people and their property. One of the primary reasons bears are removed from areas is due to conflict. Alternative B not only allows for the relocation of bears, but allows for the lethal removal of individual grizzlies in response to conflict, as well as in defense of life. To proactively avoid conflicts, this alternative calls for increased education about living with grizzlies.

Environmental Impacts Under Alternative B

In examining environmental impacts, alternative B offers the most balanced consequences of the alternatives.

For grizzly bears, alternative B allows for the restoration of the species to historic and presently suitable habitat that would not occur under alternative A. It's suggested that increased management options under alternative C will best address human-bear conflict, stating "without management tools to sufficiently address conflicts between grizzly bears and humans, the escalation of conflict situations is likely to erode social tolerance for grizzly bear restoration among some groups." Primary management tools should be those focused on conflict prevention, including tools that we have seen increase social tolerance of grizzlies by preventing conflicts like electric fence, scare devices, livestock guardian dogs, use of range riders, and carcass management--all of which can be used under any alternative. Lethal control is also allowed under alternative B and ensures trained professionals are responsible in situations where this management method is required.

For other wildlife and fish, reintroduction of grizzly bears under alternative B will "contribute to restoring missing ecological interactions." These positive benefits are not gained under alternative A, and no additional benefits are gained under alternative C.

For wilderness character, restoring grizzlies via alternative B, as opposed to alternative A, would "benefit the natural value of wilderness," with "adverse impacts...offset by restoring a native species." Alternative C would have greater adverse impacts to wilderness character due to "human intervention and manipulation" of this species.

For visitor use and recreational experience, the reintroduction of grizzlies can increase visitation as individuals want to see these animals. Concerning the potential increase of conflicts between bears and visitors, alternative B offers management solutions, including lethal take in necessary situations. Additional take offered under alternative C can provide visitors with the false impression that bear behavior is not influenced by human actions and encourage poor safety practices, and that any bear near a human is cause for removal creating an inaccurate sense of how bears should and can be managed.

For public and employee safety, education on preventing conflicts, as will be increased under alternative B, promotes conflict prevention over conflict response, creating less of a need for the increase in relocation management as described in alternative C.

For socioeconomics, restoring grizzlies as described under alternative B presents the fewest negative impacts to socioeconomic dynamics, as it does allow for management response in cases of livestock depredation. Removing the requirement for federal agencies to consult under section 7(a)(2) of the ESA for livestock grazing, as alternative C would, can create situations where livestock operations continue as if nothing has changed on the landscape and lead to more grizzly-livestock conflict that will require the removal of bears, slowing the restoration effort.

For ethnographic resources, continued communication with Tribes will be essential in determining how each alternative may impact these resources.

Proactive Conflict Prevention is Key to the Program's Success

Throughout these comments we have mentioned the importance of conflict prevention. Although People and Carnivores works toward lethal control being a last resort after proactive solutions are exhausted, we understand that the removal of some animals is a necessary tool for grizzly bear management. That said, we know from our extensive experience working with communities and private landowners that prevention is effective most of the time. Notably, on nearly all of our hundreds of projects, once we apply preventative tools, we see no losses for humans, property, or bears. These tools include electric fencing, livestock guardian dogs, range riders, and scare devices, and they should be prominent in the management toolbox used by the NPS and USFWS.

Proactive conflict prevention can address concerns about property loss, human safety, and grizzly bear movement brought forward by Washington residents at recent public comment sessions hosted by the NPS and USFWS. We've experienced producers and rural community members asking for alternatives to lethal control when they hear from their peers or observe how well prevention tools can work. We have been contacted by several ranchers seeking out prevention tools, having experienced the inadequacy of reactive management. There will always be some conflicts and encounters we can't avert, but widespread conflict prevention work will make living with grizzlies safer, easier, and less contentious.

Please let us know if you have any questions about our comments or our conflict prevention work. Thank you again for the opportunity to share our input.

On behalf of People and Carnivores, and sincerely,

Correspondence ID: 13728Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Concrete, WA 98237
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 10:45:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a local home and forestland owner, I support Alternative C of the Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan. This alternative seems well reasoned and offers maximum flexibility for managing conflicts while attempting to restore a sustainable population to our area.

Correspondence ID: 13729Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Elma, WA 98541
United States of America
Outside Organization: Pacific Crest Trail Assn & Back Country Horsemen of WA Non-Governmental
Received: Nov,13 2023 10:45:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I am a member of both the Pacific Crest Trail Assn and the Back Country Horsemen of Washington and I recreate and volunteer on trail maintenance in the proposed Grizzly Bear Recovery Areas.

The long-term impact of mechanically importing bears to Washington on recreation, hunting, farming, ranching, and tourism needs more research and planning. All are huge economic necessities for Washington state. The proposed North Cascades Grizzly Bear Recovery Area, from Cle Elum to Canada, is a huge area and very popular for hiking, horseback riding, camping, and bicycling. Not to mention the ranchers and farmers who live there. The concern over human-bear interactions by the well-heeled bear conservationists will likely result in large recreation area closures, just for a few bears. With already limited and over-used trail opportunities in WA (people parking for miles from a trailhead just to access it), this will result in

even more overcrowding and resource damage by those who recreate on our public lands. It also puts the future of the long-planned and worked-on Pacific National Scenic Trail in danger of being completed.

If the bears come to Washington by themselves from Canada, proving that the natural resources in the area can sustain them, then we deal with that then. We need more information on that plan, which is not addressed in the DEIS.

My guess is that the majority of citizens who support this idea will never have their personal lives or livelihoods affected at all by the decision, which to me, is a sad way to make significant changes for those who will.

Thank you for considering my opinion,

Correspondence ID: 13730Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Newcastle, WA 98059
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 10:53:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am opposed to the reintroduction of grizzlies into the North Cascades. I support Alternative A - No Action.

I am an avid hiker and solo backpacker. Reintroduction of grizzlies into the North Cascades would end my ability to enjoy these activities in the park.

Reintroduction of grizzlies in the North Cascades would ultimately cause people to die. Full stop.

Correspondence ID: 13731Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Redmond, WA 98052
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 10:57:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I don't agree with the plan about restoring the grizzly population in our area. It's not rare that brown bears visit neighborhoods and school zones in our town, and it's very dangerous and scary. We are afraid for our kids when they walk alone after school. People already avoid going outside in darkness. Some people avoid going on a hike for the same reason. We are worried about our pets too. Grizzly will make the situation worse.

Correspondence ID: 13732Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98102
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 11:00:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am worried and do not approve of the grizzlies being reintroduced to the north cascades. It will effect the whole eco-system, for the black bears and other apex predators like mountain loins. The mountains are calm, it will be best to let things be and not stress out the already established wildlife.

Correspondence ID: 13733Project:112008Document:132104

Address: chelan, WA 98816
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 11:00:12

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I request that you grant an extension of time for public responses to the Draft Grizzly Bear EIS. In the mean time please take my complete opposition to bringing grizzly bears back to Washington state. Man is not safe in grizzly country and cannot consider being safe against attack even when fully armed with legal sports fire arms. Grizzly bears need wide open vast mostly uninhabited country like Canada and Alaska. signed, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 13734Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Everett, WA 98201
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 11:01:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am totally against releasing Grizzly bears into the mountains in the Central area in the North Cascades of the state of WA. Those giant 1000 lb. Carnivors will kill people's live stock and kill people. Please let them loose elsewhere.

Sincerely,
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 13735Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Redmond, WA 98952
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 11:09:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzli bears should not be artificially introduced in Washington..

The migration is already happening naturally without human intervention.

Safety concerns increase for human population.

Human intervention and introduction of predators will imbalance the ecosystem. And endanger other species like elks, mountain goats, dear, and others.

Correspondence ID: 13736Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Darrington, WA 98241
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 11:10:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'd like to voice my opposition to introducing grizzlies to the North Cascades as a resident of a town that borders the park and a frequent user of the park and surrounding region. Among many concerns, the primary ones I'd like to highlight is the risk of introducing a non-native population of apex predator bears into an already struggling ecosystem. The primary food source for these bears would likely include salmon and other fish whose populations have been in steady decline over the past several years. Not only would this be harmful to the efforts to conserve these native river fish, but also bringing in non-native grizzlies from an outside area would create competition for our established native black bears. In addition to salmon and other fish, our native population of deer and elk have also been suffering herd number decline and again, introducing a non-native apex predator to the region would only further disrupt the efforts in conservation of these animals.

There is no way to guarantee that these non-native bears would stay within any boundaries established by the people who have decided this was a good idea. There is no way to guarantee the families in the region who farm and raise livestock would be able to safely maintain their livelihoods safe from a non-native predatory species. I believe that in bringing these bears to this region, not only would it potentially put the bears at risk due to farmers and residents needing to keep their homes and farms safe, introducing competition with the native animals from the region, risking the bears simply migrating back to the area they are from and familiar with, but also increase public distrust and dissatisfaction with the National Park Service and Federal Government.

It is not fair, as residents of this region, and therefore the people to be most directly effected by decisions made in Seattle, to be overlooked and disregarded in interest of serving other's peoples ideals.

Correspondence ID: 13738Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sammamish, WA 98075
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 11:12:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As an avid outdoorsman I 100% support the reintroduction of Brown Bears into NCNP. Not only do we have a moral obligation to reintroduce extant species into areas with local extinction, the NCNP is unlikely to see any detriment from the action. The fearmongering surrounding the reintroduction are vastly exaggerating the risk to humans in what is already a park with low visitors numbers. I stand with the ecologists and indigenous leaders who are calling for this reintroduction.

Correspondence ID: 13741Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 11:18:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I will start by saying that I would like to see grizzly bears reintroduced to the North Cascades Ecosystem. However, if they are introduced, I would want all organizations involved to leave no stone unturned to ensure they have the best chance possible to survive as individuals and establish a viable population.

Analysis of NCE Draft EIS using HDST

In my assessment of the North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly Bear Draft Environmental Impact Statement, I will apply the Hierarchical Decision-making System for Translocations (HDST) as outlined by Pérez et al. in their 2012 paper, "What is wrong with current translocations? A review and a decision-making proposal" (full citation below). Using the HDST process is a way of systematically looking at all aspects of a proposed translocation project to assess its viability and reduce subjectivity in the final decision-making process. The HDST method as proposed by Pérez et al. 2012 (Table 1) outlines 10 main criteria divided into three decision levels that must be applied using a step-by-step methodology. For example, if the criteria in level 1 are not fully met the project should not continue even if all the criteria for levels 2 and 3 are met.

I will now apply the HDST methodology to evaluate the North Cascades Ecosystem Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan and Environmental Impact Statement (NCE DEIS).

Level 1: Necessity of the Translocation

1. Is the species population under threat?

Yes. Grizzly bears are proven to be threatened in the NCE. They were listed as threatened under the Endangered Species Act in 1975 and the last confirmed sighting of a Grizzly bear in the NCE was in 1996. They are now considered to be functionally extirpated from the NCE.

2. Have the Threatening factors been removed or controlled, or will they be absent in the release area?

Partial. Human conflict was the most significant historical threat to the grizzly bear population in the NCE. If the bears are protected under the Endangered Species Act or as a nonessential experimental population the threat of direct human conflict would mostly be removed. However, now with a larger population of people living near, traveling through, and recreating in

the NCE than when grizzly bears last inhabited it, indirect human conflict is still likely to occur. This threat would be slightly increased if alternative C is adopted because it would give more flexibility for the removal of bears that conflict with or become habituated to humans. Another consideration is the presence of sufficient suitable habitat and food sources with consideration to season-to-season variability. The DEIS cited a few sources that have studied the carrying capacity of the NCE for grizzly bears over long periods of time and concluded the NCE could support the 200-bear goal of the DEIS (Servheen et al., 1991; Lyons et al., 2018). The DEIS also cites a study (Ransom et al., 2023) that projects the habitat suitability for grizzly bears in the NCE will improve over time when climate change is accounted for. However, what these three studies and the DEIS fail to address is the short-term or seasonal fluctuations in suitable habitat and food sources that could prevent a stable grizzly bear population from establishing.

3. Are translocations the best tool to mitigate conservation conflicts?

Yes. The closest existing populations of grizzly bears are located to the east in the Selkirk and Kettle Granby Mountains, but in numbers too small to expand their range, and to the north in British Columbia, again in low numbers. Even if neighboring populations were large enough to facilitate range expansion, they would face many barriers to dispersal including the Fraser River, and high levels of human influence including roads, railroads, and cities. Therefore, it is highly unlikely that a population would establish itself in the NCE without translocations.

Level 2: Risk Management

4. Are the risks tolerable for the target species?

Unknown. With the information presented in the DEIS, the risk for the translocated grizzly bears is too high. There needs to be more consideration of the yearly variability of habitat suitability and food sources. Long-term trends are important to study and understand but if the initial translocated population faces short-term threats such as a bad wildfire season, or a heavy snow year with a short growing season resulting in food shortages, it could result in a mortality rate the introduced population cannot recover from. The DEIS cites an abundance of potential food sources for grizzly bears but does not identify the presence of a high-density food source in critical seasons such as late summer and early fall. Grizzly bear populations in other areas area rely on at least one such food source. Short-term threats also tend to cause bears to venture closer to human settlements in search of easy food sources. This can cause bears to become habituated and increase the conflict between bears and people. Habituated bears have a higher mortality rate than wary bears, and rarely will go back to being a wary bear even after short-term threats are removed (Pease and Mattson, 1999).

5. Are the Risks for other species or the ecosystem acceptable?

Yes. The DEIS outlines the potential impacts on other wildlife species including ungulates, fish, birds, small mammals, and other predatory species. Other animal populations would likely either not be affected by the introduction of grizzly bears, or the impact would not be harmful at the population level. The introduction of high trophic level animals like the grizzly bear could have a positive effect on the ecosystem by restoring ecological interactions.

6. Are the possible effects of the translocation acceptable to local people?

Yes. Some people will be excited about the reintroduction of grizzly bears in the NCE, and it may draw some visitors to the region, benefiting locals economically. However, there will inevitably be a subset of people who are opposed to reintroduction due to the potential loss of livestock and an increased perceived danger while recreating in the NCE.

Level 3: Technical and logistical suitability

7. Does the project maximize the likelihood of establishing a viable population?

No. Insufficient population modeling has been completed. In the NCE grizzly bear DEIS a simplistic exponential population growth projection is used that is likely not representative of actual grizzly bear population growth rates. It also

underestimates the risk of failure of translocation and extinction. A better method would be to perform a comprehensive population viability analysis as recommended by Traill et al., 2007, to determine the minimum viable population size and to identify the most important variables to control to give the highest chance of success.

8. Does the project include clear goals and monitoring?

Yes. The project has clearly defined goals: to establish a population of 200 bears within 60 to 100 years, increase biological diversity in the NCE, and enhance the long-term probability of survival for individual grizzly bears in the NCE and of the grizzly bear species by establishing multiple populations. The monitoring of the bears has also been outlined sufficiently. GPS tracking collars would be installed on each bear before being released to track their movements and send out mortality signals if needed and remote wildlife cameras would monitor bear presence and reproductive success and take genetic samples by installing hair snags.

9. Do enough economic and human resources exist?

No (unclear). In Appendix C of the DEIS, the implementation costs are outlined but it is unclear where the funds would come from and if the funding has been secured. Appendix C also fails to cover cost variability throughout the years after initial implementation. This project has three main phases with different costs associated with each phase. The first phase includes the translocation and close monitoring of the bears, the second phase includes monitoring the population and handling any conflicts or supplementing the population with additional translocations if needed, and the third phase is the final stage of the project with minimal monitoring once the population is established. I would want to see how these costs are anticipated to change over time and make sure funding has been secured throughout the whole 60-100-year timeline of the project. With the long-term scope of this project, it is also important to secure staff or outline a plan to train new staff to ensure the project has the human resources needed to make it successful years into its implementation. I did not see any mention of this in the DEIS. Appendix C also does not outline resources for adaptive management techniques that might be required such as trail or road closures, addressing conflicts with livestock, or resource restoration to ensure adequate food supply.

10. Do scientific, government, and stakeholder groups support the translocation?

Yes. The DEIS had many contributors including the United States Department of the Interior, the United States Forest Service, the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, the National Park Service, the US Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Washington State Historic Preservation Office. There has already been one round of public comments before the DEIS was released with the second public comment process open now. The NPS and the FWS have met with Tribes, however, the DEIS does not explicitly say whether the Tribes are in support of the translocation effort and reintroduction of grizzly bears to the NCE, nor does it mention if they approve of the methods. I would want to see more information included in the DEIS explicitly addressing the Tribes' interests and wishes to ensure their voices are heard.

Conclusion:

After a systematic review of the North Cascades Ecosystem Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan and Environmental Impact Statement using the Hierarchical Decision-making System for Translocations (HDST) as outlined by Pérez et al. in their 2012 paper, I would suggest further considerations before proceeding with action alternatives B or C. Specifically, additional considerations must be given to ensuring abundant food sources during key times of the year accounting for season-to-season variability, performing a detailed population viability analysis, and further outlining the funding sources and details for all stages of the project. The risks of implementing action alternatives B or C without including additional considerations in the DEIS are too high and could jeopardize any future efforts to reestablish grizzly bears to the NCE.

Thank you for your consideration.

References:

Lyons, A. L., W. L. Gaines, P. H. Singleton, W. F. Kasworm, M. F. Proctor, and J. Begley. 2018. "Spatially Explicit

Carrying Capacity Estimates to Inform Species Specific Recovery Objectives: Grizzly bear (*Ursus arctos*) Recovery in the North Cascades." *Biological Conservation* 222 (2018): 21-32.

Pease CM and Mattson DJ. 1999. Demography of Yellowstone grizzly bears. *Ecology* 80(3):957-975.

Pérez I, JD Anadoón, M Díaz, GG Nicola, JL Tella, A Giménez. 2012. What is wrong with current translocations? A review and a decision-making proposal. *Front.Ecol.Environ.* 10(9): 494-501. doi: 10.1890/110175

Ransom, J. I., A. L. Lyons, K. C. Hegewisch, and M. Krosby. 2023. "An Integrated Modeling Approach for Considering Wildlife Reintroduction in the Face of Climate Uncertainty: A Case for the North Cascades Grizzly Bear." *Biological Conservation* 279: 109947. Accessed March 15, 2023.
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0006320723000472#bb0255>

Servheen C., A. Hamilton, R. Knight, and B. McLellan. 1991. Report of the Technical Review Team: Evaluation of the Bitterroot and North Cascades to Sustain Viable Grizzly Bear Populations. A Report to the Interagency Grizzly Bear Committee. December 10, 1991.

Traill LW, Bradshaw CJA, Brook BW. 2007. Minimum viable population size: A meta-analysis of 30 years of published estimates. *Biol.Cons.* 139:159-166.

US Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS). 2022. Species Status Assessment for the Grizzly Bear (*Ursus arctos horribilis*) in the Lower 48 states. Prepared for FWS Grizzly Bear Recovery Office, Missoula Montana. January 2022. Version 1.2 - January 21, 2022. <https://ecos.fws.gov/ServCat/DownloadFile/213247>

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service and National Park Service. 2023. Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Environmental Impact Statement, North Cascades Ecosystem. North Cascades National Park Service Complex, Sedro-Woolley, WA. [online] <https://parkplanning.nps.gov/document.cfm?parkID=327&projectID=112008&documentID=132104> (accessed 28 Sept. 2023)

Correspondence ID: 13742Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bothell, WA 98021
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 11:18:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think this is a terrible idea given the amount of hikers and even people that specifically travel to these areas in Washington for outdoor activity. Once you introduce them, if the number of attacks goes up, what is the plan? Take them back out again after enough people have died? Shoot them? It seems like a terrible set up. I could also see this impacting travel to Washington and commerce if people stop wanting to come enjoy our outdoors here.

Correspondence ID: 13743Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98122
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 11:20:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: One of the great advantages of living in the PNW is the easy access to nature. That said, potentially increasing encounters with grizzly bears shouldn't be encouraged or facilitated. The attached document states "The restoration of grizzly bears to the NCE could increase visitation and recreational use of the NCE as visitors seek to experience grizzly bears in their native habitat." This is irresponsible. We should not encourage visitors to seek out grizzly bears. They currently exist in remote areas where few hikers go, and it should stay this way. The bears should have space to themselves without human interactions, and it is safest for humans to stay away from them as well.

Correspondence ID: 13744Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Walla Walla, WA 99362
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 11:23:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears should be reintroduced to the Cascade Mountains. They are an essential part of the ecosystem. The reason they need to be reintroduced in the first place is because of human influence. Bear management infrastructure is already in place in some locations in the Cascades, like bear-resistant trash cans and trail monitoring. The National Parks Service already has articles informing hikers and campers of proper bear etiquette and safety measures. Grizzly bears have a right to the land as they have been here longer than humans. They are culturally significant to the Pacific Northwest and their population is dwindling. The reintroduction of the bears to the Cascades could greatly benefit the species and increase their numbers.

Correspondence ID: 13747Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America

Outside Organization: Washington Outfitters and Guides Association Non-Governmental(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,13 2023 11:27:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: RE: 2022 North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan comments by the Washington Outfitters and Guides Association

The planned re-introduction of the Grizzly Bear to the North Cascades of Washington State is a misguided attempt to establish a predatory bear population into a geographical area not suitable for these animals.

The draft EIS states the North Cascades ecosystem of north-central Washington State has been targeted as one of six recovery zones where it is identified as an area grizzly bears inhabited across a continuous range of Western North America. Contained in this environmental impact statement there is an acknowledgement of little substantial proof that this area supported grizzly bears. It is also evident that there is a substantial effort to "synthesize" the data to justify the reintroduction decision.

Historical harvest records show the number of grizzly bears harvested. The location of the harvest was not recorded. It is suggested there is a wide geographical area involved in the harvests and that the recorded numbers may or may not have been harvested from the target area. "The current low number of grizzly bears along with an apparent scarcity of historical observations obfuscates the extent to which the North Cascades and its surrounding lowlands previously supported grizzly bears". Of interest, the historical harvest records of the black bear significantly outnumber the grizzly bear harvest records, yet the black bear are constantly sited in Washington State - the question is why are these black bears still visible in Washington State and not the grizzly? This directly points to the fact that the proposed reintroduction area does not have the proper habitat in the amount needed to support a viable grizzly bear population.

The proximity of the target area to areas of concentrated population in Washington State is problematic. The historical data in the EIS does not address the changes/growth of the population of Washington State. The State of Washington is the 13th most populated state in the continental US - growing in population from 523,000 in 1900 to 7,740,745 in 2022. The State has seen growth in each year from 1900 to 2022 (apart from 1947). There is nothing to suggest this growth will not continue to occur, making the State more incompatible with a grizzly bear population. The comparing areas where grizzly bears are known to inhabit:

State Population Geographical Square Miles

Washington 7,740,745 71,362

Montana 1,122,867 147,040

Wyoming 581,681 97,814

The population and geographic size of Washington State should be a determining factor against the re-introduction.

Recreational activities (including horseback riding, hunting, backpacking/hiking) in Washington State are embraced and outdoor enthusiasts expect safe access to the national forests. The introduction of grizzly bears will create an elevated likelihood of dangerous to fatal human/bear interactions.

Concern for the well-being of the grizzly bear should be paramount in the final decision to re-introduce but it should not outweigh public safety nor ignore the negative impacts that reintroduction will produce. The grizzly bear is on the endangered list due to its low numbers - one would argue that to sacrifice even one grizzly in the relocation process is counterproductive to the end goal of increasing grizzly numbers.

It is the position of the Washington Outfitters and Guides Association that Alternative A: No Action be taken and then continued discussion of grizzly bear reintroduction by the National Park Service and the US Fish and Wildlife Service in the North Cascades of Washington State needs to stop once and for all.

Submitted,


Washington Outfitters and Guides Association
P O Box 1125
Twisp, WA 98856
Email: outfitters@woga.com

Correspondence ID: 13748Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Arlington, WA 98223
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 11:40:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Don't want brown bear reintroduced in the north cascades. I live there, recreate there, and work there.

Correspondence ID: 13751Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Sammamish, WA 98074
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 12:01:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please only consider Alternative A: No Action. I have seen first hand the negative impacts of introducing a new predator has on existing prey populations.

Correspondence ID: 13752Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Renton, WA 98059
United States of America
Outside Organization: Back Country Horseman of Wa Non-Governmental
Received: Nov,13 2023 12:01:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the: Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Environmental Impact Statement for the North Cascades Ecosystem

As a member of Back Country Horsemen of Washington, I am very concerned with the ability to continue to recreate in the North Cascades should a small population of heavily protected grizzly bears be mechanically moved into the region that we recreate in. The DEIS does not sufficiently analyze the impact to recreation or present any options for how trails can be maintained open in the presence of protections implemented to reduce human-grizzly interactions.

1. The Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail runs through the core habitat and has permitted distance hikers of around 10,000. When considering the other trail users in and along the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE) since this is one of the most populated areas around any bear ecosystem, the use likely exceeds a quarter million visits. However, the DEIS indicates that

the use is insignificant. It is very significant and will likely result in many human-bear interactions.

2. The Pacific Northwest National Scenic Trail also runs through the NCE as well as other bear ecosystems to the east, including the Cabinet-Yaak (CYE). The CYE has a more established population of bears but still has resulted with challenges to the very existence of the trail due to the limited number of bears in the CYE (20-40). Opposition to the National Scenic Trail in the recovering bear population area as well as the connecting landscapes between ecosystems has also been expressed by USFWS staff, the same agency putting forth the NCE proposal through which the same trail will pass.

3. Without a more detailed analysis of how to retain the carrying capacity of the trails, trailheads, and campgrounds without resulting in long term or permanent closures, there is no way to effectively review this DEIS.

4. Furthermore, the NPS and USFWS have pointed out that the Canadian counterparts and First Nations are preparing to release grizzly bears in the northern part of the NCE. IF that was the only release point, it would move the core recovery/release area north and away from the more densely human populated areas of Washington State. It also would be in line with Washington State law as well since no bears would be translocated directly into Washington, and there also would be predictability on how many bears are being moved into the entire NCE which overlaps both countries. The BC government has noted that their Recovery Plan is being developed jointly with the USFWS even though this US EIS only addresses the Washington effort.

5. As a trail horse rider in the NCE, I ask that the No Action Alternative be selected. The areas we ride in includes the Mt Baker Snoqualmie National Forest, the Okanogan Wenatchee National Forest including the Pasayten Wilderness, and the North Cascades National Park. We have many horse camps along the boundary of the NCE. We cannot support either Action Alternative without more substantive analysis on impacts to recreation as well as knowing more on the joint planning with Canadian counterparts.

Correspondence ID: 13753Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Anacortes, WA 98221
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 12:04:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear National Park Service, et al:

I am in favor of restoring our Grizzly Bears to our North Cascades Mountain Range where they were exterminated years ago.

The basis of my comments is the fact that man has degraded our ecosystems here in our National Parks and Forests because of human encroachment, agribusiness, and runaway land development. This is why the Grizzly bears were exterminated all those years ago. Man did not find a happy medium living in harmony with these apex predators that, in my opinion, God created and placed where He wanted them and for His purposes. Man cannot manage nature because he is merely a part of nature. Management means having control over God and Nature...it doesn't work! IF you restore Grizzly bears to the North Cascade Mtn Range, they will need protection from man. Figure that out first! Don't harm the bears once they are restored to their rightful and meaningful ecosystem.

They, like the Gray Wolves were/are hammered because they live in habitats man has encroached upon, our Public Lands that we pay taxes on to keep these places wild and for nature. Man has to comply with nature, not nature with man. It seems that when you try to sort something out from the rest of something, we find it hitched to everything else, (John Muir). We are all connected...every living species on this planet!

These species, these Grizzly Bears need to come back and restore the balance of nature man has ripped away from our ecosystems in our North Cascade Mtn Range. They need to be here! They don't need to be shot for any depredation of cattle either. That is the price cattle ranchers pay to do their money-making meat business. Cows don't belong in or on our Public Lands!! They are non-native and have no business being on those lands or nearby them for the sake of our wildlife. We've encroached enough!

Please bring our Grizzly Bears back to our North Cascades Mountain Range where they once lived and thrived. Restore the balance of nature that Grizzly Bears bring to our planet...they do matter!

PS: By the way, I hope our Native Tule Elk at Point Reyes National Park/Refuge are getting the space they need to live unharmed by man and his agribusiness there! Those fences need to be come down to restore their rightful place on those Public Lands!

Best Regards,

Correspondence ID: 13754Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Covington, WA 98042
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 12:06:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: November 13, 2023

National Park Service
North Cascades National Park Complex
810 State Route 20
Sedro-Woolley, WA 98284

Subject: Formal Comment on the North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/Environmental Impact Statement

Dear National Park Service,

I am writing to formally endorse and express my comprehensive support for the Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan in the North Cascades National Park Complex. As a former National Park Ranger stationed at the Stehekin district of NOCA, I have a deep connection to the region and believe that the restoration of grizzly bears is a crucial step towards preserving the ecological integrity of this magnificent landscape.

Personal Reflection: During my tenure as a ranger at Stehekin, I marveled at the diverse wildlife that called NOCA home. While black bears were a common sight, the absence of grizzly bears, a once-native species, left a noticeable void in the ecosystem. The restoration of grizzly bears not only reinstates a missing element but also contributes to the overall health and resilience of the North Cascades.

Legal Framework and Compliance: I firmly believe in the importance of accurate and extensive bear counts for evaluating the success of the restoration plan. The National Park Service should invest in monitoring programs employing advanced scientific methodologies to provide precise population data, adhering to the legal framework established by acts such as the National Park Service Organic Act and the Wilderness Act.

Ecological and Biodiversity Benefits of Grizzly Bear Restoration: The restoration of grizzly bears to the North Cascades holds significant ecological importance. As apex predators, grizzly bears shape ecosystem dynamics through their foraging behaviors, predation patterns, and role in seed dispersal. This initiative aligns seamlessly with the principles enshrined in the National Park Service Organic Act, the Antiquities Act, the Endangered Species Act, the Wilderness Act, the Washington Park Wilderness Act, and the North Cascades Enabling Act of 1968.

Public Safety and Livestock: Scientific studies, including "Fatal Grizzly Bear Attacks in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem" and "Grizzly Bear Predation on Humans in North America," suggest that well-managed bear populations and responsible human behavior can coexist harmoniously. The data presented in these studies provides valuable insights into minimizing potential conflicts between grizzly bears and human activities.

Public Access: Studies such as "The Impact of Grizzly Bear Restoration on Public Access in the North Cascades Ecosystem" and "Grizzly Bear Restoration in the Selkirk Mountains: A Risk Assessment" indicate that restoring grizzly bears to the region would have a minimal impact on public access. Well-managed coexistence strategies,

public education, and responsible recreational practices can ensure the enjoyment of the North Cascades by both humans and bears.

Prohibitions on Detrimental Activities: To safeguard the recovery process, I urge the National Park Service and the U.S. Forest Service to enforce strict prohibitions on activities detrimental to bear recovery, such as road building, mining, deforestation, construction, and hunting. The identified human activities, as per the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, pose significant threats to grizzly bear habitat, and strict enforcement is necessary to ensure the success of the restoration plan.

In conclusion, I commend the National Park Service for its commitment to conserving and preserving our national parks. Restoring grizzly bears in the North Cascades is a vital step toward ensuring this unique ecosystem's long-term health and sustainability. I urge the NPS to expedite bear recovery, considering this restoration initiative's urgency.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,


Covington, WA

Citations:

1. Gunther, K. A., & Haroldson, M. A. (2008). Grizzly bear-human conflicts in the Greater Yellowstone ecosystem, 1992-2000. *The Journal of Wildlife Management*, 72(3), 640-649. [Link](#)
2. Herrero, S., & Fleck, S. (1990). Injury to people inflicted by black, grizzly or polar bears: recent trends and new insights. *International Conference on Bear Research and Management*, 8(1), 239-248. [Link](#)
3. Herrero, S., & Higgins, A. (2003). Human injuries inflicted by bears in Alberta: 1960-98. *The Journal of Wildlife Management*, 67(4), 718-726. [Link](#)
4. Kendall, K. C., Stetz, J. B., Boulanger, J., Macleod, A. C., Paetkau, D., & White, G. C. (2009). Demography and genetic structure of a recovering grizzly bear population. *Journal of Wildlife Management*, 73(1), 3-17. [Link](#)
5. McLellan, B. N., & Shackleton, D. M. (1988). Grizzly Bears and Resource-Extraction Industries: Effects of Roads on Behaviour, Habitat Use and Demography. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 25(2), 451-460. [Link](#)
6. Mowat, G., & Strobeck, C. (2000). Estimating Population Size of Grizzly Bears Using Hair Capture, DNA Profiling, and Mark-Recapture Analysis. *The Journal of Wildlife Management*, 64(1), 183-193. [Link](#)
7. Nielsen, S. E., Herrero, S., & Boyce, M. S. (2012). Grizzly bears and forestry: I. Selection of clearcuts by grizzly bears in west-central Alberta, Canada. *Forest Ecology and Management*, 276, 188-197. [Link](#)
8. Proctor MF, McLellan BN, Strobeck C, Barclay RM. Genetic analysis reveals demographic fragmentation of grizzly bears yielding vulnerably small populations. *Proc Biol Sci*. 2005 Nov 22;272(1579):2409-16. doi: 10.1098/rspb.2005.3246. PMID: 16243699; PMCID: PMC1559960
9. Proctor, M. F., Paetkau, D., McLellan, B. N., Stenhouse, G. B., Kendall, K. C., Mace, R. D., ... & Kasworm, W. F. (2012). Population fragmentation and inter-ecosystem movements of grizzly bears in Western Canada and the Northern United States. *Wildlife Monographs*, 180(1), 1-46. [Link](#)
10. Ripple, W. J., Beschta, R. L., Fortin, J. K., & Robbins, C. T. (2014). Trophic cascades from wolves to grizzly bears in Yellowstone. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 83(1), 223-233 [Link](#)

Correspondence ID: 13755Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Renton, WA 98059
United States of America

Outside Organization: Back country horseman Non-Governmental

Received: Nov,13 2023 12:06:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the: Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Environmental Impact Statement for the North Cascades Ecosystem

As a member of Back Country Horsemen of Washington, I am very concerned with the ability to continue to recreate in the North Cascades should a small population of heavily protected grizzly bears be mechanically moved into the region that we

recreate in. The DEIS does not sufficiently analyze the impact to recreation or present any options for how trails can be maintained open in the presence of protections implemented to reduce human-grizzly interactions.

1. The Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail runs through the core habitat and has permitted distance hikers of around 10,000. When considering the other trail users in and along the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE) since this is one of the most populated areas around any bear ecosystem, the use likely exceeds a quarter million visits. However, the DEIS indicates that the use is insignificant. It is very significant and will likely result in many human-bear interactions.
2. The Pacific Northwest National Scenic Trail also runs through the NCE as well as other bear ecosystems to the east, including the Cabinet-Yaak (CYE). The CYE has a more established population of bears but still has resulted with challenges to the very existence of the trail due to the limited number of bears in the CYE (20-40). Opposition to the National Scenic Trail in the recovering bear population area as well as the connecting landscapes between ecosystems has also been expressed by USFWS staff, the same agency putting forth the NCE proposal through which the same trail will pass.
3. Without a more detailed analysis of how to retain the carrying capacity of the trails, trailheads, and campgrounds without resulting in long term or permanent closures, there is no way to effectively review this DEIS.
4. Furthermore, the NPS and USFWS have pointed out that the Canadian counterparts and First Nations are preparing to release grizzly bears in the northern part of the NCE. IF that was the only release point, it would move the core recovery/release area north and away from the more densely human populated areas of Washington State. It also would be in line with Washington State law as well since no bears would be translocated directly into Washington, and there also would be predictability on how many bears are being moved into the entire NCE which overlaps both countries. The BC government has noted that their Recovery Plan is being developed jointly with the USFWS even though this US EIS only addresses the Washington effort.
5. As a trail horse rider in the NCE, I ask that the No Action Alternative be selected. The areas we ride in includes the Mt Baker Snoqualmie National Forest, the Okanogan Wenatchee National Forest including the Pasayten Wilderness, and the North Cascades National Park. We have many horse camps along the boundary of the NCE. We cannot support either Action Alternative without more substantive analysis on impacts to recreation as well as knowing more on the joint planning with Canadian counterparts.

Correspondence ID: 13757Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Missoula, MT 59802
United States of America
Outside Organization: Western Environmental Law Center Non-Governmental(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,13 2023 12:07:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please note that this submission form provides no opportunity for attachments and creates a document that does not recognize footnotes. I provide the footnotes as endnotes, and have had to copy and paste the attachments- which creates a very messy comment. I tried to contact somebody multiple times to determine a solution, such as an email address where I could send attachments, but was unable to reach anybody. I therefore refer you to the comments and attachments I submitted in opposition to the USFWS proposed rule establishing a nonessential experimental population, via the regulations.gov erulemaking portal. Comment tracking number: lox-77mq-1lq8

November 13, 2023

Superintendent Don Striker
North Cascades National Park Service Complex
810 State Route 20
Sedro Woolley, WA 98284

Submitted via the link on the National Park Service's Planning website:
<https://parkplanning.nps.gov/document.cfm?parkID=327&projectID=112008&documentID=132104>

RE: Public Comments on the September 28, 2023 Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/ Environmental Impact Statement for the North Cascades Ecosystem

Dear Superintendent Striker,

Thank you for the opportunity to submit these comments on the U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service ("NPS") and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service ("FWS") North Cascades Ecosystem Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Environmental Impact Statement (hereinafter "Draft Plan"). These comments are submitted by the Western Environmental Law Center on behalf of WildEarth Guardians and Nimiipuu Protecting the Environment. WildEarth Guardians is a non-profit conservation organization dedicated to protecting and restoring the wildlife, wild places, wild rivers, and health of the American West, with a long history of engaging on grizzly bear issues (including repeatedly in the on-again-off-again plans to restore a population to the North Cascades Ecosystem). Nimiipuu Protecting the Environment works to carry on the time-honored sustainable environmental practices in the tradition of the Nimiipuu by facilitating and organizing tribal youth and adults in activities for the protection, enhancement, and promotion of mother earth and the Nimiipuu culture.

We submit the following comments on the 2023 Draft Plan, generally in support of Alternative B - reintroduction of grizzly bears into the North Cascades (without a 10(j) rule designating the NCE population as an "experimental" population), with the protections the Endangered Species Act provides grizzly bears elsewhere in the U.S. However, in these comments, we also identify several concerns around the use of the best available science, including the identified carrying capacity, inappropriate and arbitrary boundaries for grizzly bear dispersal, an overly slow translocation timeline and small number (25) for the initial phase. We also attach (attachments A and B) and incorporate wholly, the comments submitted previously on behalf of WildEarth Guardians. We separately submit comments (via the federal rulemaking portal) in opposition to the proposed 10(j) rule and designation of the North Cascades Ecosystem population of grizzly bears as experimental, non-essential.

Listed as "threatened" in 1975, grizzly bears were among the first species granted federal protections under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) shortly after the Act became law (now 50 years ago). Roughly 50,000 grizzly bears once inhabited the western contiguous United States. However, European settlement resulted in increasing human/bear conflicts, with the grizzly bear on the losing end of that conflict, not least as a result of government-funded eradication programs. By the 1930's, grizzly bears in the lower 48 states numbered fewer than 500. At this time, the "range and number of grizzly bears were reduced to less than 2 percent of their former range and numbers." And by the time grizzly bears were listed, the population estimate was 136-312 bears.

Although grizzly bears are making a comeback to the lower 48, today, after nearly 50 years of protections and efforts to restore healthy populations, they still number fewer than 2,000 in 3 states. Grizzly bears exist in only a few small isolated populations in the lower 48 and they are still absent the vast majority of their native habitat- including the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE), which as one of the most intact wildlands in the contiguous United States, provides outstanding habitat for grizzly bears. The U.S. side of the North Cascades Ecosystem is one of the largest contiguous blocks of public lands in the lower 48, encompassing nearly 9,600 square miles, about 40% of which is in protected status as Wilderness or National Park. The U.S. portion of the NCE, particularly when combined with the Canadian portion of the NCE (4,000 square miles), offers an exciting and important opportunity to support long-term survival and recovery of the grizzly bear

Restoring grizzly bears to this large, wild, and remote area, where much of the prime grizzly habitat is protected, is key to recovering grizzly bears as a whole, with interconnected populations that exhibit resiliency, redundancy, and representation. We are eager to see and support the restoration of this population. However, we have some concerns about the reintroduction plan and also support Alternative B rather than the Park Service's and Fish and Wildlife Service's preferred alternative - Alternative C.

Recovery efforts should include all current suitable habitat, including areas south of I-90. And these efforts should be fluid enough to provide protections for grizzly bears in any areas they successfully colonize. This would hopefully alleviate dealing with problems like the essentially arbitrary lines that have hampered recovery efforts in the NCDE and GYE and the spatially truncated protections in the Bitterroot Ecosystem. Given the wide range of estimated carrying capacity (300-800+ from various studies) and the highly imperiled status of grizzly bears in adjacent British Columbia which create uncertainty about what will be needed, using all suitable habitat is of greater imperative. And the uncertain effects of climate change only exacerbate the need to establish grizzly bears in as much currently suitable habitat as possible. Although some suggest all will be well even in the face of a changing climate, others project a decline in huckleberries and the bumble bees that pollinate the berries. All of this uncertainty lends further support for protecting bears and all suitable habitat and translocating grizzly bears into all suitable habitat, both north and south of I-90. We encourage you to remove Management Zone 2 status as is

currently proposed, for bears in suitable habitat south of I-90.

The DEIS proposes a plan for translocating 3 to 7 bears/year for 5 to 10 years, seeking a population of 25 bears for the initial phase with a shift at that point to an “adaptive management” phase during which additional translocations would be purely voluntary. Under this adaptive management, in the best case scenario, this might mean a sustainable population in 100 years. The best available science would support a faster pace, with 200 bears in 25 years. The history of augmentation in the Cabinet Mountain population suggests that only 2 of 25 introduced bears successfully reproduce (as per the Cabinet-Yaak annual progress reports), which raises concerns for the translocation plan - with only 3 to 7 bears to be translocated per year, and a shift to a different phase when the population is just 25 bears. Recent studies suggests that when grizzly bear populations are isolated, there appears to be a tipping point of around 50 individuals, below which adult female mortality, even with intensive management, becomes prohibitive for population recovery. The best available science supports the translocation of a substantial number of bears each year (e.g., 20) into targeted areas, with sustained translocations until at least 50 reproductive-aged bears have been documented, ideally more. A vigorous and sustained reintroduction effort will likely be needed given the likely adverse effects of competition for shared foods from high densities of resident black bears, which have a competitive advantage when exploiting low to medium densities of berries and herbaceous food.

Coexistence efforts will be essential and should be well-established and institutionalized in a large area encompassing targeted reintroduction areas prior to reintroduction. The Blackfoot Challenge provides a good model for how to address potential conflict with livestock. While grizzly bear reintroduction in the NCE has broad and overwhelming support from the public, substantial education and support for conflict prevention and coexistence (which must include a broad set of tools, and not rely primarily on the removal of grizzly bears) must be provided early and maintained.

Grizzly bears in the NCE will need meaningful habitat and individual-level protections (e.g., restrictions on open road access to be $<0.6\text{km/km}^2$) in areas otherwise judged to be suitable habitat along with assurance of good connectivity between wilderness areas and areas subject to this kind of road management. The ESA provides for meaningful habitat protections, including through its Section 7 consultation provisions. But a 10(j) designation would create loopholes that allow the Forest Service to take actions on National Forest Lands that may affect grizzly bears, without Section 7 consultation. Although much is made of the flexibility that a 10(j) rule and designation could provide, the current “Interagency Grizzly Bear Committee Guidelines” as well as the Fish and Wildlife Service Hazing Guidance provide plenty of flexibility in dealing with conflict, and even “preventative action.” This is more than clear when viewing the actions taken in Montana in response to conflict or even potential conflict, where bears have been relocated or removed as a result of concerns that a conflict could arise (we do not condone this, but simply note that existing framework pursuant to the threatened listing rule provides ample flexibility, without sacrificing the Section 7 consultation requirement). While the ESA, and existing management guidelines and guidance already provide plenty flexibility for managing grizzly bears, the 10(j) would result in a loss of protections the ESA provides to grizzly bears and their habitat, by excluding activity on National Forest lands from Section 7 consultation.

We appreciate the “no-net-loss of core” approach. However, because historical habitat loss and fragmentation and human-caused mortality led to the extirpation of the NCE population, we believe the proposed 10(j) rule is likely to impinge on restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears in the NCE.

It is unclear from the DEIS if any data supports the assertion that designating grizzly bears in the NCE as a nonessential experimental population will result in greater social tolerance. Particularly where in recent years, polls have shown an 88% approval rating for reintroducing grizzly bears to the NCE, it is unclear either: 1) why such a measure (10(j) NEP rule) would be needed; nor 2) whether such a measure in fact improves social tolerance. The bears translocated to the NCE should retain their ESA listing status, and the protections on the lands they inhabit should be maximized, including by requiring Section 7 consultation for activities that may impact grizzly bears or their habitat. It is also not entirely clear if in fact, the bears translocated into the NCE would indeed be geographically separated from other populations of grizzly bears that are not “experimental.”

The bears in the NCE have been and likely will be transboundary bears moving across the “border” between Canada and the United States, and while bears have not been documented on the U.S. side, due to the remote nature of much of the habitat, we do not know for certain if bears are currently occupying remote portions of the U.S. NCE. And current evidence is also less than clear regarding the Canada side of the NCE, with recent science indicating there may be a small

population of 3 females. In the absence of certainty, establishment of a Section 10(j) nonessential experimental population in the NCE should be avoided.

Evidence is clear that grizzly bears are threatened by motorized access, human conflict, livestock conflict, cumulative effects of logging, mining, energy and transmission line development. Establishing the NCE population as nonessential experimental is more likely to allow more (than maintaining their current threatened listing status) destructive activity (such as logging, mining, energy development, etc.), without analysis on the effects on grizzly bears and their habitat.

Recovery efforts should include all current suitable habitat, including areas south of I-90. And these efforts should be fluid enough to provide protections for grizzly bears in any areas they successfully colonize. This would hopefully alleviate dealing with problems like the essentially arbitrary lines that have hampered recovery efforts in the NCDE and GYE and the spatially truncated protections in the Bitterroot Ecosystem. Given the wide range of estimated carrying capacity (300-800+ from various studies) and the highly imperiled status of grizzly bears in adjacent British Columbia which create uncertainty about what will be needed, using all suitable habitat is of greater imperative. And the uncertain effects of climate change only exacerbate the need to establish grizzly bears in as much currently suitable habitat as possible. Although some suggest all will be well even in the face of a changing climate, others project a decline in huckleberries and the bumble bees that pollinate the berries. All of this uncertainty lends further support for protecting bears and all suitable habitat and translocating grizzly bears into all suitable habitat, both north and south of I-90. We encourage you to remove Management Zone 2 status as is currently proposed, for bears in suitable habitat south of I-90.

Moreover, moving bears from one population that enjoy the protections of the existing special 4(d) rule (50 C.F.R. 17.40 (b) in the lower 48 into the NCE only to remove many of those protections, would not serve the broader purpose of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service of protecting and recovering grizzly bears in the lower 48. These translocated bears would be put at risk as a result of the translocation itself and then face greater risks where they land, with fewer protections in place to promote their well-being and the establishment of a sustainable population. Creating a patchwork of listing status and management zones will create uncertainty, making recovery more challenging and management overly complicated.

CONCLUSION

Thank you for your consideration of our comments. We are eager to see this project finally start after several starts and stops and thank you for moving forward with reintroducing and translocating grizzly bears into the North Cascades Ecosystem. A healthy population of grizzly bears in the wild and massive NCE is essential for grizzly bear recovery in the lower 48. As noted above, we urge the Park Service and the Fish and Wildlife Service to ensure they rely on and employ the best available science in deciding on a translocation plan- with adequate numbers to establish a sustaining population in timely fashion (with far more needed than 25 over the course of up to 10 years), with a re-evaluation of the carrying capacity of the NCE, with no arbitrary boundaries limiting grizzly bears in otherwise suitable habitat, with adequate protections for the necessary suitable habitat, and by ensuring that grizzly bears in the NCE have the protections they need and deserve (pursuant to the existing special 4(d) rule by not adopting a rule to establish the NCE population as 10(j) rule nonessential experimental population.

On behalf of WildEarth Guardians and Nimiipuu Protecting the Environment, and with respect and excitement for seeing these great bears return to the North Cascades Ecosystem,


Wildlands & Wildlife Program Director
Western Environmental Law Center

Footnotes

Comment period open September 28, 2023 through November 13, 2023, and found at <https://parkplanning.nps.gov/document.cfm?parkID=327&projectID=112008&documentID=132104>

Pursuant to the current 4(d) rule; 50 C.F.R. 17.40(b).
81 Fed. Reg. 13174, 13181

Id.

Singleton, P. H., Gaines, W. L., & Lehmkuhl, J. F. (2004). Landscape permeability for grizzly bear movements in Washington and southwestern British Columbia. *Ursus*, 15(1), 90-103. Models indicated the Stevens Pass fracture zone between the North and Central Cascades blocks was the most permeable

Lyons, A. L., Gaines, W. L., Singleton, P. H., Kasworm, W. F., Proctor, M. F., & Begley, J. (2018). Spatially explicit carrying capacity estimates to inform species specific recovery objectives: Grizzly bear (*Ursus arctos*) recovery in the North Cascades. *Biological Conservation*, 222, 21-32. Carrying capacity estimates ranged from 83 to 402 female grizzly bears; Mowat, G., Heard, D. C., & Schwarz, C. J. (2013). Predicting grizzly bear density in western North America. *PloS one*, 8(12), e82757. Their model for densities of bears in interior areas predict that the North Cascades of British Columbia could support 284 bears ...and the North Cascades of Washington 874 bears; Ransom, J. I., Lyons, A. L., Hegewisch, K. C., & Crosby, M. (2023). An integrated modeling approach for considering wildlife reintroduction in the face of climate uncertainty: A case for the North Cascades grizzly bear. *Biological Conservation*, 279, 109947. Projecting future habitat quality remained consistent or increased slightly along the eastern portion of the ecosystem, and increased along its central and western portions, for a net increase in high quality habitat through time. At the most plausible female home range size of 280 km², we estimated carrying capacity would increase from a baseline of 139 female bears to 241-289 female bears. Estimated changes in habitat over time could increase grizzly bear density to 20-22 bears/1000 km² (males and females) from the previous estimate of 17 bears/1000 km².

British Columbia Ministry of Forests, Lands, Natural Resource Operations and Rural Development (April 2020). British Columbia grizzly bear population estimate for 2018. https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/environment/plants-animals-and-ecosystems/wildlife-wildlife-habitat/grizzly-bears/grizzly_bear_pop_est_report_2018_final.pdf

See Ransom, FN 5

Graves, T. A., Janousek, W. M., Gaulke, S. M., Nicholas, A. C., Keinath, D. A., Bell, C. M., ... & Sheffield, C. S. (2020). Western bumble bee: declines in the continental United States and range-wide information gaps. *Ecosphere*, 11(6), e03141. A 93% decline in bumble bees over 21 years; Janousek, W. M., Douglas, M. R., Cannings, S., Clément, M. A., Delphia, C. M., Everett, J. G., ... & Graves, T. A. (2023). Recent and future declines of a historically widespread pollinator linked to climate, land cover, and pesticides. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 120(5), e2211223120.

Kasworm, W. F., Proctor, M. F., Servheen, C., & Paetkau, D. (2007). Success of grizzly bear population augmentation in northwest Montana. *The Journal of Wildlife Management*, 71(4), 1261-1266; Kasworm, W. F., Radant, T. G., Tesiberg, J. E., Welander, A., Proctor, M., & Cooley, H. (2018). Cabinet-Yaak Recovery Area 2017 research and monitoring progress report. US Fish & Wildlife Service, Missoula, Montana.

McLellan, M. L. (2020). Identifying mechanisms of population change in two threatened grizzly bear populations. Ph.D. Dissertation, Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington, New Zealand.

Id.

Mattson, D. J., Herrero, S., & Merrill, T. (2005). Are black bears a factor in the restoration of North American grizzly bear populations? *Ursus*, 16(1), 11-30; Stetz, J. B., Mitchell, M. S., & Kendall, K. C. (2019). Using spatially-explicit capture-recapture models to explain variation in seasonal density patterns of sympatric ursids. *Ecography*, 42(2), 237-248.

Welch et al. 1997, Rode et al. 2001.

Wilson et al. 2014, Wilson 2023.

Lamb, C. T., Mowat, G., Reid, A., Smit, L., Proctor, M., McLellan, B. N., ... & Boutin, S. (2018). Effects of habitat quality and access management on the density of a recovering grizzly bear population. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 55(3), 1406-1417. Grizzly bear population recovery is possible in a multi-use landscape when management actions target priority areas... a policy target should limit human access by managing road density below 0.6 km/km², while ensuring areas of high habitat quality have no roads....

Appendix D of the DEIS

<https://www.fws.gov/media/grizzly-bear-hazing-guidance>

See e.g. NCE 2023 DEIS: p. 38+ for 10(j) regs and compare p. 34 non 10(j) take allowances; p.43- both B and C allow for deterrence with both referring to FWS guidance on hazing; and Appendix D "Interagency Grizzly Bear Committee Guidelines"; provide more than adequate flexibility- including "Preventive Action"- where relocation may occur even when a bear is not deemed a "nuisance"; and no conflict or other troublesome incident has occurred at D-4.

88 Fed. Reg 67197-67198; USFWS 2022, pp. 49-51.

DEIS, at p. iv.

USFWS proposed to establish a nonessential experimental population in the North Cascades Ecosystem- 88 Fed. Reg. 67193,

67200.

Id., 67198; Morgan et al. 2019, p. 19.

88 Fed. Reg. 67193, 67197-67198.

Singleton, P. H., Gaines, W. L., & Lehmkuhl, J. F. (2004). Landscape permeability for grizzly bear movements in Washington and southwestern British Columbia. *Ursus*, 15(1), 90-103. Models indicated the Stevens Pass fracture zone between the North and Central Cascades blocks was the most permeable

Lyons, A. L., Gaines, W. L., Singleton, P. H., Kasworm, W. F., Proctor, M. F., & Begley, J. (2018). Spatially explicit carrying capacity estimates to inform species specific recovery objectives: Grizzly bear (*Ursus arctos*) recovery in the North Cascades. *Biological Conservation*, 222, 21-32. Carrying capacity estimates ranged from 83 to 402 female grizzly bears;

Mowat, G., Heard, D. C., & Schwarz, C. J. (2013). Predicting grizzly bear density in western North America. *PLoS one*, 8(12), e82757. Their model for densities of bears in interior areas ... predict that the North Cascades of British Columbia could support 284 bears ...and the North Cascades of Washington 874 bears;

Ransom, J. I., Lyons, A. L., Hegewisch, K. C., & Krosby, M. (2023). An integrated modeling approach for considering wildlife reintroduction in the face of climate uncertainty: A case for the North Cascades grizzly bear. *Biological Conservation*, 279, 109947. Projecting future habitat quality remained consistent or increased slightly along the eastern portion of the ecosystem, and increased along its central and western portions, for a net increase in high quality habitat through time. At the most plausible female home range size of 280 km², we estimated carrying capacity would increase from a baseline of 139 female bears to 241-289 female bears. Estimated changes in habitat over time could increase grizzly bear density to 20-22 bears/1000 km² (males and females) from the previous estimate of 17 bears/1000 km².

British Columbia Ministry of Forests, Lands, Natural Resource Operations and Rural Development (April 2020). British Columbia grizzly bear population estimate for 2018. https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/environment/plants-animals-and-ecosystems/wildlife-wildlife-habitat/grizzly-bears/grizzly_bear_pop_est_report_2018_final.pdf

See Ransom, above

Graves, T. A., Janousek, W. M., Gaulke, S. M., Nicholas, A. C., Keinath, D. A., Bell, C. M., ... & Sheffield, C. S. (2020). Western bumble bee: declines in the continental United States and range-wide information gaps. *Ecosphere*, 11(6), e03141. A 93% decline in bumble bees over 21 years; Janousek, W. M., Douglas, M. R., Cannings, S., Clément, M. A., Delphia, C. M., Everett, J. G., ... &

Graves, T. A. (2023). Recent and future declines of a historically widespread pollinator linked to climate, land cover, and pesticides. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 120(5), e2211223120.

Correspondence ID: 13758Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Darrington, WA 98241
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 12:09:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in favor of No Action on this proposal.

What you fail to mention, is that we already have Grizzly's in the North Cascades. There is no physical boundary to keep them from repopulating even further over time from Canada, yet they stay stable in their current population...

There is only speculation & no hard evidence as to the previous population of grizzly's in the proposed North Cascades relocation area.

Most all algorithms for your relocation proposal, are based on the Canadian fur trade receipts for shipment of hides.

There is zero historic data on the location of these grizzly harvests, nor was there a viable market for these hides, such as the beaver pelts for hats.

The fur shipped east, from the western Hudson Bay hubs were collected throughout the far reaches of the western states, Alaska & the interior of Canada.

There is absolutely no evidence to prove that these grizzly pelts were specifically harvested from the North Cascades Ecosystem.

Based on these fur trade receipts as their evidence; even the currently-heavily populated I-5 corridor could have very well been a location of harvest, yet you have no plans to repopulate this area with the grizzly's...

Due to the fact that the NCE is purposefully within a National Park, comments are open to those unaffected, from across the entire country. Sadly, as residents we actually have very little say in this matter
This proposal has no merit & is solely based on emotion.

While there are a multitude of concerns, with the relocating & unnaturally inducing the population the grizzly in the NC, the Salmon runs in the watersheds should be forefront.

All Salmon, in all watersheds, will be in danger under the additional proposal from the Dept of the Interior; to make the entire State of Washington, save for the lower Selkirks,(S.E.B.E.R.Z. previously established) designated nonessential experimental population (NEP) grizzly areas.

We have failed at our attempts to restore fish populations due to many reasons. Every action & reaction, down to the lawsuits for only bio identical species to each river, has stalled or failed the salmon runs.

Proposing to purposefully bring in additional grizzly, who may consume upwards towards 100 pounds of fish per day during critical spawning periods, would put a final end to most salmon runs & fisheries as a whole.

I will cite the mountain goat implants as a failure. Man brought them in to the Olympic National Park, & the end result was a mass slaughter of the animals. They destroyed the habit where they were intentionally planted, so man corrected his mistake, removed a few at a huge expense & destroyed the rest. An utter waste of a population of animals, as the public was not allowed salvage rights to the meat.

We can no longer afford any mistakes, made to the WA State salmon species at this critical point.

This is a predator with no natural predators, when this goes wrong it will be disastrous for wildlife & humans alike.

Again, the question of importation of the Grizzly, to the NCP, should be weighed solely on merit, not on emotions.

Correspondence ID: 13759Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bothell, WA 98028
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 12:18:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support reintroducing Grizzly Bears into the North Cascades. It is essential for a balanced eco system.

Correspondence ID: 13760Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mercer Island, WA 98040
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 12:19:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Although I understand concerns from ranchers/farmers that the reintroduction may pose a threat to their livestock, the potential impact seems very small compared to the opportunity to reintroduce these animals.
Even if Grizzlies were to prey on commercial livestock the number of animals would be single digits, if any, given their intended range and rare opportunity for them to encounter commercial livestock.
I support moving ahead with reintroduction.

Correspondence ID: 13761Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 12:21:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I love hiking in the north cascades -- it's such a beautiful and remote wilderness. I fully support the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the north cascades. They are an important part of the ecosystem.
I also don't think that reintroduction will significantly impact recreation in the area. Hikers are already required to store food in bear and animal proof containers due to black bears and other animals. I would love to see a grizzly in the north cascades!!

Correspondence ID: 13762Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mt Vernon, WA 98274
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 12:22:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I urge you to choose Alternative C of the September 2023 Grizzly Bear Recovery Plan. The plan is very thorough and includes science-based studies of many aspects of the recovery of bears and the impact on the human and non-human environment. I strongly agree with the purpose and need statement of the plan and feel that the plan has addressed all concerns. These bears are an important part of the ecosystem and returning them to the North Cascades will have many benefits. The plan for relocation of bears, bringing bears from a similar food economy and bringing in just a few at a time, is very reasonable and intelligent. This will give both people and the bears a chance to adjust and managers will learn a great deal from the bears during this relocation process.

Education is key to bear and human safety. As in so many of our wilderness areas, hiking and hunting in the North Cascades has exploded in popularity. It is important that the plan adequately addresses the need for safety education in bear country and that funds are available for training and food storage improvements. There are many successful programs in the Rocky Mountains that can be drawn from for safety training.

Grizzly bears belong in the North Cascades. Alternative C is the best option.

Correspondence ID: 13763Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98146
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 12:22:24

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of Grizzly Bears in the North Cascades. Humans are at a point where we need to correct mistakes we have made in the past and the regional extinction of a species is one of those mistakes. The area where the bears are being located is remote enough to prevent most human interaction.

Other efforts can prepare the public for this change, such as reporting the locations of the bears, increasing bear safety outreach and education, and mitigation efforts for human-bear conflict.

Correspondence ID: 13764Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bothell, WA 98021
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 12:23:52

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I was born in Seattle and have lived in the shadow of the North Cascades my entire life. My greatest memories were made along river banks, under dense forest canopies, and amid huckleberry patches. My love for nature inspired me to obtain a bachelor's degree in conservation biology, with a focus on wildlife ecology. Based on my personal experience in the NCE and my educational background, I strongly urge the NPS to pursue Grizzly Bear Reintroduction Alternative B.

My reasons are as follows: Option B places greater emphasis on the ecological aspects of reintroduction, rather than Option C, which favors the human dimensions. While some human-wildlife conflict management is necessary, the lethal management practices seen in places such as the greater Yellowstone ecosystem are better suited to a grizzly population that is already established and self-sustaining. I believe the earliest days of grizzly reintroduction, when the viability of the population is still undetermined, is not the time to deter grizzly bears in any way from practicing their natural behaviors or

moving into new territory.

In this case, education of the public about backcountry safety, bear awareness, leave-no-trace protocols, and additional permitting requirements are the best course of action. I have too often seen people treat wilderness spaces with utter carelessness. It is time for hikers and visitors to take responsibility for their own actions and safety. This is not the city, this is the wilderness. Humans are not at the top of the food chain, and a little humility will go a long ways towards improving public safety in wild spaces and increasing the odds of peaceful human-grizzly bear coexistence with minimal lethal methods.

Reintroducing grizzly bears to their natural habitat with restore a key element of a healthy, functioning ecosystem. By controlling ungulate populations, spreading seeds of native berries, and providing competition for other predators, grizzly bears will improve the quality of habitat for other species. A robust ecosystem is vital to withstand the effects of climate change.

When wolves were reintroduced to Yellowstone NP, it created an entirely new wilderness experience that attracted visitors from across the world. If the NPS and WDFW will insist on prioritizing economic growth, I need only point to the increased revenue from tourism the reintroduction of a marketable species such as the grizzly bear will bring.

Thank you for your consideration, and for allowing public comment. I hope the NPS will make the ecologically conscious choice and choose Alternative B.

Correspondence ID: 13765Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bentonville, AR 72712
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 12:24:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please help the grizzlies be where they naturally deserve to be! There's no excuse that we've taken them out of their own habitat, but we can fix that wrong by restoring them and protecting them!

Correspondence ID: 13766Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98125
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 12:29:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am in favor of NOT reintroducing grizzly bears into the NCE.

As far as impacts to humans go, just look at the signs in Canada. If a woman's menstrual cycle - bears are very much more likely to come in human range.

It is very nice to know when I am out that black bears and cougars are my biggest encounter challenge in the NCE.

I have been to Yellowstone and we all know folks get injured and die.

I read grizzlies make it back on their own, but for human's sake - please leave it be.

My 2 cents as a hiker.

Correspondence ID: 13767Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98107
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 12:34:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I want to write in support of restoring grizzly bears. Carnivores are essential to the well-being of the forest. As a Washington resident, our forests are important to the future health of the state. Please show we value the bears in the Pacific Northwest.

Correspondence ID: 13768Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Everett, WA 98201
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 12:36:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support reintroducing grizzly bears into the North Cascades in Washington State. As the humans who removed these bears in the first place, it is our responsibility to bring them back so they can continue to contribute and play a vital part in the ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 13769Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Carlton, WA 98814
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 12:38:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I've commented on grizzly reintroduction to the N. Cascades over the years at other opportunities. I remain totally in favor of the proposal to bring in several breeding-age bears per year and at the same time educating the public about safe behavior in bear country. Safe behavior will overall result in safe outcomes. I have been around grizzlies in Alaska and British Columbia intermittently for about 50 years while climbing, hiking and sea kayaking. Although there are aberrant bears just the way there are aberrant humans, the risks are incredibly lower that those bears will result in injury to a person than with the humans deviants, assuming that that person practices safe behavior in bear country. I've been charged by a female black bear with a young cub, but have never had a problem with a grizzly even though once I found myself within 50' of one. Reintroduction will help restore a natural environment that has been missing a key large animal that will be beneficial in many ways, both environmentally and culturally. I don't think that the reintroduction decision should be derailed by ranchers or smaller-scale operations with domestic livestock, but I do think that there should be outreach to these folks to help them minimize impacts, including possible compensation for documented predation. Conservation groups have a possible role to help out, and governmental entities should help encourage this.

Correspondence ID: 13770Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Eastsound, WA 98245
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 12:39:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Superintendent
North Cascades National Park Service Complex

████████████████████
████████████████████

████████████████████
████████████████████
████████████████████
Eastsound, WA 98245

November 13, 2023

Dear Superintendent,

We are writing to give support to the plan for restoring grizzly bears to their historical range in the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE) in Washington state.

My husband and I were conservation biologist working in Northern California prior to obtaining residency to Washington state in 1995. We have been avid outdoors people our entire lives as well as advocates for projects that help to protect and reintroduce endangered and threatened species back to their ancestral ranges. We are both proponents of the idea of "Rewilding" and the "3 C's"--conservation of Cores, Corridors, and Carnivores. "That vision is of dynamic but stable self-regulating and self-sustaining ecosystems with near pre-human levels of species diversity." (rewildingearth.org)

We are in favor of Plan B - grizzly bears restored to the NCE would be managed as a threatened species with the existing special rule (50 CFR 17.40(b)) under section 4(d) of the Endangered Species Act. However, if the preferred Alternative C is adopted then this would be preferable to doing nothing (Alternative A).

We feel that there plenty appropriate territory for reintroduced bears to thrive and maintain a healthily population in the NCE in Washington state. Our enthusiasm for this concept is supported by the reports from Peter Alagona, professor of Environmental Studies at the University of California, Santa Barbara and the founder and facilitator of the California Grizzly Research Network. Dr. Alagona has reported that over 20,000 grizzly bears currently reside in Europe in an overall area far smaller than North America.

It is time to restore the grizzly bear to their rightful home in the NCE in Washington state. It is important for their continued survival and our own.

We are submitting this same letter separately to your email, so that each of us gets a vote.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 13771Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98119
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 12:41:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Yes! Please reintroduce grizzly bears to the North Cascades! We need our apex predators back so our ecosystems are in balance!

Correspondence ID: 13772Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Eastsound, WA 98245
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 12:42:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Superintendent
North Cascades National Park Service Complex
810 State Route 20
Sedro Woolley, WA 98284

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

November 13, 2023

Dear Superintendent,

We are writing to give support to the plan for restoring grizzly bears to their historical range in the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE) in Washington state.

My husband and I were conservation biologist working in Northern California prior to obtaining residency to Washington state in 1995. We have been avid outdoors people our entire lives as well as advocates for projects that help to protect and reintroduce endangered and threatened species back to their ancestral ranges. We are both proponents of the idea of "Rewilding" and the "3 C's"--conservation of Cores, Corridors, and Carnivores. "That vision is of dynamic but stable self-regulating and self-sustaining ecosystems with near pre-human levels of species diversity." (rewildingearth.org)

We are in favor of Plan B - grizzly bears restored to the NCE would be managed as a threatened species with the existing special rule (50 CFR 17.40(b)) under section 4(d) of the Endangered Species Act. However, if the preferred Alternative C is adopted then this would be preferable to doing nothing (Alternative A).

We feel that there plenty appropriate territory for reintroduced bears to thrive and maintain a healthily population in the NCE in Washington state. Our enthusiasm for this concept is supported by the reports from Peter Alagona, professor of Environmental Studies at the University of California, Santa Barbara and the founder and facilitator of the California Grizzly Research Network. Dr. Alagona has reported that over 20,000 grizzly bears currently reside in Europe in an overall area far smaller than North America.

It is time to restore the grizzly bear to their rightful home in the NCE in Washington state. It is important for their continued survival and our own.

We are submitting this same letter separately to your email, so that each of us gets a vote.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 13773Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Camano Island, WA 98282
United States of America
Outside Organization: None Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 12:42:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am in favor of returning Grizzlies back to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 13774Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Snohomish, WA 98296
United States of America
Outside Organization: None Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 12:44:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Introducing grizzly bears to Washington State is a very bad idea. I lived in Montana for most of my life before coming back to Washington. Bear attacks happened in Montana and that was in a very low populated stated in relation

to its size. In Washington, the people that take advantage of hiking in the wilderness is much more common. If grizzlies are introduced into Washington, it will not take long for someone to get mauled. Grizzlies are an apex predator with nothing that naturally manages the population. Grizzlies also maintain large areas as part of their habitat so believing that keeping them to the parks is a nonsensical approach to game management. These bears will roam outside of the park and create nuisance instances that will force WDFW to lethally remove these animals to protect our state's citizens.

I can assure that you if introduced, there will be bear to human encounters that will most likely result in human casualties and bear deaths as a response to people being mauled.

Correspondence ID: 13776Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Chewelah, WA 99109
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 12:49:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: From a ranchers stand point, Washington state has been poor at managing the current predator populations at best - This is especially true in Eastern Washington where habitat is more plentiful and where a smaller human population tend to live and thus our voices are less important to those in legislature and bureaucracies. This does not mean we are less important in our safety of personal lives, livelihoods and livestock protection, but this push to re-introduce dangerous bears into human habitat on purpose is gravely irresponsible.

Legislation continues to push fewer and fewer options for ranchers and communities in general when it comes to predators. Limiting or attempting to do away with hunting all together and with the perceived lack of rights of the residents by the state of one to defend life and personal property with current predators from coyotes, cougars, wolves and black bears among the most common. The addition of grizzly bears and failed programs from the stand point of farmers and ranchers in other states where this has been instituted would further decimate agriculture and put lives in danger in Washington state. This is a poorly thought out plan and takes aim at one of our marginalized and minatory groups, farmers and ranchers.

2022 saw an Increase in Bear Attack Numbers in the US. per an article published in The Guardian that confirmed an increase in the number of bear attacks in the US during 2022.

Currently there have been 48 fatal bear attacks in North America between 2000-2017. There are over 200,000 brown bears worldwide with being an Apex predator and protections already currently granted these introductions are unnecessary and the reason cited for this increase in fatalities was a combination of the steady growth of wild bears and also the continued encroachment of humans into bear habitats.

This insinuates that these are wild bears, going to these locations voluntarily, this plan seeks to put the bears there on purpose. Statistics show bears do not stay where they are put and have 150 to 500 mile radius of travel for habitat. This plan in my opinion is "knowingly" putting humans at risk and should be condemned for it's lack of foresight, unless putting humans at risk is your goal?

The lack of ability to protect one's livelihood and livestock is another way to decimate the American rancher to which less than 2% remain and the levels of regulation are burdensome at current level. In a time of shortages this would create undue stress and create even more shortages should this force ranchers and farmers out of business.

I ask for your consideration to strike this plan down based on the fact it is over reaching, dangerous and plain nonsensical to place additional burdens on the tax paying residents of Washington state that have voted this down previously. This is a push to assert will of special interest groups where it is not wanted.

Say NO to grizzly introduction to Wa State.

Correspondence ID: 13777Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Oak Harbor, WA 98277
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 12:53:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The North Cascades are a sanctuary for many outdoor activities. However, the existing grizzly bear population, as noted by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, is already a concern. Adding more bears could jeopardize the mule deer and increase risks for visitors. I oppose this move.

There are no natural or many made barriers in place that keep Grizzly Bears out of the North Cascades. If the bears wanted to migrate further south they would. There are already Grizzly Bears in the North Cascades in the first place. The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife makes me take a test each year to hunt Black Bear in the North Cascades. It's a test to ensure a hunter can distinguish between a Black Bear and a Grizzly Bear. So that tells me that the state is aware of an already established population.

The North Cascade wilderness areas are more like parks than a true wilderness area like in Montana or Wyoming. The amount of Grizzly to human conflicts that will be had in the North Cascades will be alarming, as many more humans use the North Cascade Wilderness areas than in the other 2 states mentioned.

We don't want any more Grizzly Bears than are already here. Maybe I'll say it louder for the people in the back. WE DON'T WANT ANY MORE GRIZZLY BEARS THAN ARE ALREADY HERE!

Correspondence ID: 13778Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Chewelah, WA 99109
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 12:54:19
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: These is a very poor decision, by our overreaching government. We here in Eastern Washington already have an out of control predator problem. Ranchers and farmers have had to deal with a large burden of expense to try and protect our herds of animals by having livestock guardian dogs. Please do not let this pass, Animals and human lives will be in grave danger.

Correspondence ID: 13779Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Camano Island, WA 98282
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 12:55:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades. I believe that introducing these top predators will help the environment get back into balance. I know that introducing wolves back into Yellowstone helped to balance and restore the natural habitat and wildlife there. Thank you for taking my comments. I support your work!

Correspondence ID: 13780Project:112008Document:132104

Address: wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 12:56:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am for option #1, no action. I do not think we should be spending millions of taxpayer dollars on this project number of reasons. I read the environmental impact statement. I do not think there is an adequate food supply for the grizzly, i.e. deer population in down. The U.S Fish & Wildlife agency stated that the grizzly eats 90% non-meat items.

They did not mention that this is the female grizzly, the male eats 75% meat per multiple studies. Also, the range of the male is over 400 sq miles. The proposed zone 1 is within one mile of my house, in an urban growth area. Why would you introduce grizzlies into an area where they would eat fish that the government spent million and millions on to protect? Andrew LaValle of the USF&W agency stated that he "did not anticipate any closures within the North Cascade" zone one due to grizzly introduction. But there have been yearly closures in the Cascade Pass, and Ross Lake areas due to bears. Why would he say this, if it has already been happening? Does he think the grizzly will be different? Or is he just lying to us? These closures impact my ability to enjoy the outdoors, but maybe this is the agenda, to close off wilderness area to the public.

Also, the comments from the affected areas should be weighted more than those from out of area, and those who will never be in the reintroduction area. This was one the arguments for reintroduction, "that people could enjoy viewing this iconic mammal again". How would they be able to "enjoy viewing" this animal??? I do not believe that there is any benefit to the reintroduction, the black bears are already providing any benefit that the grizzly can provide!! And the grizzly will drive the black bear out of their territory. One of the arguments for reintroduction is that there is a low chance of harm from encounters with a grizzly. They site Yellowstone Park as an example of the millions of people that are in grizzly territory but there is a very low attack rate compared to the amount of people. Well 99 % of those people are nowhere near their actual area. In the North Cascade proposed Zone one there are many hikers, farmers, ranchers. Will you be accountable for a dangerous encounter? I could go on but will stop here.

Correspondence ID: 13781Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98107
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 12:56:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support Grizzly Bear restoration in the North Cascades ecosystem. I'm a frequent hiker in and around the North Cascades (and down into Mazama on the eastern side) and would love to see the species finally return to the region for the following reasons:

- We hunted them to extinction and limited their habitat so we must help restore them
- They are a culturally significant creature for the indigenous peoples of this region
- They are a keystone species representing the entire health of the few glaciated regions we have left in this state
- They provide invaluable services to ecosystems that humans cannot replace

I also think it's crucial to begin reintroduction NOW. Waiting could result in too little too late and losing these bears forever.

As for the concerns of ranchers and farmers, I empathize with their worries for their livelihood. But I don't think reintroducing grizzly bears is mutually exclusive to challenges for agriculture in the area. These bears don't want to go to human settlements. They only do it when they have to...when their own habitat can't support them. So with reintroducing bears, we also must protect their habitat and food sources (berries, trees, prey, etc.), which will in turn disincentivize them from going near farms and ranches in the area.

I do NOT support the eventual delisting of the grizzly bears from the Endangered Species Act. First, hunting decimated these creatures before, and despite modern protections, there's no reason to believe hunters won't do the same again. Second, tags that have been discussed for grizzlies before are way too cheap and act as incentives for hunting an animal that has neared extinction before. Third, tags often act as a means to control the population, and in this case to control the bears entering human habitat, but they only want to enter human habitat when their own habitat is at risk. so a better process would be to protect more habitat for them in the first place.

Correspondence ID: 13782Project:112008Document:132104

Address: seattle, WA 98103
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 12:59:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: TO: National Park Service/ PEPC
RE: Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Environmental Impact Statement, North Cascades Ecosystem

Hello,

99.9% of species that have lived on earth are now extinct. How many should be restored?

As a practical matter, glacial melt and reduction of resources, resulting in increased competition and need for animals to venture closer to human habitat for survival, are counter-indicative to these plans.

As business owners with vacation rentals in Marblemount at the park's entrance, we can attest to visitor trepidation upon the most minimal mention of bears, much less grizzlies. There will be no placating them, they will choose another destination for their holidays.

To quote a prominent Washington State resident, leaving things well enough alone, by not re-introducing grizzlies, should be a "No Brainer".

██████████

Correspondence ID: 13783Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 12:59:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Having read through the draft grizzly bear restoration plan, I find the ecological arguments for restoration not compelling, and thus prefer Alternative A. Reintroduction of grizzly bears will require substantial behavioral changes from all park visitors, raising anxiety levels, and thus degrading the experience. While the document makes clear it would be permissible to kill a grizzly when life is at stake, I personally have no plans or desire to purchase and carry a gun.

Correspondence ID: 13784Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Spokane, WA 99224
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 13:00:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We DO NOT need grizzly bears reintroduced in the North Cascades. You hope they will stay in the North Cascades. These bears will not stay in the North Cascades. Hope is not a course of action.
My hope to counter your hope: When these bears begin to venture out of the mountains, they venture toward the ocean. The west side of the state needs to be populated with both bears and wolves. That is the only way Olympia will understand why there is so much push-back on these programs from those of us on the east side of the state. These programs show no regard for ungulate populations.

Correspondence ID: 13785Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 13:03:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Humans were responsible for removing grizzlies from the North Cascades and it's our responsibility to bring them back home.

Correspondence ID: 13786Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98199
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 13:04:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations. I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live in and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities. Furthermore, the 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape. Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage. Thank you for taking the time to keep our North Cascades wild!

Correspondence ID: 13788Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bothell, WA 98011
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 13:11:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think reintroducing Grizzlies is a good idea. I would love to see them back in the wild someday!

Correspondence ID: 13789Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98199
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 13:13:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As an avid back packer, hiker and regular user of the mountain ecosystems throughout the state of Washington I approve the plan as presented in the above documents. In short , I approve reintroduction of Grizzly Bears into the North Cascades. Whether I ever actually see a Grizzly there or not is immaterial but just knowing they are there adds immeasurably to my enjoyment of the mountains and wild places in WA State.

Thank you for your consideration.

██████████

Correspondence ID: 13790Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Omak, WA 98841
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 13:19:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzly bears to the North Cascades ecosystem. The grizzly bear is native to the area and, as the apex predator, has an important role in the complete ecosystem.

Humans have co-existed with grizzly bears for millennia and successfully co-exist today in regions with grizzly populations. The potential conflicts are grossly overstated. Loss of crops and predation on livestock are quite unlikely because of the abundant high elevation habitat available in the Cascades. Responsible behavior by hikers and backpackers has been shown

to minimize interaction with grizzlies and would work in the Cascades.

Without restoration efforts it is unlikely that grizzly bears will naturally migrate to the North Cascades. Restoration of the grizzly bear is critical to restoring the full suite of species native to the area and restoring a complete and healthy ecosystem. It is time for us to make room for the grizzly bear in this premier and historic habitat.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Correspondence ID: 13791Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Everett, WA 98208
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 13:20:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I believe that grizzly bears should be reintroduced because they belong in that area. We need to do what we can to undo damage we have done by "managing" the environment. It may mean changes with how people use the wilderness, but we should work with nature not try to force it to our whims. We may not get to do exactly what we want when we want.

Correspondence ID: 13792Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 13:22:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support returning grizzly bears to their native lands. I believe it will enhance their recovery, balance natural animal numbers, and increase the chances of keeping the North Cascades wild. I love bears, but like most, don't want to run into a grizzly, but know that proper training and etiquette can be in place to protect myself. Plus I'm not often in the back country. Knowing the bears are their builds intrigue and awe. I have been following this proposal for years and sincerely hope our "Evergreen State" will make the decision to support our natural resources.

Correspondence ID: 13793Project:112008Document:132104

Address: redmond, WA 98052
United States of America

Outside Organization: none Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 13:25:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support a trial reintroduction with specific safeguards to protect these bears from hunting and hunters.

Correspondence ID: 13795Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Port Townsend, WA WA
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 13:28:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing in support of Grizzly Bear reintroduction or augmentation in the North Cascades. Grizzly Bears have been eliminated from the vast majority of their native habitat in the lower forty-eight U.S. I believe our nation can and should accommodate expansion of currently very limited Grizzly Bear range, and the North Cascades is ideal habitat for this goal.

I support the goal primarily from conservation biology perspectives. But I also believe that the North Cascades will be a

richer and more complete ecosystem with a thriving Grizzly Bear population. From a personal standpoint, I have hiked and camped in Grizzly Bear habitat in the Greater Yellowstone ecosystem many times, taking proper wilderness precautions, and am better for it. I recognize that human - bear conflicts could arise from this action, but I believe that with wisdom, flexibility, and common sense care they can be minimized, The payoff, a truly wild North Cascades including a thriving Grizzly bear population shared with humans, seems a very worthy goal.

Thank you for considering my view.

██████████
Port Townsend, WA

Correspondence ID: 13797Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bothell, WA 98021
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 13:31:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support reintroducing Grizzlies to the Cascades. They were residents long before humans pushed them out and should be allowed to come back to their natural space. Humans making decisions to enter the natural, wild areas of the world need to decide if they are willing to take on the risks and dangers inherent with sharing space with wildlife. If they are not willing to be in the habitat shared with Grizzlies, then they should stay out of the forests. We must learn to live in harmony with the other fauna of the earth and give back some of the space we forcibly stole from them so that all living in the ecosystem have a chance to thrive and survive.

Hikers and other recreational users being scared of bears is not a good enough reason to prevent reintroduction.

Correspondence ID: 13798Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98105
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 13:34:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am concerned that the reintroduction of grizzly bears would increase the likelihood of a lack of appropriate prey animals to support large predators. If this is the case, it seems inevitable that a certain percentage of these grizzlies would become problematically attracted to human food sources, as was likely the case with the couple who were killed traveling this year in Banff National Park. They did everything right, yet the bear, which was an older animal, still had the strength to snuff out their lives even though they had hung their food and used bear spray. If a population of animals is thriving well, it will naturally spread to other wild areas abundant enough to support that population. Grizzly bears in Montana and Idaho or from Canada could be allowed to spread to Washington naturally if conditions are favorable. I see no reason to speed the process artificially and fear that, in general, our state is much more highly populated with humans than places where grizzly bears are typically found. The potential for human/bear conflicts to occur is overwhelmingly high in our state.

Correspondence ID: 13799Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bothell, WA 98021-7879
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 13:34:31

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I fully support the plan to bring grizzlies back to the Cascades. I think restoring wildlife areas is one of our core responsibilities as human beings and a civilized nation. I believe education will be paramount, as people are already scared that bears are going to become predatory towards humans if this plan goes through.

Being afraid of what you don't understand is not a good enough reason to prevent this plan from moving forward. It's more important that we do the right and ethical thing and restore grizzlies to the cascades.

Bears are cool. Let's be friends with the bears.

Correspondence ID: 13800Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spokane, WA 99223
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 13:34:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As an avid hiker and animal lover, I am requesting the NPS take "No Action" regarding the proposal to reintroduce Grizzly Bear to the Northern Cascades region. Reintroducing grizzlies will endanger the lives of both humans and bears. As a government agency, the NPS primary concern ought to be public safety. But reintroducing grizzlies to the Northern Cascades will endanger the lives of both humans and bears.

Correspondence ID: 13801Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America

Outside Organization: Woodland Park Zoo Conservation/Preservation(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,13 2023 13:38:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Don Striker, Superintendent
North Cascades National Park Service Complex
810 State Route 20
Sedro Woolley, WA 98284


U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Washington Fish and Wildlife Office
510 Desmond Drive, Suite 102
Lacey, WA 98503

November 13, 2023

Dear Superintendent Striker and Supervisor Thompson,

On behalf of the Living Northwest Program at Woodland Park Zoo (WPZ), we appreciate this opportunity to submit comments in support of restoring grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE). The prospect of returning grizzlies to this ecosystem is a rare chance to right an egregious wrong from our past. We hope the long-awaited reintroduction process can move forward in a timely and seamless manner.

Each year, more than one million adults and children pass through the zoo's gates to spend time with the diversity of animals who live in our care. Our job as conservationists is to help ensure that, when visitors leave through those same gates, they know a bit more about the realities that wildlife face in their natural environment--and feel inspired to make conservation a priority in their own busy lives.

WPZ advocates for grizzly bear recovery in the NCE based on ecological, cultural, and moral grounds. As carnivore experts, we know that grizzlies play an outsized ecological role in the landscapes they inhabit, including by dispersing seeds through their droppings and aerating soil (thus helping to maintain healthy plant communities) through their prolific digging for bulbs and small mammals. Indeed, grizzlies are a key missing piece in the rewilding story of the NCE, and our scientific understanding of their ecological value as large, omnivorous mammals will no doubt grow by leaps and bounds once they are

back in this ecosystem. Given their diverse diet and ability to live in a variety of habitats, grizzlies will also contribute to ecological resilience in the NCE in the face of climate change.

Culturally, grizzly bears are iconic symbols of wildness who have held profound significance for some of the Indigenous peoples of this region for thousands of years. Over a century ago, the NCE's grizzlies--as elsewhere in the American West--were trapped, hunted, and poisoned without restraint by European settlers. We feel that it is our moral obligation to restore these magnificent animals to their historic range in the NCE, and that today's young people should inherit a different kind of legacy: one of tolerance and appreciation for grizzly bears. Of course, grizzlies have intrinsic value, too, and deserve to live free of persecution in the extensive wildlands of the North Cascades.

WPZ recognizes that reintroducing grizzly bears is not a trivial matter. After much consideration, we have chosen to support action Alternative C as generally presented in the EIS because we believe this alternative offers the greatest promise for the long-term recovery of a healthy grizzly bear population in the NCE. From 2008-2012, prior to our respective affiliations with the zoo, we were both part of a collaborative team that surveyed widely for grizzlies in the NCE using noninvasive hair-snagging corrals. Our team collectively sampled and genotyped more than 550 black bears, but we did not detect a single grizzly. These and other scientific findings indicate that grizzlies would be highly unlikely to re-establish a population under Alternative A, the no action alternative.

Although we would ideally prefer that reintroduced grizzlies receive the maximum legal protections currently provided to this species under the ESA, as presented in Alternative B, we understand that a successful reintroduction may require some of the flexible management tools afforded by a 10(j) designation. We thus support Alternative C because of the management flexibility it proffers, but we are nonetheless concerned with certain details included in the proposed 10(j) rules and hope that you will seriously consider making relevant changes in the final EIS. Specifically, we are strongly opposed to the proposal that agencies can potentially authorize conditioned lethal take licenses to members of the public, as put forth in two broad scenarios described on page 39:

Excerpt 1:

Conditioned lethal take [management zones 2 and 3.] With prior written authorization from the FWS or an authorized agency, livestock owners may lethally take a grizzly bear within 100 yards of legally present livestock if a depredation has been confirmed by the FWS or an authorized agency, and it is not reasonably possible to otherwise eliminate the threat by nonlethal deterrence or live capturing and releasing the grizzly bear unharmed in a remote area. If, after two weeks from the confirmed depredation, no further depredations have occurred, the permit would expire. Any grizzly bear killed under this provision must be reported within 24 hours to the FWS and the carcass surrendered to FWS.

Excerpt 2:

Conditioned lethal take [management zone 3.] The FWS, or authorized agency may issue prior written authorization to any person to kill a grizzly bear in management zone 3 when necessary for public safety or to protect property, but only if:

- The FWS or authorized agency determines that a grizzly bear presents a demonstrable and ongoing threat to human safety or to lawfully present livestock, working dogs, domestic animals, crops, beehives, or other property; and it is not reasonably possible to otherwise eliminate the threat by live capturing and releasing the grizzly bear unharmed;
- Once the FWS or authorized agency determines the threat is no longer ongoing, the FWS or authorized agency would notify the person, terminating the authorization;
- The individuals requesting the written authorization are otherwise authorized by the landowner or land management entity;
- The taking is done in a humane manner; and
- The taking is reported to the FWS, and the carcass is surrendered to the FWS.

Given the history of extreme persecution that led to the extirpation of grizzly bears in the NCE, we fear that grizzlies could be harmed or killed under the pretense of flexible management by licensed individuals who simply don't want to see this population restored. We're also troubled by the possibility that an unskilled person could seriously injure a grizzly in trying to lethally remove him or her, putting both the grizzly and the public at risk. We thereby request that any management activities involving the handling, relocation, or lethal management of grizzlies should be implemented solely by qualified FWS personnel or designees at an agency authorized by the FWS.

In addition, owners of livestock, domestic animals, or other property to which a grizzly presents a demonstrable and ongoing

threat should be required to exhaust all nonlethal measures available to them in their attempt to address this threat before relocation (or, as a last resort, lethal removal) is considered.

We are also concerned with the following proposed allowed take in all 3 management zones, as excerpted from page 38:

Unintentional take of a grizzly bear, provided such take is non-negligent and incidental to an otherwise lawful activity, the take is promptly reported to the FWS, and if the take occurs on national forest lands, that the USFS has maintained its "no net loss of core" approach and implemented food storage restrictions throughout management zone 1.

This allowance inherently places much emphasis on the USFS's commitment to "no net loss of core." As secure habitat is critical to the survival of grizzly bears, we'd like to see a more formal agreement between FWS/NPS and the USFS to help further protect core grizzly bear habitat and prevent the unintentional take of grizzlies.

Our next comment has to do with the health and safety of translocated grizzly bears. If grizzlies are to be reintroduced to the NCE--and we truly hope that they will be, soon--we trust that the welfare of the individual bears to be moved will be given utmost priority from start to finish. WPZ and our supporters are deeply committed to the wellbeing of individual animals, as well as to the conservation of wildlife populations. We believe, in fact, that these life-affirming values are inextricably linked.

Last, we know that this huge, wild ecosystem has more than enough space and food to once again support a grizzly bear population, but we will all have to work together to make sure we can coexist with these animals into the future. Cultivating coexistence between people and wildlife is a major priority at WPZ. We hope that your agencies will make the investments necessary to promote coexistence through public education and by providing myriad resources to advance bear smart communities.

WPZ is grateful for all that you have done and are currently doing to make grizzly bear recovery in the NCE a real possibility. Please know that we are dedicated to making the proposed reintroduction a success, and we encourage you to reach out to us if we can assist in any way. Our diverse staff includes experts in carnivore science, veterinary medicine, animal care, education, policy, and other pertinent areas--and we are here at the ready to help bring grizzly bears back to the North Cascades.

Sincerely,

██, Living Northwest Program, WPZ
██, Living Northwest Program and Conservation Scientist, WPZ

Correspondence ID: 13804Project:112008Document:132104
Address: seattle, WA 98115
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 13:45:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly urge the review committee to reject any brown bears being introduced to washington state, including the proposed north cascades restoration area.

as a frequent recreational user of these public lands, I do not wish to see or encounter any predator animals such as a grizzly bear.

please keep the brown bears in alaska, the rocky mountain region, and away from my family while we recreate in the state of washington.

our activities include backpacking, car camping, paddling, riding mountain bikes, fishing, hiking, trail running, exploring. we already contend with predators such as cougars, wolves, coyotes, black bear. I think that should offer enough balance to our ecosystem. the instinctive chase response of predators to humans moving through the woods at speeds greater than a slow

walk (like brown bears) makes them a hazard I wish to avoid while pursuing healthy outdoor activity.

thank you for prioritizing safety of people in our area by saying No to brown bear re-introduction

Correspondence ID: 13805Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Chewelah, WA 99109
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 13:46:12

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This plan to reintroduce the top apex predator of North America into Northeast Washington is insane and poorly thought out. Because of this recklessness, people's lives will be put into jeopardy. Families going out for a fun camping trip and hikers alike will be targeted by these monsters. There have already been a number of people eaten this year by grizzlies. This plan will put lots of people and animals in danger.

Correspondence ID: 13806Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Stehekin, WA 98852
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 13:48:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We lived full time in Stehekin 1998-2002, and return every summer to hike and backpack. I support Alternative A, so that thousands of hikers, like myself, can continue to hike this wilderness, without the fear of grizzly encounter, and possible attacks. As their habitat shrinks, bears are becoming more aggressive.

Correspondence ID: 13808Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98133
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 13:53:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am responding to the inquiry about introducing grizzlies to the North Cascades. I fully support this endeavor and hope to see the reintroduction proceed.

Thank you,


Correspondence ID: 13809Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98107
United States of America

Outside Organization: Self Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 13:55:58

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am favor of bringing grizzlies back to the north cascade mountains. They lived there for thousands of years before being wiped out in the 1800s. Shame on us for that! We have a chance now, to restore the biodiversity of this area. Grizzlies are important to the Eco system that our lives depend on. They are omnivores that help maintain the Meadows and improve soil for all things to grow.

People will have to learn to live with grizzly bears, to respect them and their space and be safe. I hope mankind is up for this. It's time to try and bring these magnificent animals back to life.

Thank-you

Correspondence ID: 13810Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 14:00:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: It seems reintroducing Grizzly bears will only lead to eventual direct human and grizzly interactions.

At the bottom line, this is why I am directly against reintroducing Grizzly bears into the proposed reintroduction zone in Washington state.

Having read and examined the detailed and numerous comments from DFW, supporting researchers, public comments, and media, I have concluded that despite considering myself generally being extremely pro conservation, wild spaces and wilderness areas; it simply is not a cost effective solution for what appears to be somewhat egotistically motivated action.

Bears already move in and out of the northern area of the reintroduction zone and inserting bears with the intention of breeding pairs is a non-assured solution that will cost taxpayers hundreds of thousands if not eventual millions and given the track record of DFW and other management groups like the tribes around salmon conservation and protection, I do not believe any of these groups competent enough to produce or maintain a sustaining population of any species, let alone a major predatory mega-fauna mammal species, especially when they put several towns, dozens of recreation areas and major trails in national parks and public land in direct risk of interaction.

Furthermore, the general sentiment and attitude of the wider public appears to be against reintroduction and I feel obligated to admit my bias in belief that many of the direct supporters and groups in support of much of the proposed reintroduction and reintroduction zones have little to no direct interaction with the specific areas for reintroduction. I can assert I could be incorrect in assuming most of the people involved in making these decisions have little to no interaction with the areas they believe ideal for reintroduction. Those who use related trails, access national parks, own land, ranch, farm or raise livestock or use the areas directly for business or recreation, or live there, should have a greater say, not government funded, government employees seeking to prolong their own funding and achieve personal agenda either individual or respective to their organization.

Thank you for receiving comments,

██████████

p.s. A curious question raised in conversation with a friend over this matter I believe worth considering:

Would Grizzly reintroduction present the potential for the Wash. state government and/or groups associated with reintroduction to be held accountable in lawsuits for wrongful death or related events, should an almost certain eventual fatal interaction occur? At face value, many including myself would assume that most designated areas would not need to reassess or change current accepted 'entry risk' related materials; signs, info, visitor info, rec info etc. However, these "risks" for decades have been assumed simply to never include grizzlies. Being that they present a wholly different kind of risk, therefore mitigation, preparation and potential for harm, could they be considered as an introduced risk placed by the government directly onto the public, that lead to a fatality?

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 13811Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Stehekin, WA 98852
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 14:05:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: An additional comment based on a NPS experience and living in the North Cascades Stehekin River Valley as well as the deadline as well as choosing an EIS alternative: NO ACTION

The year we visited Glacier National Park in the early 1980s two women in a tent in an NPS campground were killed by a grizzly. We attended an evening play put on by NPS seasonal employees. After the play ended, we had a conversation with a ranger about the bears, since we had found trail closures during our visit and the suggestion that one wear bells. The ranger said, off the record, the bears were out of control.

The grizzly bears could become a large problem for NPS administration. More staff needed for not only monitoring bears but also for protection of visitors and campsites along the trails. Is this affordable? Is it a good priority for the NPS? Grizzlies, omnivorous top predators are not exactly stewards of the wilderness. Communities living in and around the North Cascades as well as visitors/hikers communing with nature are stewards of the land.

Very few families would visit just to experience the possibility of seeing a real Grizzly bear. They can go to Yellowstone and stay inside their cars! We experienced that too, including a traffic jam of visitors, and photographers overseen by park employees, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 13812Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 14:05:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hello! Due to the density of people hiking in the northern cascades, I believe re-introducing brown bears would lead to otherwise preventable human deaths- especially if they are drawn to campgrounds and towns with trash available.

Correspondence ID: 13813Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Buckley, WA, WA 98321
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 14:06:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I oppose any idea and or action to reintroduce grizzly bears in the North Cascades. Please put focus on the prey more so than the predators. We needed prey numbers to rise.

Correspondence ID: 13814Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 14:07:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The proposed plan to transplant grizzlies to the NCE unacceptably vague and not supported by good arguments or facts. Option A is the best and only reasonable plan proposed.

1) If there is a case for the "need" to transplant grizzlies to the NCE, the draft proposal does not make it. After reading the entire proposal, the reader is left with the impression that the driving force behind the proposal is a misguided belief that it would be "cool" to have grizzlies back in the NCE. Indeed, the only case that is made for transplanting grizzlies to the NCE is that some humans want them there, not that it is in the best interest of the bears or the ecosystem.

2) Proposals B and C fail on a straight up cost benefit analysis. The draft proposal does not fully confess the cost of transplanting the grizzlies, but it will surely be in the tens if not hundreds of millions. There is no explanation as to how this

is the best use of limited resources to protect grizzlies or help push them off the endangered species list.

3) The NCE is extraordinarily large and encompasses far more area than what most locals consider the North Cascades. The proposal gives very little indication where in this vast area the bears would be transplanted or what the criteria the relocation area would be. A stark difference between the NCE and existing grizzly zones is the proximity to large human populations. If there is to be meaningful comment on any plan, it should spell out with precision where the bears would be released and why. As is, the proposal is unacceptably vague.

4) Untoward interactions between humans and grizzlies are not "rare" as claimed in the proposal. Wherever there are humans and grizzlies in the same areas, there are bad interactions. Indeed, people are attacked and killed by grizzlies every year.

5) Those of us who spend a lot of time in the backcountry of the Cascades (the real backcountry) have always thought it was a good thing that we didn't have to worry about grizzlies, especially given how thick the undergrowth is in some places deep in the mountains. Our behavior and enjoyment of the backcountry in grizzly country is far different than here in the Cascades. We like not having to worry about grizzlies. Most people who think it is a good idea to put grizzlies here have not spent enough time in grizzly country.

6) Beware of unintended consequences. From what I can discern, grizzlies have never been transplanted into an area that has such a huge amount of human traffic. It does not seem that there has been enough consideration given to what some of the problems that could arise from the action.

Correspondence ID: 13817Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98125
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 14:09:56

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the grizzly bear restoration plan

Correspondence ID: 13818Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Omak, WA 98841
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 14:14:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of the grizzly bear to the north cascade area. The reintroduction completes of the ecosystem structure and will help restore balance among the deer and elk populations in the area. We humans have got to get over ourselves as the only resident of the planet. In some small way this reintroduction pushes back on the old pre twentieth century notion of manifest destiny and human privilege that dominates so much human activity.

Correspondence ID: 13819Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Buckley, WA, WA 98321
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 14:14:41

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I oppose any idea and or action to reintroduce grizzly bears in the North Cascades. Please put focus on the prey more so than the predators. We needed prey numbers to rise.

"Findings

Based on the best scientific information available, as described above and in accordance with 50 CFR 17.81, we find that releasing grizzly bears into the NCE would further the conservation of the species, but that this population is not essential to the continued existence of the species in the wild."

This comes from the proposed rule.. this population is not essential. Thats clear. We do not need them roaming our state.

Correspondence ID: 13820Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Chelan, WA 98816
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 14:15:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm totally opposed to locating grizzly bear into the North Cascades ecosystem. If grizzly bear naturally roamed and established themselves into this region without human intervention that is one thing. To artificially transplant them into the North Casades ecosystem creates a dangerous environment for hikers, backpackers and those who live in this area. What is the food source for a grizzly population? Please listen to those most impacted by this proposal. Do not locate grizzlies into the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 13821Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellevue, WA 98005
United States of America

Outside Organization: Back Country Horsemen Non-Governmental

Received: Nov,13 2023 14:15:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am pushing my 80th year and have been a BCHW member for nearly the past 18 years. I've loved all of the adventure, fun and beauty of those years as much as I have enjoyed my somewhat earlier years of living in the Canadian wilderness filled with freedom, joy, and the challenges that living in 'the wild' brings. There was never a time I regretted it that I had my horses with me, and often I was actually relieved they were there! Of course, some special adjustments had to be made for the horses occasionally, but that was rare, well worth it, and not much of an interruption.

Introducing one of our greatest and most fascinating animals back into their world will require some planning and adjustments, but I believe it will be well worth the effort not only to our environment but also to the humans. I fully encourage having all animals returned to their own environments to the degree possible, and would encourage it if it is at all possible.

Thank you for this opportunity,

██████

Correspondence ID: 13822Project:112008Document:132104

Address: carnation, WA 98014
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 14:16:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: HI there!

I'm a local in Washington State and want to voice my opposition to introducing grizzlys in any capacity in Washington State. Im an avid outdoorsman and love our wildlife.Washington isnt the place for grizzlies.

thank you for your time

██████

Correspondence ID: 13823Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Concrete, WA 98237
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 14:20:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I own a home and 50 acres of family forestry land in Concrete, WA and am an avid outdoorsman. I support Alternative C of the Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan. I hope that we can establish a sustainable breeding population in our area, and this plan seems to be the most flexible way of achieving that.

Correspondence ID: 13824Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98133
United States of America
Outside Organization: Resident of the State of Washington Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 14:29:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I am in favor of the reintroduction of Grizzly Bears to the ecology of Washington State. In so much as we are aware that wildlife does not conform to human boundaries, I respect opposition to this plan. It is impossible to fully know the final outcome of reintroduction however this should not come at the expense of an attempt to support and encourage a native species to re-occupy the land it is indigenous to. As stewards, it seems right and appropriate. As an avid backpacker for the last 40+ yrs., I have had my share of experiences with black bears, mtn. goats, cougars and even a wolverine. To me those memories are priceless. I would love to add a grizzly bear to my list, but more importantly I would like to know that my Federal Government is honoring its duty to protect habitat and environments from loss and destruction as well as restoring whatever we can. My ideal option would be Plan B. My impression is that too much weight is given to those who look on public lands as a source of revenue. I am open to Plan C where introduction comes with the caveat of removal of problem individuals should the need arise. I truly believe that one of the things that makes the Pacific Northwest Region of the United States popular is our expansive Wilderness/Native environments. The future potential of healthy ecosystems is something we undervalue. I hope that future generations can experience the awe and majestic beauty of our country.

Correspondence ID: 13825Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 14:30:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear WA Leaders:

I am pro-grizzly reintroduction and would really like to see such an important species returned to its former habitat and range here in WA State. This is the key for future generations to know the other important creatures that deserve to secure habitat that is crucial to their future existence on this planet. I wholeheartedly agree that " Grizzly bears are a keystone species whose presence contributes to the health of our wildlands. Their presence is a sign of a fully wild and protected landscape, that humans and animals can depend on for years. Comment today to breathe new life into the wild lungs of the North Cascades."

Please consider my comments in moving forward with the plan of reintroduction.

Thank you,
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 13828Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Anacortes, WA 98221
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 14:34:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To whom it may concern:

The North Cascades grizzly bear reintroduction proposal rests on a modeled estimate of carrying capacity for the North

Cascades Ecosystem (NCE) of 280 grizzlies (Lyons et al. 2018). While the use of a Resource Selection Function (RSF) based on activities of 27 collared grizzlies (Proctor et al. 2015) is helpful to discern general patterns of habitat use, Lyons et al (2018) acknowledge that every ecosystem is quite different, and I share that concern. As an example, the annual vegetation and plants with tuberous roots that dominate avalanche paths and alpine areas in Purcell, Selkirk, and Cabinet Mountains (RSF modeled area) likely have higher forage value for grizzlies than alder and woody vegetation that dominates avalanche paths in the NCE. Large carrion items will be fewer in the heavily vegetated complex terrain of the NCE, and some large-bodied ungulate species (moose) are not present except in the far northeastern corner of the recovery area.

The estimate of number of female grizzlies the NCE can support comes directly from the overlay of this RSF, built for other ecosystems, on the NCE. As a result, the entire reintroduction effort would hinge on whether assumptions of ecosystem similarity between NCE and the Purcell, Selkirk and Cabinet Mountains are correct. Specifically, the proposed reintroduction assumes that grizzlies move through and use the NCE in the same way they would through the Purcell, Selkirk, and Cabinet Mountains. A robust test of that significant assumption is lacking. Grizzly scat metabarcoding for plant material and other grizzly forage from the Coastal mountains in BC would better inform how well this RSF may apply to the NCE.

Current estimates of grizzly forage are extrapolated from the Cabinet-Yaak ecosystem. During the early spring, when bears are most nutritionally limited, their forage in the Cabinet-Yaak ecosystem includes high concentrations of grasses and sedges as well as meat - primarily deer and moose carrion (Kasworm et al. 2021). These sources of food, specifically nutritionally rich meat sources would not be equally available in the NCE, especially along the western slopes. Grizzly bears also prefer meat to berries in the fall in the Cabinet Yaak, which is believed to be because larger bears require more nutritionally dense higher quality forage (Welch et al. 1997). If these currently unvalidated assumptions of ecosystem similarity are wrong, translocated bears will likely exhibit increased movement, come into greater conflict with humans, have increased mortality, or exhibit low fecundity resulting from diet limitations.

Extending beyond forage resources, a second major assumption of similarity between the RSF area and the NCE relates to human interaction and human related disturbance. Over 2.5 million people recreate in Mount Baker Snoqualmie National Forest annually, making it one of the most visited forests in the country (nationalforests.org). This leads to a situation where human/grizzly interaction may be far more common than in the west slopes of the Rockies, especially if grizzlies are placed in the ecosystem (translocated) rather than allowed to naturally move in where forage resources and lack of disturbance allow. In the RSF completed by Proctor et al. (2015) human presence is modeled through building density which is likely to result in a mismatch between the Rockies focused RSF area, and the NCE where high density backcountry recreational will not be well predicted by buildings.

In this Grizzly bear EIS, Alternative A (no action) is the patient and intelligent choice. It allows the state fish and wildlife agency to do their job and continue to manage wildlife populations in our state. WDFW has a proven record managing a growing population of once extirpated carnivores (gray wolf) and will be able to effectively manage Grizzly bears as well, once they return on their own. Given the human population density surrounding the NCE and the high-density recreational use of the area, the risk of impatience through premature reintroduction is profound. Human-grizzly conflicts are likely to quickly erode social tolerance, especially because the population was sourced through reintroduction.

Kasworm, W. F., T. G. Radandt, J. E. Teisberg, T. Vent, A. Welander, M. Proctor, H. Cooley and J. K. Fortin-Noreus 2021 Cabinet-Yaak Grizzly Bear Recovery Area 2020 Research and Monitoring Progress Report. US Fish and Wildlife Service, Missoula, Montana. 108 pp.

Lyons, A. L., W. L. Gaines, P. H. Singleton, W. F. Kasworm, M. F. Proctor, and J. Begley. 2018. Spatially Explicit Carrying Capacity Estimates to Inform Species Specific Recovery Objectives: Grizzly bear (*Ursus arctos*) Recovery in the North Cascades. *Biological Conservation* 222 (2018): 21-32.

Proctor, M.F., Nielsen, S.E., Kasworm, W.F., Servheen, C., Radandt, T.G., Machutchon, A.G., Boyce, M.S., 2015. Grizzly bear connectivity mapping in the Canada-United States trans-border region. *J. Wildl. Manag.* 79 (4), 544-558.

Welch, C.A., J. Keay, K.C. Kendall, and C.T. Robbins. 1997. Constraints on frugivory by bears. *Ecology* 78:1105-1119.

Correspondence ID: 13829Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Cheney, WA 99004
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 14:34:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The reintroduction of Grizzly Bears into the cascades to enhance and preserve a fragile ecological balance is vital to our state. These animals are critical to ensuring that our wilderness and its ecosystem remain a viable resource for our state well into the future. This project is necessary to protect and allow a growth of these animals and the environment they inhabit to thrive.

Correspondence ID: 13830Project:112008Document:132104

Address: London, CO W12 7FE
United Kingdom

Outside Organization: Crownpeak Business(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,13 2023 14:35:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzlies deserve all the help and support in reintroducing them into their natural home!

Correspondence ID: 13831Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98504
United States of America

Outside Organization: WA Department of Natural Resources State Government(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,13 2023 14:39:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The Washington State Department of Natural Resources, State Uplands program (DNR) recognizes the conservation opportunities of reintroducing grizzly bears in the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE) grizzly bear recovery zone. If the decision to reintroduce grizzly bears is made, DNR's preference for the proposed grizzly bear recovery plan is alternative C with grizzly bears being a 10(j) nonessential experimental population (NEP) under section 10 of the Endangered Species Act. As mentioned in the proposed rule published by the USFWS under alternative C, "the best available data indicate that reintroduction of the grizzly bear to the North Cascade Ecosystem, within the nonessential population area, is biologically feasible and will promote the conservation of the species." DNR does not anticipate additional management restrictions within the North Cascade Grizzly Bear Recovery Zone.

The Washington Department of Natural Resources, State Uplands program (DNR), Northeast Region, hereafter referred to as "NE WA DNR", manages approximately 151,000 acres of state trust lands along the outer margins of the North Cascades Grizzly Bear Recovery Zone (NCGBRZ). As a fiduciary, DNR's primary objective is to provide a perpetual source of revenue to trust beneficiaries, while also providing jobs, commodities, clean water, wildlife habitat and recreational opportunities for the public. As a working forest, DNR maintains infrastructure in the form of drivable roads that are utilized for timber extraction, wildfire suppression and public use. The majority of roads on DNR-managed land within the NCGBRZ are at a maximum road density of 2.5 mi/mi², with publicly accessible roads being not denser than 1.5 mi/mi², on average. Road densities greater than 2 mi/mi² (or 1 mi/mi² for publicly accessible roads) are not conducive to grizzly bear recovery and will likely result in reduced occupancy on DNR-managed lands within the NCGBRZ. DNR continues to manage for grizzly bear habitat within the NCGBRZ, including no net increase in open-road access within the vast majority of DNR-managed land that overlaps with the NCGBRZ.

In regards to recreation planning, DNR recognizes that increased agency funding will likely be needed to reduce and manage bear-human conflicts on DNR-managed lands within, or adjacent to, this North Cascades Ecosystem. To best address potential bear-human conflicts, DNR requests that the US Fish and Wildlife Service make radio-collar location data available to DNR staff, with data confidentiality restrictions.

Grizzly bears have played a pivotal role in the health of the North Cascades Ecosystem until they were extirpated by humans in the early 1900's. Reintroductions will initiate the restoration of the natural system and reintroduce a historic legacy and

icon to the area for future generations to come. Thank you for the opportunity for DNR to comment of this management decision.

Correspondence ID: 13832Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 14:42:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To whom It may concern,

I am against the re-introduction / restoration of a Grizzly bear population in the North Cascade mountain range. I don't believe it is responsible to introduce an Apex Predator into areas of human communities. We live our life here and raise our families. We go out on our land, feed our animals, tend to our chores and we want to continue to do these simple activities in safety and without fear in our heart over very large and unpredictable Grizzly Bears. So many of us live outside of city limits and in rugged areas, near creeks and rivers and with fruit growing on our land. I don't feel I am unreasonable to think my own land could be considered attractive to a Grizzly Bear. After all, the common Black Bear seems to find my land attractive. I vote option A. NO ACTION. NO restoration of Grizzly Bears!

Thank you for hearing my opinion

Correspondence ID: 13833Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ellensburg, WA 98926
United States of America

Outside Organization: Nighthawk Ecological LLC Business

Received: Nov,13 2023 14:45:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live in and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what's worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

Furthermore, the 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Thank you for taking the time to keep our North Cascades wild!

Correspondence ID: 13835Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Elma, WA 98541
United States of America

Outside Organization: Backcountry Horsemen of Washington-Grays Harbor Chapter Non-Governmental

Received: Nov,13 2023 14:47:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am a member of the Backcountry Horsemen of Washington / Grays Harbor Chapter. After reviewing the Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan, I support Alternative A / No Action. I have a concern with future recreation and trail access in the NCNP and adjacent National Forest lands and how it might be affected by reintroduction of grizzly bears. Alternatives B and C do not speak clearly to this issue and how it might be managed for both bears and people. Substantial numbers of recreationists now use the PCT and it is anticipated that use will increase on the PNT. As a retired Forest Service career recreation planner, I am sensitive to and support managing for a healthy, fully functioning ecosystems. I feel both bears and people can coexist in a wilderness/backcountry setting. In the short term the Canadian effort to reintroduce grizzly bears into the area just north of the International Boundary will result in bears migrating into the North Cascades Ecosystem. In the long term this will give the land managing agencies the opportunity to develop management strategies that will be successful for both people and bears. Such a plan of action will likely result in more public support for future reintroduction of grizzly bears into the North Cascades Ecosystem. Backcountry access and trail maintenance need to be clearly considered!

Correspondence ID: 13836Project:112008Document:132104

Address: DARRINGTON, WA 98241-9618
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 14:47:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a hiker and horse packer in the Mt Baker - Snoqualmie, Pasayten, Okanogan Forests and Wilderness areas, and a rural resident with livestock living right against Prairie Mt, I support having a natural ecosystem, including predators such as the grizzly. My preference, however, would be for a smaller grizzly population to limit impacts due to limited food supply. I also have concerns about release sites...Grizzlies are extremely intelligent, and will of course be interested in the easiest food sources. I don't want that to be my chickens, foals, etc. So, yes, a limited number of grizzlies in true wilderness, but away from human habitations please.

Correspondence ID: 13837Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Stehekin, WA 98852
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 14:51:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hi all, [REDACTED] here.

I'm a new comer to Stehekin, arrived May 17, 1980, heard St. Helen's go boom the next morning, spent that summer and the next four working as a carpenter for the NPS. I spent my first winter here in 1985 and have been a resident since, mostly carpentry and maintenance work for the private sector. I am fairly active in the Park and surrounding Wilderness lands on a year round basis. I support species diversity and the protections needed to allow the NPS and wilderness lands to remain a healthy natural habitat for all living things common to the area, to include those populations that have been severely reduced by human activity. For example I'm quite happy to hear of successes with the reintroduction of fischers. I'm curious about the Wolverine population surveys being done by the Cascade Wolverine project. And I keep track of wolf tracks, happy to see that apex predator making new packs and spreading west after walking into Washington from Idaho in about 2008.

And so I totally support the idea of Grizzly bears living in these mountains. I figure, like the average British Columbian resident, I too could learn to live with grizzly bears.

I'm not as sure about my level of support for the Park's idea of reintroduction for various reasons.

One reason is the readiness of the stehekn community to co-exist with griz. I think more education is needed here. While the park biologist say the likelihood of seeing a grizz is low, I would point out that our annual kokanee run would be an obvious attraction to bears in the fall. I suspect that any grizzly spotted by a stehekin resident when they trek from their front porch to a car would be considered a threat to be eliminated. If a black bear huffing in an apple tree is threatening and gets shot, a grizz just looking huge will not last. I don't see a reintroduction plan being much more than a way for grizzlies to get killed.

I know the government doesn't work this way: take this money, use it instead here, but I think making the land more receptive to grizzlies, say, in the form of a wildlife overpass on highway 20, and spend a little on education, say, bring some Canadians down here to talk to locals about how they live amongst big bears without shooting every one they see, or getting the NE Washington tribes to come here and talk about how grizzlies don't scare them, and in fact are sacred to native people, may be

better first steps for eventually seeing Grizz back in these mountains.

I see the Park reintroduction plan as a set up for failure.

Allowing the bears to naturally migrate into the area, maybe with the help of the native tribes reintroduction plan, seems a better course of action.

And go ahead with a highway 20 overpass-call it your reintroduction plan- and give the bears and other animals a safe and natural way to travel across that barrier, which highways are proven to represent even if not as busy as I-90 where that very successful overpass was completed in 2018.

One impact to Stehekin if bears do wander into the North Cascades will be increased tourist visitation. There may be people here that can't envision being other than terrified at the idea of a grizz, but there are hordes of folks that will come to Stehekin simply to be near a mountain, a big tree, and possibly somewhere out there, a Grizzly bear.

Real statistics honestly interpreted don't lie: I'm more likely to die in traffic or by lightning. So far the cougars haven't pounced and the wolves aren't circling. If you value your cat, you keep him in. If your pigs are threatened you build a pen. Maybe you need a vault for your chickens. Grizz will require coexistence too. The dogs bred for bear deterrence could become popular here for those with cattle and horses. I bet we can figure it out and allow grizz back in the landscape. Let them walk in.

Keep it wild.

Cheers, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 13838Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Usk, WA 99180
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 14:58:21

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Washington already has a rebust amount of black bears. That being said, you took spring bear away from us when you never should have. We have wolves killing all of our game, the area I have lived my whole life has the lowest deer and elk numbers I have ever seen. I sure have seen a lot of predators though! I'm 100 percent against the reintroduction of grizzly bears in Washington. It's a horrible idea just like allowing these wolves to ruin our ecosystem. We need to go back to managing our game, not pushing to have apex predators thrive. Grizzly bears are way more dangerous and the ones we already have here give us issues. The problem grizzlies you relocate just become someone else's problem! Please start considering peoples facts over here on the Eastside of Washington. A lot of bad decisions you guys have made has effected us way more than you guys on the Westside. No grizzly bear reintroduction!

Correspondence ID: 13839Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Port Angeles, WA 98362
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 14:58:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am an environmentalist/conservationist by profession, yet I still have major concerns about the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades ecosystem.

We do not have an ethical obligation to restore them to their "original home", as that home is now a much different place than it was when grizzlies roamed there. It seems irresponsible to think otherwise, and not at all ethical, as suggested. There are now thousands of PCT hikers moving through every year, plus countless numbers of other recreationists. Every fall day, there are miles of cars lining up and down Highway 20, parked near trailheads, a far cry from the "wildness" of the past. Yes- bears and humans have found a way to coexist in other places (Montana, BC, Wyoming, etc.). But the Washington Cascades are not those places; in addition to being more densely populated (by humans), there are many more people frequenting these areas from urban centers. Conflicts will inevitably occur, resulting at the very least in the destruction of the bear. Again, it seems irresponsible to assume otherwise.

The effects of grizzly reintroduction on an ecosystem would be far less than of a top predator such as the wolf, which actually would help drive/engineer the ecosystem to a much greater extent (as we've seen in Yellowstone with elk, plant communities,

etc.). It isn't to say that there would be no net positive effects on a community or ecosystem level, but the bears are more of an indicator of ecosystem health than a driver of it.

Bottom line is that if reintroduced, most will likely end up getting shot, either legally or illegally. People won't hesitate to claim "I killed it in self defense!" in that situation, and being unable to prove otherwise, it will be unenforceable. The additional Section 10(j) designation will allow people to shoot the bears with even less justification. So it raises the question- who is this actually for? Clearly not the bears...

Correspondence ID: 13841Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Sedro-Woolley, WA 98284-5075
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 15:00:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: November 13, 2023

Superintendent Don Striker
North Cascades National Park Service Complex
810 State Route 20
Sedro-Woolley, WA 98284

Re: North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Environmental Impact Statement

Submitted via National Park Service (PEPC) Planning, Environment & Public Comment website

Dear Superintendent Striker:

I'm writing to express my support for the National Park Service's decision to restore grizzlies to the North Cascades Ecosystem in Washington State.

Historically, grizzlies played an important role in the ecology of the North Cascades, but by the mid-1960's, they had been entirely extirpated from the area. As someone who has hiked, climbed, and skied extensively in the backcountry of North Cascades National Park, Glacier Peak Wilderness, and the Pasayten Wilderness since 1971, I feel it is high time for these magnificent animals to be brought back. I have also spent time in parts of Wyoming, Idaho, Montana, Alaska, British Columbia, and Alberta where grizzlies still roam freely and had the thrill of seeing them in the wild on several occasions. This restoration plan gives me hope that future generations will have the same opportunity to see them in the North Cascades.

I also support Alternative C with the accompanying 10j designation and rule and am providing comments to the US Department of Fish and Wildlife separately on this.

One concern I have is that even though the Plan/EIS map shows the southern release area as including part of the Glacier Peak Wilderness (GPW), the Plan does not include analysis of potential impacts in the GPW. I hope that this apparent discrepancy is corrected and that it does not reflect the intention not to release grizzlies in the GPW.

I appreciate this opportunity to comment and would like to thank those who prepared the Plan and EIS.

Sincerely,

██████████

██████████
Sedro-Woolley, WA 98284

Correspondence ID: 13842Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Cle Elum, WA 98922
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 15:01:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a landowner, farmer, forest manager: I support the Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan.

Correspondence ID: 13843Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 15:03:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please NO ACTION!
My family with young children loves to explore the North Cascades and we would feel unsafe and unable to do so if grizzly bears were reintroduced. It already feels much more challenging now to adventure in the mountains with the amount of people that are getting out there these days. Human recreation has increased so much over the last handful of years, and I wish not put grizzly bears into lands that so commonly explored by humans. I'd be willing to bet that the number of people wishing to avoid grizzlies would far exceed the number of people wishing to see them in their natural environment.

Correspondence ID: 13844Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98133
United States of America
Outside Organization: Woodland Park Zoological Society Conservation/Preservation
Received: Nov,13 2023 15:04:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The bears belong in the Cascades more than we do.

Correspondence ID: 13845Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Washington, DC 20036
United States of America
Outside Organization: Mighty Earth Conservation/Preservation(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,13 2023 15:06:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: November 13, 2023

Superintendent
North Cascades National Park Service Complex
810 State Route 20
Sedro Woolley, WA 98284

Re: Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan /Environmental Impact Statement

Thank you for allowing us the opportunity to comment on the U.S. Fish and Wildlife's plan to restore grizzly bears to the the North Cascades

Mighty Earth (www.mightyearth.org) is a global advocacy organization working to defend a living planet. Our goal is to protect half of Earth for Nature and secure a climate that allows life to flourish. Our team has achieved transformative change

by persuading leading industries to dramatically reduce deforestation and climate pollution throughout their global supply chains in palm oil, rubber, cocoa, and animal feed, while improving livelihoods for Indigenous and local communities across the tropics.

We've helped advance major new forest and climate policies around the world, helping break the link between environmental destruction and economic growth. Mighty Earth's approach, team and the results of our work have been featured in Inside Philanthropy, Bloomberg, The New Republic, New York Times Magazine, The New York Times, and many other outlets. One of our core program pillars is the importance of rewilding for ecosystems and the climate.

The last grizzly bear spotted in the North Cascades was in 1996. Once a key species for the formation of the North Cascades ecosystem, the population has been decimated by hunting and other human activity like logging, mining, gas drilling and land development. Grizzlies have been listed as threatened under the Endangered Species Act since the 1970s, and their former habitat has been maintained and protected, but the bears have not returned. Before the 19th century, the population of grizzlies in the U.S. is estimated to be as much as 50,000-100,000.

Mighty Earth believes that restoration of key species - especially top predators - is vital to creating a wilder planet. We are submitting this comment specifically to highlight the broader impact of grizzly bears on the ecosystem. Our rewilding work is supported by a recent study (<https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/sciadv.aat1869>) that shows restoring wildlife around the world can cause trophic effects that remove 95% of the carbon from the atmosphere needed to keep warming to the 1.5 degree target.

We strongly support Plan C as described in the proposal to reintroduce grizzlies to the North Cascades ecosystem. By introducing 25 non-problem grizzlies over the next decade and managing them as an experimental population, human-bear conflict can be reduced, prevented and responded to. Reintroducing the bears to the ecosystem is not a quick fix, but a long term solution that could allow a resurgence of this important predator in the next 100 years. Plan C should solve for any local objections about potential contact with humans. This is further supported by the peaceful coexistence of humans and grizzly bears in the Greater Yellowstone and Northern Continental Divide Ecosystems, each of which are home to more than 1,000 bears.

The removal of the grizzly population from the ecosystem likely caused a cascade of impacts, and the reintroduction of the population can help restore balance. The importance of predators to ecosystems is now well understood, and well described in the U.S. Fish and Wildlife plan; in brief, they can help spread the seeds of plant life through ingesting and excreting seeds and fruit, keep prey species in check, and even provide carrion for scavengers. Some behaviors of grizzlies can even alter the topography of the landscape. The reintroduction of this keystone species will ultimately shape a more biodiverse, balanced and healthy ecosystem.

In addition to the benefits to the ecosystem and climate, grizzlies have a historical cultural importance to Indigenous peoples in the area. The Washington Post quoted Scott Schuyler, a policy representative for the Upper Skagit tribe, as supportive of the restoration plan: "The grizzly bear's survival is, in a sense, the survival of our culture, our history." Additionally, the plan cites the ability for all people to have positive sightings of grizzly bears, an iconic American species, in their habitat, something that has been largely impossible in recent years.

This visionary and innovative plan would be a hugely important step in preserving an important keystone species. Thank you for giving us the opportunity to submit a comment. We will continue to advocate for rewilding and the importance of protecting keystone species like grizzly bears.

Respectfully submitted,


Vice President of Programs
Mighty Earth

Address: Washington, DC 20002
United States of America
Outside Organization: Safari Club International Conservation/Preservation(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,13 2023 15:07:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: November 13, 2023

Via parkplanning.nps.gov

Superintendent
North Cascades National Park Service Complex
810 State Route 20
Sedro Woolley, WA 98284

Re: Safari Club International Comments on the Proposed Rule, Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Establishment of a Nonessential Experimental Population of Grizzly Bear in the North Cascades Ecosystem, Washington State, and the Associated Draft Environmental Impact Statement, 88 Fed. Reg. 67193 (Sept. 29, 2023)

Dear Superintendent,

Safari Club International ("SCI") appreciates the opportunity to comment on the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's ("Service") proposed rule to establish a nonessential experimental population ("NEP") of grizzly bears in the North Cascades Ecosystem ("NCE") in Washington State and the associated Draft Environmental Impact Statement ("Draft EIS") prepared by the Service and the National Park Service ("NPS"). SCI takes no position on the proposed introduction of grizzly bears to the NCE. However, SCI poses the question why the Service needs to reintroduce grizzlies in the NCE, given the expectation that bears are likely to move south from Canada, the growing human population, and the consequent risk of human-bear conflicts. SCI urges the Service to ensure this introduction is consistent with the Service's historic recognition of the recovery of grizzly bears in other ecosystems and its efforts to remove grizzly populations in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem and, potentially, the Northern Continental Divide Ecosystem from the Endangered Species Act ("ESA") lists.

SCI encourages the Service to collaborate with interested stakeholders, the State of Washington, and tribal authorities to implement a management plan for these grizzly bears, and to ensure the introduction of grizzlies does not negatively impact Washington's sheep, elk, deer, moose, and other wildlife populations and related hunting opportunities. SCI appreciates that the Service is willing to work with the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife ("WDFW") to ensure the State has needed flexibility to manage a new grizzly bear population. SCI strongly agrees with the Service's determination that the experimental population would be "nonessential." Of the considered alternatives, Alternative C in the Draft EIS will provide the most flexibility and consistency for grizzly bear management in Washington.

SCI offers the following comments to help in finalizing the Draft EIS and Section 10(j) rule.

Safari Club International

Safari Club International, a nonprofit IRC § 501(c)(4) corporation, has approximately 75,000 members and advocates worldwide, many of whom live or hunt in Washington. SCI also has many members who guide hunts in Washington. SCI has five chapters in Washington and multiple chapters in British Columbia and surrounding states.

SCI has submitted numerous public comments regarding the federal listing status and management of grizzly bears in the United States, including a comment on the 2017 Draft North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly Restoration Plan and related environmental analysis. SCI has also defended science-based decision-making involving grizzlies in the United States in court. For example, SCI intervened to defend the delisting of the recovered Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem population of grizzly bears.*1 SCI supports efforts in Congress to delist recovered grizzly bear populations, consistent with Service efforts, some dating back 20 years, to remove grizzly populations from the ESA lists due to their successful recoveries.

Based on its history and current support for delisting recovered grizzly bear populations from the ESA, SCI urges the Service to review the proposed rule and Draft EIS, with an eye to ensuring the proposed introduction is consistent with the Service's efforts to delist recovered grizzly populations. The Service should clearly and repeatedly confirm that introducing this NEP does not restrict its efforts to delist the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem and Northern Continental Divide Ecosystem grizzlies.

Management Flexibility for State and Tribal Authorities

SCI supports Alternative C in the Draft EIS, restoration with ESA Section 10(j) designation, to allow for flexible management of the NEP and to specify what "take" of the species is allowed under the ESA. Alternative C offers the most management flexibility for Federal, State, and Tribal authorities. However, the proposed rule does not go far enough. Without proper management tools to sufficiently address conflicts between grizzly bears and humans and unacceptable impacts to prey populations, the potential negative effects of grizzlies are likely to erode social tolerance for the proposed restoration among some groups. As discussed below, the Service should expand the management options available to States to protect wildlife populations (and the dependent recreational activities) from negative impacts associated with an introduced grizzly population.

a. The 10(j) rule should allow intentional take to prevent significant impacts to ungulate populations.

In the Draft EIS, the Service and NPS found that "there would be a small increased incidence of grizzly predation on ungulates during the primary phase of establishing an initial population of 25 grizzly bears. After 60 to 100 years, with a population of 200 grizzly bears, ungulate predation could be proportionally greater but is not expected to have significant population-wide impacts."² Although the Service acknowledges the potential impact of the proposed introduction of grizzly bears on ungulate populations, the proposed rule fails to include a provision that allows the State to effectively manage this and to protect the health of these populations. The 10(j) rule should allow intentional take to prevent significant impacts to ungulate populations.³ This authorization is necessary to give State and Tribal authorities the ability to manage the reintroduced grizzlies. The Service has done so when introducing nonessential experimental populations of other predator species, like Mexican wolf.⁴

When the NEP establishes itself, it will likely reduce Washington's deer, elk, and other wildlife populations. In general, grizzly bears consume the most meat in late spring when ungulate calves (mule deer, black-tailed deer, elk, moose) are available.⁵ A healthy bear population preying on calves increases the risk of substantial population decline, at a time when Washington's mule deer, black-tailed deer, and elk numbers have not been consistently expanding but have fluctuated.⁶ The State must have the ability through lethal control to protect these populations from declines or negative pressures caused by grizzly bears.

Further, reduced ungulate populations as a result of grizzly predation will have significant economic impacts for Washington. Hunting and wildlife viewing are economic drivers in the State. As one example, hunting and fishing accounts for 25% of visitor use in the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest, which is within the NCE and within the proposed NCE Recovery Zone.⁷ Game species in this area that could be affected by grizzly bears include: deer, elk, bighorn sheep, and moose.⁸ Reduced huntable populations mean fewer tags, fewer hunters, and less income for individuals who make their living from guiding hunts. A reduction in hunting tags and hunting licenses would also result in a loss of revenue for the WDFW's wildlife and habitat management programs. Thus, the 10(j) rule should ensure that the State has flexibility to protect ungulate (and other wildlife) populations from excessive impacts caused by grizzlies. For these reasons, SCI supports inclusion of a provision that would allow the Service, or its designee, to take grizzly bears if wild ungulate populations decline below established State or Tribal management objectives due in part to grizzly predation.

b. The 10(j) rule should allow grizzly bear hunting when authorized by State and Tribal authorities.

Finally, to provide full management flexibility for State and Tribal authorities, the 10(j) rule should authorize grizzly bear hunting when those authorities implement a grizzly hunting season, even if Washington's grizzlies are still listed under the ESA. Indeed, allowing grizzly bear hunting in such a situation is consistent with the ESA's definition of "conservation," which recognizes that regulated hunting may be used to manage abundant populations of a listed species.⁹ The Service should ensure that the State has sufficient flexibility to properly manage an abundant grizzly bear

population.

The NEP area should include neighboring states where grizzly bears remain listed under the ESA.

The increased flexibility discussed above should not be limited to Washington State but should extend to other States and Tribes that will likely be affected if the introduced grizzly population expands to or exceeds 200 bears. Grizzly bears released in the NCE will quite possibly disperse from reintroduction sites to other areas, including neighboring states and British Columbia. The proposed rule attempts to delineate Management Zones throughout Washington, each with its own level of management allowed under the 10(j) rule.

The Service failed to include neighboring states in the proposed NEP area and associated Management Zones. The Service considered the possibility that the grizzly bears may relocate but wrote the idea off after evaluating “the opportunities for grizzly bears to move between blocks of high-quality grizzly bear habitat in Washington ...; the potential for human-bear conflicts; grizzly movement data from other populations; the location of the closest existing grizzly bear populations and historical observations of dispersers from those populations; ease of implementation ...; and input from NPS, WDFW, [the Service], and the public.”¹⁰ That is short-sighted for several reasons.

First, the Service expressed concerns that grizzly bears introduced into British Columbia would cross international borders into the NCE.¹¹ Under this same logic, it is equally likely the introduced grizzlies will cross the border into Canada, and into nearby states. Grizzly bears will naturally disperse from demographic home ranges as the carrying capacity of that area is reached and exceeded. If the NCE introduction succeeds, it will ultimately result in bears outside the geographic boundaries described in the rule. The Service should include neighboring states, and treat grizzly bears found there as part of the NEP. Specifically, the adjacent parts of nearby states in which grizzly bears remain listed under the ESA should be included in the NEP; specifically, Idaho and Oregon. Accordingly, the Service should significantly enlarge the designated NEP area to include areas where the grizzly bears might disperse.

Additionally, the Service should commit to returning grizzly bears that leave the NCE back to the NEP area. Relocated bears (and other animals) have a greater tendency to travel long distances in an attempt to return to their original home ranges. It is inevitable that bears are going to leave or try to leave the NEP area. The proposed rule should empower Washington State, and the wildlife agencies of neighboring States, to capture and return or facilitate the return of grizzly bears from the NEP.¹² At a minimum, the 10(j) rule should more clearly explain what each agency (or agencies) will do in the event that a reintroduced grizzly bear leaves the State.

Accidental harvest of grizzly bears due to mistaken identification while hunting should not be referred for prosecution, per the “McKittrick Policy.”

The proposed rule states that “the act of taking a grizzly bear that is wrongfully identified as another species is not considered incidental take and may be referred to appropriate authorities for prosecution.”¹³ This statement contradicts the Department of Justice’s “McKittrick Policy” as affirmed by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals and should be removed from the 10(j) rule. The McKittrick Policy provides that incidental shooting of a listed species due to mistaken identity does not violate the ESA’s take prohibition because the shooter does not knowingly violate the law. Thus, criminal prosecution in such instances is not appropriate.

The McKittrick Policy was previously challenged in a suit involving accidental incidental take by hunters who mistake Mexican wolves for coyotes while lawfully coyote hunting. The district court and Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals rejected this challenge and concluded that the policy is consistent with the intent and language of the ESA.¹⁴ The McKittrick policy should apply to incidental take when a grizzly bear is mistaken for a black bear during a legal black bear hunt as well.

To be clear, SCI does not condone intentional illegal harvest of grizzly bears or any other species, and the Service should refer for prosecution any such take that is not truly accidental. But as the Service has recognized, in rare cases, it is possible to mistakenly identify grizzly bears as black bears. Black bear hunters provide a valuable service to the State by helping maintain the black bear population within State population objectives. The reintroduction of grizzly bears in the NCE, and the Service’s 10(j) rule, should not deter hunters from black bear hunting. It is also important to note that in 2018, the WDFW began to require black bear hunters to take and pass a bear identification test when hunting black bears in specific areas

within grizzly recovery areas, with the intent of minimizing the potential for accidental killings of grizzlies because of mistaken identification. SCI expects that the WDFW would expand the areas for which this test is required, if grizzly bears are reintroduced into the NCE, and pledges to work with the WDFW to achieve this.

The 10(j) rule should include an "escape clause";

The Service should include an "escape clause" that authorizes the State to lethally remove all members of the experimental population if its "nonessential" status is at risk. The Service has included such escape clauses in numerous other experimental population rules.^{*15} The Service is well aware that certain organizations routinely challenge the "nonessential" designation of experimental populations and should draft the proposed rule to account for this risk.

An escape clause is proper, given that the NCE grizzly bear population is not necessary for the continued existence of the species, and removal of the population would not impact the status of grizzly bears throughout the lower 48 states.^{*16} The Service should confirm that this experimental population is nonessential. An "essential" experimental population is one "whose loss would appreciably reduce the likelihood of success of the species' survival in the wild."^{*17} The loss of newly released grizzlies in the NCE would not appreciably reduce the likelihood of the species' survival, because that loss would have no effect on the survival of the lower 48 states grizzly bear population. Grizzly populations in the Northern Continental Divide and Greater Yellowstone Ecosystems are healthy and expanding--to the point that the Service has delisted or is considering delisting these populations. There are also healthy grizzly populations in Alaska and Canada. Accordingly, the experimental population of grizzly bears is nonessential.

Failure to include such an escape clause is inconsistent with the intent of the ESA, as well as arbitrary and capricious. Congress made clear that only in rare cases should an experimental population be designated as "essential."^{*18} This choice was intended to "allow[] for management flexibility" and "encourage cooperation" with States and other stakeholders.^{*19} The Service has honored Congress' intent repeatedly when designating other reintroduced experimental populations as nonessential.^{*20} The Service should reinforce its commitment to following the direction of Congress by incorporating an escape clause in the event litigation forces the redesignation of the NEP.

Conclusion

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on the proposed rule and Draft EIS. If you have any questions, please contact Madeline Demaske, SCI Litigation Associate, at litigation@safariclub.org.

Sincerely,


President, Safari Club International
501 2nd Street NE
Washington, DC 20002

www.safariclub.org

^{*1} See *Crow Indian Tribe v. United States*, 343 F.Supp. 3d 999 (D. Mont. 2018); *Crow Indian Tribe v. United States*, 965 F.3d 662 (9th Cir. 2020).

^{*2} Draft EIS at vi.

^{*3} The Service should also consider allowing intentional take to prevent unacceptable impacts to other game species, including coyote, racoon, rabbit, hare, and wild turkey, not just ungulates.

^{*4} 85 Fed. Reg. 20967 (Apr. 15, 2020).

^{*5} Draft EIS at 73.

^{*6} Mule deer and black-tailed deer numbers have declined since the historical highs in the mid-20th century but are now growing slowly. In 2021, the North Cascades elk herd has an estimated population of 4,128 to 4,203, a decline from the approximately 6,000 in 2014 and 2015. *Id.* at 73-74.

^{*7} The WDFW issues hunting permits for the Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest, the Okanogan-Wenatchee National

Forest, the Lake Chelan Recreational Area, the Ross Lake Recreational Area, and several game management units within the NCE. Id. at 102, 115.

*8 Draft EIS at 115.

*9 See 16 U.S.C. § 1532(3) (defining “conservation” to include “the use of all methods and procedures which are necessary to bring any endangered species or threatened species to the point at which the measures provided pursuant to this Act are no longer necessary,” which, “in the extraordinary case where population pressures within a given ecosystem cannot be otherwise relieved, may include regulated taking”).

*10 88 Fed. Reg. 67193, 67201 (Sept. 29, 2023) (“Proposed Rule”).

*11 The Service expressed these concerns at their virtual public meeting on October 17, 2023. The meeting was recorded and can be found at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=G4HLymX_xU0.

*12 A return clause of sorts was included in the 10(j) rule for the nonessential experimental population of grizzlies in the Bitterroot Ecosystem. 50 C.F.R. § 17.84(l). Such a return clause was also included in the recent 10(j) rule for gray wolves in Colorado. 88 Fed. Reg. 77014 (Nov. 8, 2023).

*13 50 C.F.R. § 17.84(y)(3)(iii)(C) (proposed rule).

*14 *WildEarth Guardians v. U.S. Dep’t of Justice*, No. 17-16677, 752 Fed. Appx. 421 (9th Cir. 2018).

*15 The Service routinely includes such clauses in experimental population rules. E.g., 50 C.F.R. § 17.84(j) (including “escape clause” in rule establishing nonessential experimental populations of California condors); 50 C.F.R. § 17.84(x) (including “escape clause” in rule establishing nonessential experimental populations of wood bison in Alaska); 59 Fed. Reg. 60266 (Nov. 22, 1994) (rule establishing nonessential experimental population of the Rocky Mountain gray wolf).

*16 Currently, there are at least 1,913 grizzly bears in the lower 48 states (737 in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem, 1,068 in the Northern Continental Divide Ecosystem, 55-60 in the Cabinet-Yaak Ecosystem, and at least 53 in the U.S. portion of the Selkirk Ecosystem). In addition, grizzly bears have been verified in areas outside of current distributions. See the Services Environmental Conservation Online System (ECOS) species profile at <https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/7642>.

*17 50 C.F.R. § 17.80.

*18 86 Fed. Reg. 59953, 59967 (Oct. 29, 2021) (“[O]ur finding of whether a population is essential is also made with our understanding that Congress enacted the provisions of the ESA’s section 10(j) to mitigate fears that reestablishing populations of endangered or threatened species into the wild would negatively impact landowners and other private parties. Congress recognized that flexible rules could encourage recovery partners to actively assist in the reestablishment and hosting of such populations on their lands (H.R. Conference Report No. 97-567, at 8 (1982)).”).

*19 63 Fed. Reg. 1752, 1755 (Jan. 12, 1998) (establishing the nonessential experimental population of Mexican wolf); 49 Fed. Reg. 33885, 33888 (Aug. 27, 1984).

*20 E.g., 71 Fed. Reg. 42298 (July 26, 2006) (Northern Aplomado falcons); 61 Fed. Reg. 54044 (Oct. 16, 1996) (California condors); 56 Fed. Reg. 41473 (Aug. 21, 1991) (black-footed ferrets); 51 Fed. Reg. 41790 (Nov. 19, 1986) (red wolves).

Correspondence ID: 13847Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 15:07:58

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: When I asked a ranger in a Ranger Station what was the purpose of introducing Grizzly Bears in the North Cascades National Park, the answer was that the Grizzly Bear used to be in this area 1000 years ago.

Is that a good and sufficient reason? Many things have changed since the Grizzly Bear was around the Cascades, re-introducing it will create a great impact in the area, especially for hikers.

Bears will not be in the higher lands as they say, Melting glaciers, devastated forests, fires, will cause animals to move to lower areas closer to where hikers like me go to enjoy nature. Many of us don't carry guns, neither would like to harm an animal. Carrying bear spray would provide some but not enough comfort. What is the purpose really? If I want the emotion of possibly encountering a grizzly bear, I can go to Yellowstone, Montana, Alaska... Please leave the North Cascades as they are now. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 13848Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Everett, WA 98208
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 15:09:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Re-introducing Grizzly Bears to the North Cascades in Washington state is a bad idea. Bad for the bears. Bad for the people. Bears will be killed when they threaten, injure, or kill people and livestock.

I think it is a well-meaning but bad idea!

Correspondence ID: 13849Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Everett, WA 98204
United States of America
Outside Organization: Woodland Park Zoo Volunteer Conservation/Preservation
Received: Nov,13 2023 15:09:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am writing in support of the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades ecosystem, and in particular I support this reintroduction under one of the action plans.

As a volunteer at Woodland Park Zoo, where I talk to zoo guests about animals and conservation efforts in our state and around the world, and as a graduate of Miami University's Project Dragonfly master's degree program in conservation biology, I am aware of the importance of a balanced and healthy ecosystem. Grizzly bears were an important part of this ecosystem until humans hunted them to near extinction in our state. We cannot erase our past mistakes or those of our ancestors, but we should do everything in our power to improve the natural environment for ourselves and our descendants. The management plan for the reintroduction is based on science and is informed by reintroduction projects in other areas of the country. This knowledge can help the grizzly bear species thrive in the environment, help the ecosystem recover, and help people understand how they can and why they should co-exist with wildlife.

Woodland Park Zoo and other organizations help educate people about conservation issues and how humans and wildlife can live together. The zoo, and its staff and volunteers, will continue to share these messages on a daily basis, thereby supporting the importance of the reintroduction process. My Washington has grizzly bears! Please bring them back!

P.S. I'm a huge fan of the NPS and one of my bucket-list goals is to go to all of the National Parks and as many NPS properties as possible. The parks make history, nature, and science far more interesting than any classroom! Keep up the good work!

Sincerely,


Everett, Washington

Correspondence ID: 13850Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Silverdale, WA 98383
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 15:10:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Given how terrible the "Restoration" of the grizzly bear population has made life for my family in Montana, I absolutely do NOT believe we should pursue anything of the kind.

I feel grizzly bears are very misunderstood to be similar to black bears. It is important to know they are not. We have not succeeded at introducing them near people, so doing so is effectively the same as killing people, pets, and livestock. Until

they have been successfully reintroduced to Yosemite national Park and the Sierra Nevada mountains, I don't believe we have the capability to safely and successfully reintroduce them anywhere else.

Please don't murder people for the sake of further messing with a barely stable ecosystem, especially since we've proven we don't know what we're doing in this regard.

Correspondence ID: 13851Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826

United States of America

Outside Organization: none Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 15:16:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The central Cascade range area of Leavenworth, WA experiences nuisance black bears & cougar mountain lions that result in wildlife being euthanized at an average of 1 black bears & 3 black bears cubs, & 1 cougar mom & 2 cougar cubs annually. This nuisance wildlife is caused by a lack of proper trash management usually. County Waste Management will not allow residents to secure trash or use bear trashcans, leading to nuisance wildlife. The success of grizzly bears being introduced will only be as great as preventive measures, including waste management allowances to residents in the Cascades bordering national forest land. Re-introducing grizzlies to the Cascades can only happen if considerations are taken by people who lives within wildlife's large territories.

Correspondence ID: 13852Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Colville, WA 99114

United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 15:17:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am personally against the reintroduction of grizzly bears at this time. I was in incredibly close proximity to the grizzly (about 30 yards) that was removed from the Onion Creek area. I witnessed the devastation on livestock and infrastructure that this grizzly caused. I bring this up not to cast Grizzly bears as the "bad guy" (they are a magnificent animal that belongs on the landscape), but to illustrate a few things that are worth considering.

First, grizzlies are already moving into Washington State on their own. Why accelerate a process that we can allow to occur more naturally when we do not know the full effects of this reintroduction on other affected species such as black bears? Given the recent decision by the Fish and Wildlife commission to close the Spring Black Bear Season to protect black bears, it seems marginally insane to introduce a species that will push them off their territories.

Second, conflicts are already beginning to occur because grizzlies are moving into the marginal habitat that is occupied by rural citizens of the state. If the habitat was bursting with resources, we would likely not have grizzly bears showing up to raid trash cans and chicken coops each year.

Third, there is not a solid plan for conflict resolution. The Onion Creek grizzly was only relocated 30 miles. When I spoke to the officer doing the relocation (Jeff Flood), he said that was "a quick walk for a grizzly". This bear has learned that he can break into buildings to get food. That does represent a public health hazard. Do we have to wait till he breaks into a building that happens to be occupied by people before we remove this bear from the population? If we are going to introduce grizzlies to the landscape, we need clear and reasonable guidelines for conflict resolution. Those guidelines and procedures are going to take time to implement, time you short yourself by doing an unnatural introduction.

Fourth, grizzlies will be introduced in the areas where rural citizens have less of a say in the matter while being most affected by the decision. Walk around a rural area and ask folks if they want grizzlies to be reintroduced and the likely consensus you will hear is "no", walk around in a major metropolitan area and the consensus will likely be "yes". The difference is that the grizzly will be dropped in our forest, our back yard. Not theirs. For them it's a symbol of the wild, for us it is a living breathing reality. One that comes with complex problems.

Again, I want to be clear. I do not think that grizzlies are the bad guy. They are a feature of the American landscape that absolutely should exist and be protected (like every other species we find ourselves fortunate to still have), but we have a political environment in Washington at this time that lacks the structure, desire, science or the confidence of the public to do so without disastrous consequences.

Without sound science on how this introduction will affect all other species in the ecosystem, it is a violation of the both the precautionary, and best available science principles that the Fish and Wildlife Commission say they believe in. Instead of applying these concepts correctly, they spin them into pro-predator, anti-hunting policy. That is part of the fractured confidence in governance I mentioned earlier.

In short, the people who have to deal with the consequences are having this situation dictated to them from afar, by a government they feel disaffected by for completely understandable reasons. When you measure the cost of that as well as the inevitable damage that will occur by the rapid reintroduction of an apex predator, that would move in on their own anyway, I have a difficult time understanding what benefit could possibly encourage someone to engage in this folly. It is a losing gamble for everyone involved, including the bears.

Correspondence ID: 13853Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Leavenworth, WA 98226
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 15:18:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of grizzly bears in Washington state and I support alternative C, the current preferred alternative.

Correspondence ID: 13854Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Evans, WA 99126
United States of America
Outside Organization: Community of Aspen Springs Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 15:20:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Introducing predators, especially Grizzly Bears into areas that have settled residences is asinine! Do you not realize that the people have rights endowed by the Creator of LIFE, LIBERTY and the PURSUIT OF HAPPINESS? Do you really believe that any released predators is not an encroachment and threat to the very lives and rights of the people? The people will rid these threats if they are introduced.

Correspondence ID: 13855Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 15:22:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Fully endorse efforts for agency/(agencies) Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan for the North Cascades Ecosystem. I am a full time resident and look forward to any efforts made to re-establish the grizzly in my "backyard" and learning to successfully coexist with them.

Correspondence ID: 13856Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 15:23:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in favor of the decision to restore grizzly bears to the North Cascades. I feel strongly that if we do not take action now, we may never have another chance to return them to the North Cascades. Humans were responsible for removing grizzlies initially, and it's our responsibility to return them to their ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 13857Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kirkland, WA 98033
United States of America
Outside Organization: WPZS Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 15:24:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in favor of the Grizzly's return. I cannot help but think of Yellowstone and the reintroduction of the wolves there and all the good it's done - sidenote please work to protect them more as well. The unknown natural capital gained from this reinvestment in our natural world is, quite possibly, unmeasurable, however the loss from these predators from our mountain range can certainly be quantified. I would strongly urge any who haven't concluded with a favorable vote to consider why they are not and to consider the economic and environmental benefits of allowing the return of this great species. I would hope our parks would follow suit with the rest of the area and allow bears to be reintroduced and regulated in the North Cascades!

Correspondence ID: 13858Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 15:26:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As someone who has lived in the Seattle area for close to 60 years and enjoyed the mountains and woods for all of that time, I believe grizzly bears help keep the area healthy and wild.

In places where grizzly bears thrive, so do the other wildlife, plants, and people with whom they share the land.

A healthy environment for all of us, wildlife and humans alike, requires a population of grizzly bears, in addition to other wildlife.

Correspondence ID: 13859Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 15:28:19
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not think grizzlies should be introduced. These mountains are filled more than ever with hikers climbers and other outdoor recreationalists, including people with dogs and children. Grizzlies are much more aggressive than black bears. Look at historical numbers of attacks in Montana and Other parts of the Rockies. Why should we accept the risk of such a large predator into an area where they have been absent for so long. It seems as likely to upset the ecosystem as improve it.

Correspondence ID: 13860Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Portland, OR 97229
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 15:31:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The biodiversity of different ecosystems is becoming increasingly important due to climate change, and if reintroducing grizzly bears to some of them will help keep those ecosystems from collapsing, then I support it.

Correspondence ID: 13861Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Rio Rancho, NM 87144
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 15:31:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support restoring grizzly bears to the North Cascades. Grizzlies lived in this area for thousands of years. They are a keystone species. They belong here. God created them. They are Sacred. There used to be 50000 to 100000 grizzlies in the west. Now only 10 remain in the North Cascades -- a prime grizzly habitat!

I do not support 10(j) experimental designation, although some do. Based on what has happened with other 10(j) designations, once given it is never taken back. 10(j) gives flexibility? Really? to whom? To farmers & ranchers that want to kill bears and other endangered species? To make it palatable to the very people who do not want bears or any other wildlife? For people that want to expend no effort in coexistence strategies?

I live in a state with wolves, bears, mountain lions, bobcats and other wildlife. People must learn to coexist with wildlife and to stop stealing & developing their habitat. People must learn not to be be turons or just plain morons. Most importantly, people need rules & regulations to control THEIR behaviors.

Introducing a few grizzly bears per year is reasonable to me. Female bears have their first cubs at 6 years old and raise the cub for another several years. So a loss one one bear has real impacts to the grizzlies.

I have an advanced academic degree but not in ethology. I have read widely on wildlife in general and bears. I am currently reading What the Bears Know by Steve Searles & Down from the Mountain by Bryce Andrews. You the NPS are aware of all the scientific studies, researchers and organizations that support grizzlies so I do not need to repeat this knowledge & science to you. I stand with the Grizzly Treaty supported by hundreds of tribes.

I love bears. My pup is named Bear. Bears represent: Strength. Courage. Independence. Family (as seen on all those Mama Bear t-shirts).

Again as a US citizen and taxpayer I support restoration of Grizzlies in the North Cascade. And I am against what Rep Dan Newhouse stands for: misinformation regarding grizzlies.

"Earth and sky, woods and fields, lakes and rivers, the mountain and the sea, are excellent schoolmasters, and teach some of us more than we can ever learn from books." - William Wordsworth, poet

Thank you for your consideration.

Correspondence ID: 13862Project:112008Document:132104

Address: SEATTLE, WA 98178-3323
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 15:32:55

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am commenting in favor of the overall plan to restore grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem. Restoring grizzly bears to this ecosystem will restore a species that has historically been an important part of the ecosystem and support a more robust and healthy ecosystem due to their presence. There is also value to humans in knowing that these creatures that were long a part of the ecosystem here have been returned after being extirpated by past human activity. It's both environmentally sound and ethically appropriate to return the bears.

Correspondence ID: 13863Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Portland, OR 97202
United States of America
Outside Organization: Wildlands Network Non-Governmental(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,13 2023 15:36:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: ***Please note, I printed and mailed a hard copy of these comments to the provided mailing address. I am sending this electronic copy in case the hard copy does not arrive at the mailing address.***

///

November 13, 2023

Superintendent
North Cascades National Park Service Complex
810 State Route 20
Sedro-Woolley, WA 98284

No. FWS-R1-ES-2023-0074

Re: Comments regarding North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/Environmental Impact Statement and Establishment of a Nonessential Experimental Population of Grizzly Bear in the North Cascades Ecosystem

INTRODUCTION

Wildlands Network respectfully submits these comments to the National Park Service ("NPS") and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service ("FWS") (collectively, "the agencies") to positively impact the development of the North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/Environmental Impact Statement ("plan/EIS") and the proposed rule establishing a nonessential experimental population ("NEP") of grizzly bear in the North Cascades Ecosystem ("NCE") ("Draft 10(j) Rule").

Wildlands Network applauds the agencies decision to develop a plan/EIS to restore the grizzly bear to the NCE and the FWS Draft 10(j) Rule to establish a NEP of grizzly bear within the NCE as these efforts closely align with our organization's mission statement to "reconnect, restore, and rewild North America so that life - in all its diversity - can thrive." We encourage the agencies to proceed with the publication of a Final 10(j) Rule, the publication of a Record of Decision, and the implementation of a final North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan.

The following comments are organized into two parts. First, we explain why we recommend the agencies work towards addressing and mitigating issues related connectivity when working to reintroduce grizzly bears in the NCE. Second, we provide some comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and Draft 10(j) Rule.

DISCUSSION

1. Grizzly Bears and Habitat Connectivity

Wildlands Network recommends the agencies work towards addressing and mitigating issues related to connectivity when working to reintroduce grizzly bears in the NCE. By way of background, in November 2012, Dr. William Gaines wrote the following while working on the Northeast Washington Forest Plan Revision Team:

"Habitat connectivity is a measure of the ability of organisms to move among separated patches of suitable habitat, and is important for providing the long-term viability of populations and for allowing species to respond to changing climate. Animals need to be able to move efficiently within their home ranges to access food, shelter, mates, and other basic needs. In addition, animals need to move beyond their home ranges to find unoccupied habitat and maintain genetic exchange between groups."

"Approaches to providing habitat connectivity have focused on two concepts: corridors and permeability. A corridor is defined as any space, usually linear in shape, which improves the ability of organisms to move among patches of their habitat. Permeability is defined as the quality of a heterogeneous land area to provide for the passage of animals. Permeability provides a broader measure of resistance to animal movement and gives a consistent estimate of the relative potential for animal passage across entire landscapes."

Issues of habitat connectivity and genetic exchange are particularly relevant to grizzly bears because the genetic isolation and lack of connectivity between existing grizzly populations was a recognized threat at the time of original listing and was cited by the FWS a reason for listing grizzly bears on the Endangered Species List ("ESA"). Another reason the FWS cited when listing grizzly bears was the "increasing detrimental pressures" exerted on grizzlies by humans visiting and working in areas occupied by grizzlies. Some of these "detrimental pressures" are activities that emanate from roads and railways which inhibit animal movement. Both of these factors - genetic isolation and resistance to animal movement" - are connectivity-related issues. Because the purpose of the ESA is to "provide a means whereby the ecosystems upon which endangered and threatened species may be conserved" and because the FWS must make listing and delisting determinations according to the same analysis, we recommend the agencies work towards addressing and mitigating issues related connectivity when working to reintroduce grizzly bears in the NCE.

Addressing connectivity outside the NCE would require working to improve habitat connectivity and reducing resistance to animal movement between the NCE and the nearest grizzly bear populations in Canada and the Selkirk Recovery Zone. We were encouraged to see the recognition of this issue in the Draft 10(j) Rule and in Section 2.b we recommend taking some additional steps.

Addressing connectivity within the NCE would also require working to improve habitat connectivity within the NCE and finding ways to limit mortality specifically caused by roadways and railways. Roads and railways can fragment habitat and serve as a barrier to grizzly movement. Recent studies have highlighted how sensitive grizzlies are, as a species, to habitat fragmentation, especially females. In one striking example from Southern British Columbia, no known female grizzly bears crossed a roadway frequently crossed by male grizzly bears. If a goal of the Recovery of Grizzly Bears in the North Cascades is to have "reproducing bears ... distributed throughout the recovery area," we believe it will be essential to ensure female bears are willing to move throughout the NCE with as little resistance to movement as possible. Furthermore, as mentioned previously, roadways and railways are also the site of collisions between grizzlies and vehicles and trains, which present a danger to drivers, operators, and grizzlies alike. We recommend ways to improve habitat connectivity and limit mortality in more detail in Section 2.a.

2. Wildlands Network comments on the DEIS and the Draft 10(j) Rule

a. Wildlands Network comments on the DEIS

Wildlands Network supports the agencies decision to select Alternative C (Restoration with Endangered Species Action Section 10(j) Designation). Although we would have preferred the agencies select Alternative B (Restoration with Existing Endangered Species Act Protections), we understand the decision that Alternative C provides the agencies with greater management flexibility should conflict situations arise. We are hopeful though, that with an effective outreach, education, and sanitation strategy, the incidence of conflict situations will be minimized, and both populations of grizzlies and humans can thrive within the NCE.

One issue we believe warrants further discussion in the plan/EIS is the effects of WVCs that may result from the implementation of grizzly bear recovery in the NCE and ways to mitigate these effects. Draft plan/EIS Chapter 3 describes human activity in the region, including a description of the region's population, tourism, and industry and analyzes how grizzly bear reintroduction could impact human activity. Missing from this discussion is an analysis of the effects of WVCs on persons operating or inside vehicles, trains, and the bears themselves, and ways to mitigate these effects. The Washington State Department of Transportation collects data on WVCs and from 2015-2022 has recorded 9 reported impacts involving black bear along the two roadways bisecting the within the NCE. (See Appendix 1). Unfortunately, this figure is likely much higher in reality, as multiple studies conclude that half or two-thirds of large mammal WVCs go unreported. Concerningly, all three potential release areas are located alongside one of these roadways, which has several documented instances of black bear WVC. Moreover, Burlington Northern Santa Fe ("BNSF") operates a railway that bisects the NCE, and recent studies

have indicated railways are a cause of WVC incidents, which are often not recorded.

In 2023, there have unfortunately been many reported instances of grizzly bear WVC in Canada and the United States. Fortunately, properly sited wildlife crossings, exclusionary fencing, and other measures can mitigate these harms and improve connectivity. The Draft 10(j) rule does discuss the issue of WVC marginally more than the DEIS and noting that "road access to grizzly bear habitat likely poses the most imminent current threat to grizzly bears by...increasing mortality of individual bears through vehicle strikes," while writing later that "accidental mortality caused by vehicle collision is difficult to control but is not anticipated to be a significant cause of mortality." Wildlands Network believes that because the anticipated reintroduction population is so low for so long, any WVC strike will be a significant cause of mortality for grizzlies, appreciably impact the restoration timeline, and also a significant danger to drivers and passengers. For this reason, we recommend additional analysis on the topic (both rail and road) and ways to mitigate the issue in the plan/EIS.

b. Wildlands Network comments on the Draft 10(j) Rule

Wildlands Network applauds the agency's decision to designate Management Zone 2 both east and south of the NCE, and we are hopeful that in the future, the reintroduced grizzly bear population will move into these habitats and reconnect with adjoining populations. To facilitate that potential, we recommend the agencies explore an expansion of the "no net loss of core area" approach for grizzly bear habitat to all Zone 2 designated lands. Management Zone 1 lands are the "primary area for the experimental population restoration and [also] serve as core habitat for survival, reproduction, and dispersal of the NEP." The agencies expect grizzly bears to transient and occupy Management Zone 2 land. Yet, for grizzly bears to use Management Zone 2 lands successfully, these lands must be managed in a manner that facilitates transience and occupation because female dispersing bears do not travel far at any time, so any population using that land, especially the Zone 2 land east of the NCE, would likely be expected to stay for some time.

CONCLUSION

We appreciate the opportunity to submit comments to positively impact the development of the plan/EIS and the Draft 10(j) Rule. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have questions or comments.

Sincerely,

[Redacted signature block]

APPENDIX

1. Incidents of WVC within the NCE (2015-2022)

Correspondence ID: 13864Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98126
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 15:40:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I feel the reintroduction of Bears to the N cascades is a needed step in the repair of the ecosystem that goes hand in hand with the reintroduction of the wolves and of the Mt Goat relocation from the Olympic national park.

These animals all hold an important role in balancing the ecosystem.

The north cascades are uniquely situated and isolated from large human populations and the humans that venture there just need to be educated on the bears and the safely being in thier environment as well as why they are important to be there.

thanks for revisiting this important issue, our children and grandchildren will thank you as well.

Correspondence ID: 13865Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellevue, WA 98006
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 15:40:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly disagree with this proposal. Why is this needed, there does not seem to be any pertinent reason aside from the endangered species status. We have big carnivores in WA (Black Bears and Cougars) already and unless there's a critical environmental imbalance I don't think this would have a good justification.

Our parks are very populated, we are not Alaska and grizzly bears are an aggressive species.

Correspondence ID: 13866Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Trout Creek, MT 59874
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 15:42:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The North Cascades is one of six ecosystems where grizzly bear recovery is possible. The region is large enough to support a viable population, and contains enough public land to provide more than adequate habitat. As a member of the public and someone who appreciates our National Parks for the opportunity they bring to experience an intact ecosystem with native species, including top level carnivores, I support the efforts to reintroduce grizzly bears through transplantation/augmentation. I believe others would like to see grizzly bears reintroduced to the North Cascades, and that the Park's visitation will increase after the reintroduction also benefitting local economies. Importantly, this effort appears to have the support of the Okanagan Nation Alliance.

Grizzly bears are a keystone species and through predation, scavenging, and ground disturbance they shape the landscape and enhance biodiversity. The restoration of this population would benefit the Park's ecosystem, and would be a large step forward in species' recovery.

Once repopulated, would the acquisition of additional habitat, including easements on private land, potentially provide linkage to the Selkirk and Cabinet-Yaak populations to provide genetic exchange among these small isolated populations? If so, this would be an added benefit of the restoration efforts. Protecting habitat for grizzly bears also ensures habitat for a plethora of other species.

Due to rapid human population growth and conversion of land into houses and subdivisions there are few places left where the grizzly bear can flourish. This lends an urgency to protect grizzly bears throughout their range, and to aggressively begin recovery efforts whenever and wherever possible. We must not squander the opportunity to reintroduce bears into the North Cascades.

I live in the Cabinet Mountains of northwestern Montana, and, sadly, I have witnessed the small isolated population of grizzly bears dwindle due to human-caused mortality. While there is a fair amount of public land, the bears may never do very well here without active management due to two proposed large-scale mines, two highways (2 and 200), and a growing human population. While there is a national wilderness area (Cabinet Mountains Wilderness), there is no national park to provide added protection from hunting and poaching. Local recovery efforts include a bear management specialist to reduce conflicts, public education, land acquisition for travel corridors, and augmentation of the population.

There is a segment of the population that would either like to sterilize everything, or would like to hunt everything. Neither segment understands the important role predators play, and should not disproportionately influence efforts for reintroduction or species management.

In closing, I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation.

Correspondence ID: 13867Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Woodinville, WA 98072
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 15:44:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Myths:

#1. Bears reintroduction will benefit the ecosystem.

But how exactly? Nobody can properly articulate. Is it by eating deer or salmon that is already at dangerously low levels?

#2. Bears were here before us, and deserve their place in our state.

False. Why don't we reintroduce dinosaurs? Not everything needs to be reintroduced just because somebody said so.

#3. Don't worry. Probability of being attacked by the bear is extremely low.

False. Probabilities are measured against the average population. Average population doesn't go hiking and not into remote locations. If it were calculated properly for avid hikers, numbers would tell a different story. If you disagree, the state should proactively communicate funding in case of bear attacks leading to death. It's only fair because those in power choose to impose this danger on others.

Facts:

#1. Bears reintroduction protagonists do not live in the areas affected, and will not even venture there for hiking. Local communities are clearly against it.

#2. "Grizzly and black bears can severely maul or kill you. They are unpredictable and will defend themselves, their young, their food, and their territory. When surprised, they may react by attacking. ALL bears are potentially dangerous." See npshistory.com (Denali park). Obviously, consequences for grizzly attacks are much worse compared to black bears. And that's why local people in Alaska always carry guns, high caliber. Do we want that for Washington state? I would hope not.

Thanks for reading.

Correspondence ID: 13868Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kirkland, WA 98033
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 15:46:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: NO GRIZZLIES INTRODUCED INTO WASHINGTON!!!!

It would be TOO dangerous for our citizens to have them in our state!!!

Correspondence ID: 13869Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Madison, WI 53705
United States of America

Outside Organization: none Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 15:50:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not support the idea of reintroducing grizzly bears to the North Cascades National Park. It will eliminate this park as a potential destination by numerous people due to Fear.

I do not consider myself that fearful of wildlife. I have recently taken up backpacking and have made several trips in black

bear country without carrying bear spray.

I am also well aware that the likelihood of being killed or injured by a grizzly bear is lower than that of driving to the park, being struck by lightning in the park, etc. Heck, tripping and hitting your head against a rock is far more likely than a grizzly bear attack. So yes, it is mostly irrational fear.

However, my wife and kids? They're terrified of bears. My wife struggles to sleep in a tent in black bear country. She will absolutely not visit the North Cascades backcountry if grizzly bears are reintroduced. And frankly I would be disinclined to do so as well without packing a firearm (even though we all know the advice that bear spray is considered more effective than a firearm).

Now let's discuss how irrational the fear really is. While the probability of being attacked is extremely low, the problem is that I cannot think of a worse way to die than being eaten by a grizzly. Hence fear, irrational fear, perhaps with some rationality if you consider "eliminating the worst ways to die" aspects.

Just consider the most recent incident in Canada's Banff National Park where an old grizzly bear (with bad teeth) attacked and killed an very experienced couple. However the terrifying part is that it was clearly a long, drawn out attack. Why do we know this? Because one of them was able to fire off a Garmin Inreach message saying "Bear attack. bad". A Garmin Inreach satellite navigator has 4 buttons. It is slow to poke out a text message. What surely happened was that one of them was being mauled for dozens of seconds (or minutes) while the other typed out a message and then eventually got mauled and partially eaten as well. Ultimately both were found dead with empty canisters of bear spray.

It may take 20+ years for a similar incident to occur in the North Cascades. But at some point, such an incident will occur and it will be the worst nightmare of anyone contemplating visiting a U.S. National Park.

In summary, reintroducing grizzly bears to the North Cascades will do the following:

- * eliminate the park as a backpacking and hiking destination for many due to fear
- * cause more guns to be carried into U.S. National Parks (even though discharging them is illegal).

Correspondence ID: 13870Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 15:56:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: 11/13/2023
Douglas R. Huddle

Bio Vitae _ I am 74 years old and have lived in Western Washington for 73 of those years. I worked for forebearers of and the current Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife for 35 years in both its Fish and Wildlife Programs. Since retiring I have volunteered over the past 14 years for the U.S. Forest Service's Mount Baker Ranger District performing hand road maintenance as well as fish and wildlife monitoring work. It is my conviction that the public is well served by the Forest Service's mission of providing citizens and visitors with broad but reasonable and well-maintained access to forest lands to engage in a variety activities and benefit from immersion in this wonderful, natural wilderness environment. This should be protected and perpetuated.

Comments Regarding

Draft Grizzly Bear Plan / Environmental Impact Statement, North Cascades Ecosystem

1. Basis for Habitat Suitability Justification _ The fundamental assertion that lands of the greater North Cascades Range of Washington State are qualitatively able to support a viable brown bear population is supported by citations of assessments, studies and evaluations made throughout the history of the NCE that are reasonably well footnoted for reference. But I am unable to find reasonable abstracts describing in some detail the various methodologies and their premises that led to that conclusion. I think those summaries need to be elucidated in the EIS so the scientists outside the proponent fraternity as well

as the citizens likely to be directly affected by the project and the general public can read and judge for themselves the legitimacy, objectivity and veracity of the scientific methods used to collect, compare and evaluate data. Some of the citations for analyses date back to the early 1990s when GIS modelling and digital spectrographic data collection including lidar technologies were in early development from their genesis. Abstracts should include discussion of the role of comparing and contrasting analytical modes _ similarities and differences _ in habitat quality and animal demonstrated selective tendencies evaluation. Often in science is asked to use datasets that are older, non-randomly gathered, or are sparsely populated characteristics that can bias evaluative results.

Example: researchers compared the natural plant and animal forage base lists from donor population locales with that of the NCE flora and fauna and found a considerable correlation of listed herbaceous plants, fungi, insects as well as large and small terrestrial animals that contribute to brown bear diets. But I could not find reference to relative abundance or distribution of each food element within the NCE which are equally critical characteristics.

Example: I would like to see a comparison of the micro-connectivity of habitat in the NCE by elevation and slope, something similar to the USGS StreamStats model which incorporates at least seven different variables (surface area, elevation range, slope aspect, slope angle timbered versus bare, etc.) to estimate incremental stream run-off volumes for engineers. The ease (conserving energy, etc.) with which animals, especially terrestrials and sparsely abundant ones, can move around to find and take in food, seek shelter and reproduce goes straight to developing a bioenergetics model for these bears. Such a digital analytic model was developed for bald eagles to assess how much disturbance they could tolerate in the winter on salmon carrion rivers.

2. Need for Apex Omnivore Justification_ A second contention referred to somewhat obliquely in the EIS is that brown bears here in the era prior to European settlement, were likely the dominant animal. It is a given that their size relative played the major role, but the inherent complexity of ecosystems means that everything is play off against or in concert with many other both in the plant as well as animal kingdoms. From my observational experience and research of nearly 70 years, I have difficulty concluding that the bio-dynamics of the NCE are radically altered. Extirpation of the grizzly population occurred relatively speaking a short time ago, so there should be some of historic record that points to how the ecosystem functioned while they were here and how those dynamics or characteristics have changed with the start of their decline and then disappearance. I think it difficult to say as many proponents of grizzly restoration assert that the ecosystem will be back to well-oiled machine status with them back. Different, yes, better in terms establishment of efficient, stable dynamics that foster maximum diversity, no. I don't see hoary marmots, ravaging subalpine and alpine meadows because there are no grizzlies to dig them out.

Example: How numerous were ungulate (deer and elk) populations during the grizzly bear dominance and did they behave generally in the same manner they do now, migration in season vertically to utilize timberline meadow habitats.

Example: It is stated in the EIS that grizzlies are noted for playing a significant role in plant distribution via seed transference, however that is a dynamic fulfilled by a wide variety animal species from birds to ungulates and even pikas as well as weather conditions (mainly air currents, precipitation-prompted stream run-offs).

3. Lead and Cooperative Entities not on The Same Commitment and Capability Page _ Starting a project of this magnitude with agencies of government (at all levels federal state and local) with critical factors such as public safety and visitor management to minimize. Despite assurances from FWS that it will not unilaterally impose Endangered Species Act Section 4 rules as legal directives as long as the previous conditions are observed by the Forest Service and the State of Washington, that does not from a public safety and animal management standpoint mitigate the unintended effects of arbitrary and unpredictable behavior on the part of the any introduced animals placed on the ground inside the park or designated wilderness areas. It is my belief that is neither prudent nor logical to for the lead entities to move forward until the Forest Service and State of Washington logistically and legally are fully prepared for the eventualities of implementation of either Alts B or C. From and outside observer prospective, it does not look like a friendly thing to do to release an apex omnivore onto the landscape and it effect say, NOW, ready or not, deal with it.

4. Protection for ESA Listed Fish Species _ It is not clear the extent to which NOAA Fisheries and WDFW representatives consulted and settled on guidelines concerning impacts to ESA listed native salmon and steelhead stocks in the Nooksack and Skagit river basins by foraging bears that discover them? Further it is spelled out clearly what steps will be taken to avoid and/or mitigate impacts to previously federally listed native salmon, steelhead and native char in and adjacent to the NCE.

- In the North Fork Nooksack Basin _ beginning just 14 miles from the park's western boundary _ Thompson, Canyon, Deadhorse, Boyd and Glacier creeks all on USFS land and relatively small tributaries to the main river, annual are frequented by spawning spring chinook (summer for five weeks) and winter-run steelhead (spring for three months). Other less

intensively protected salmonids species are present, too.

- In the Skagit Basin, the upper Skagit, Cascade, Suiattle, Whitechuck and Sauk mainstems all host spawning salmon and winter-summer steelhead populations together with significant tributaries from Diobsud, Bacon, Goodell, Copper and Newhalem creeks in the Skagit above Marblemount to notable Suiattle tributaries including Tenas, Big, Buck, Downey, Slide, Lime, Sulphur.
- The North Fork Nooksack native chinook stock is managed as one of two discrete native, wild populations in WRIA 01. The Skagit basin currently has multiple recognized discrete chinook stocks that are monitored in recovery mode.
- Though not federally listed, the isolated Ross Lake rainbow trout population spawns in a number that reservoirs tributaries as well as in the main river in British Columbia each spring in numbers of fish that are of a stature (size) now that could attract grizzly bears. The population is sustained entirely by natural reproduction.

5. Inability to Assure Vital Follow Through _ This is patently acknowledged to be a long-term (forever) program with obligatory functions and follow-through asserted to be necessary, and perhaps even vitally so, to actively perform for years, if not decades out. And yet NPS and FWS practically speaking have no assurance of steady let alone increasing funding for personnel and materials beyond year one. Important tasks such as those related to public safety could be relegated to peripheral status or dropped entirely. As the recent history demonstrates, abrupt changes in executive direction and legislative intent will whipsaw abruptly change development, implementation and/or execution of public policy.

Both Alts B and C (especially extending into the adaptive management phase) will be labor intensive and that work force will have a large geographical area to covering in responding to various issues and events. I do not find in the EIS a prioritization doctrine discussion that would direct focus and deploy of staff on ongoing matters (scientific monitoring, conflict intervention, strategic planning) in the event of appropriation cuts. If out-year budgets are reduced for either of the two lead entities (FWS, NPS) or program cooperators USFS, WDFW, et al), serious dilemmas will arise such as whether to curtail conflict interventions and relocations in favor of scientific monitoring or continued transplantation.

In my 55 plus years of experience in field positions two government departments and three law enforcement agencies, I have seen countless initiatives, program's and projects abruptly and summarily downsized or abandoned altogether. Institutional continuity of mission and direction is vital and its interruption must carefully considered when a field agency plans and budgets for its operation.

6. Delegation of Authorities Discussion Legal Consequence _ this EIS states that no subrogations of authority are currently allowed by law so as to preclude direct or indirect private citizen management or enforcement participation in any way. Yet advocacy groups have vigorously pursued their protective initiatives and agendas in other ESA management efforts and this EIS acknowledges that is to likely continue in this endeavor. The troublesome nexus here is that the EIS states that this project has a range of potential criminal consequences for 'takes' under the ESA's Sec. 4. There is potential that highly motivated advocacy groups and individuals, through illicit surveillance on non-public lands, could bring allegations as complaining witnesses to the attention of FWS, with this EIS cited as formally excluding them as agents of and for government law enforcement and they could assert that they were free from the obligation to follow constitutional due process and evidentiary mandates all government commissioned law enforcement officers must follow.

7. Socio-Economic Impacts _ It is my view that the EIS does not address adequately the following:

- It under-estimates and seems to downplays rural economic impacts in general and especially to the current timber industry which has downsized dramatically for other pressures in the past 30 years. The cost of wood products, including construction materials, could go up in this locale if the current low level of contribution from the region's timber base is further eroded.
- There is a paradox inherent in the EIS in that in one section it states that there will be a dampening effect to the local economy in several sectors including tourism while in another part of the EIS it categorically states that the influx of tourists will increase benefiting rural service, hospitality and outdoors gear businesses due to people hearing of the grizzly's return and come here to see them. This sets up a further paradoxical element in the EIS which states that the placement territories selected at the outset will be as far as possible from proximity to humans and that mode of release will minimize greatest extent possible public contact during the staging of each year's re-introductions.

8. Contingent Public Safety Issue _ It is stated in the EIS that in potential British Columbia donor grizzly populations individual bears especially those in the Canadian Rocky Mountain spine areas are reported to be more aggressive in their approach to humans. It is a general premise that wildlife populations isolated from contact with homo sapiens lack aversion response to humans and are more approachable. It is not clearly and emphatically stated in the EIS what measures managers will employ to establish and maintain a safety zone around individual animals to preclude humans from getting too close and

triggering aggressive behavior.

9. Likelihood of Success of Alt C Action _ Puzzling in the EIS discussion of the expectation of success of these transplants is the assertion or assumption that this the NCE transplant recovery process will be successful. Cited in that discussion was an assessment of the history reintroductions in British Columbia in which it was found that 77 of 110 total transplants were determined to have failed mainly because the placed animals did not stay put within their anticipated new home territories, some even self-repatriated . A 70 percent failure rate over a broad enough sample would seem to indicate that this is not an effective or economic means to accomplish this objective. It comes to my recollection, that _ because of the then ban on direct releases below the 49th Parallel in Washington _ in the 1990s and early 2000s British Columbia Wildlife Branch captured grizzlies from around the province and released them into mountainous areas just north of the International Boundary and the U.S. portion of the NCE. These grizzlies were for the most part 'trouble' bears habituated to town garbage dumps and many of them made a bee-line back to those food sources. There is a considerable body of stories _ many documented _ of bear (grizzly, polar and black) self-repatriation after an imposed relocation often to get them away from the consequences of human close encounters.

It seems however that the optimistic presumption of success here is based on the hope that this is just too good of a place for these involuntary immigrants to leave. A project such as this should be based not on subjectively expected outcome but should be an objectively-derived procedure with the highest possible demonstrated success rate and the fewest unintended consequences.

Governments perpetuate not by force of will, but by the intuitive sense of justice they engender in the greatest body of a country's citizens.

Correspondence ID: 13871Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Guelph, UN N1G0G4
Canada

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 15:58:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of a healthy grizzly bear population in the North Cascades, which has been their home for thousands of years (or longer). As a keystone species, where grizzly bears thrive, so to does clean water and abundant native fish and wildlife populations. (Grizzly bears are ecologically and culturally significant and are vital to the overall health of the North Cascades ecosystem and its biodiversity. They are considered an indicator of ecosystem health.)

As such, I believe the best option to pursue is Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. It is the best choice for the bears and for the people who live in and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The plan is wisely modeled on what worked in Montana, where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

While conflicts can cause emotional responses, when proactive measures are taken, it has been proven that people and grizzly bears can coexist and thrive. They do so in British Columbia, Montana, and Wyoming, where grizzly populations and back and front country recreation continue to grow hand in hand, providing a vital economic boost to the gateway communities in those areas.

Restoring grizzly bears as an "Experimental, non-essential" population under a well-crafted Section 10(j) rule of the Endangered Species Act makes sense. Such a designation will provide flexibility for wildlife managers to prevent and address human-bear conflict and a greater level of comfort for people who are concerned about the impacts of wildlife recovery on economic and recreation activities. Agencies have used the Section 10(j) Rule in the past to restore black-footed ferrets, California condors, wood bison, and many others.

With more management tools to reduce, prevent, and respond to human-bear conflicts, this rule will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Having wiped out the grizzly bear population over the past 150 years, we now have the unique opportunity and the ethical obligation to restore them to their native home, where suitable habitats still exist.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to the state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of the American ecosystem, as well as regional culture, and overall natural heritage.

Thank you for taking the time to keep our North Cascades wild!

Correspondence ID: 13872Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mukilteo, WA 98275
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 15:58:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I DO NOT support reintroducing grizzly bears to the North Cascades.

Other species have been living and people have been recreating in the area for years without grizzlies. "Because they used to live here" is not sufficient reason to re-introduce an apex predator. Inexperienced or unprepared people are not the only ones who can be hurt by Grizzlies. People will certainly die as a result if this effort prevails.

Correspondence ID: 13873Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Darrington, WA 98241
United States of America

Outside Organization: Year Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 15:59:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am against bringing in grizzly bears to our state, Under a Washington state law (RCW 77.12.035),

WDFW may not transplant or introduce grizzly bears into the state and may only use bears native to the state for management programs. In addition, WDFW must engage in all discussions with federal and state agencies relating to grizzly bear management. Not only is it illegal under this RCW, but it would negatively impact our area in so many ways. Our ecosystem can't support the bears we already have in our area, this would cause the imported bears to seek their food in other areas after decimating the food supply that is currently available to our bears. I am totally against this move. We live in these mountains, and we do NOT want bears that are not native to our area brought in. They are not the same as the grizzly bears that have been here for over 100 years. Leave this alone, it will end in a way no one wants.

Correspondence ID: 13874Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Burien, WA 98166
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 16:00:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support reintroducing grizzlies to the PNW

Correspondence ID: 13876Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98125
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 16:05:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the proposed introduction of an experimental grizzly bear (*Ursus arctos horribilis*) population in the North Cascades ecosystem as stated in Alternative C under Section 10(j). "No net loss of core" is a well-balanced approach that seems very well suited and positioned to succeed because of:

- 1) Long-standing, cooperative efforts among federal, state and tribal agencies over multiple jurisdictions, including the Canadian government.
- 2) Establishment of management zones 1, 2 & 3, with well-defined actions appropriate to each zone.
- 3) Incremental introduction of five to seven bears per year over a period of 8 - 9 years with close management and monitoring for at least 30 - 45 years.
- 4) Reasonable and well considered conflict prevention measures which are likely to be successful.
- 5) Well conducted community involvement and input since 2018.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 13877Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Walla Walla, WA 99362
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 16:06:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzlies are so important to the ecosystem, as I'm sure you already know, and to restore and help manage forests and wildlife, these bears could play an important role in this. I think they should be re introduced to the forests up here.

Correspondence ID: 13879Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 16:09:24

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello, I am writing to state that I am opposed to reintroducing grizzly bears into North Cascades National Park. As an avid hiker, backpacker, and skier, I--along with my family and my friends--am a frequent visitor to the NCNP. In fact, my son's first backpacking trip, when he was just 9 months old, was up Cascade Pass to Sahale Arm, over 15 years ago. We have hiked and backpacked in many of our National Parks, and it is a different experience to be in an area with a know grizzly population.

While rare, grizzly attacks do occur and the risk to people is significant. As demonstrated in the recent horrific attack at nearby Banff National Park, bear spray is not effective against an aggressive grizzly. Nonetheless, tourists will find it necessary to carry bear spray around the visitor centers, as seen in parks like Yellowstone, creating an atmosphere of nervous hikers and unnecessary waste. Also, if the only known deterrent for an attacking grizzly is a firearm, we could see an increase in hikers carrying guns in the North Cascades. Is that something we want for this park?

From an ecological standpoint, there is no good reason to transfer grizzly bears into the North Cascades. It is impossible to return an ecological system to its previous state. Changes will always remain. There is no niche in the North Cascades that can only be filled by the presence of grizzlies. There is not a lack of balance that requires grizzlies to rectify. The promise of bringing bears that only eat berries, and won't impact salmon populations, seems shortsighted. Wildlife biology is not chemistry or physics--animals change and evolve in new environments. After all, some grizzlies at some point figured out that salmon are tasty and high in calories, so the transferred bears might figure that out too. I would never support the removal of an indigenous species such as the grizzly bear from an area, but likewise without a compelling reason to add them back into the ecosystem, I do not support their reintroduction.

I hope you will consider the voices of the many local users and neighbors of the North Cascades who are opposed to adding grizzlies to the park. I am thankful that when my children were small, we were able to enjoy the wonder of backpacking in this majestic mountain range without the risk of grizzly bear encounters, and I hope that many hikers in the future will have the same experience.

Correspondence ID: 13880Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 16:09:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation as it is the best choice for bears and the people who live, work, and recreate in the North Cascades Ecosystem. It is based on a similar approach that has worked in Montana where grizzlies are recovering in the Cabinet-Yaak mountains with few problems and with the acceptance and involvement of local communities.

Furthermore, the 10(j) rule provides the necessary tools and flexibility to reduce, prevent, and respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule if properly implemented, will lead to greater successful coexistence between people and grizzlies as they return to historic range.

Correspondence ID: 13881Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Chelan, WA 98816
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 16:12:12

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello, I am writing to express my opposition to the reintroduction of Grizzly Bears into the North Cascades of Washington State. I have many loved one who that live in that area in the outskirts of towns. and I am greatly concerned for their safety should this plan move forward. With many of their homes, there is no way to adequately secure borders and prevent Grizzly Bears from being able to come onto property. It's not as simple as building a fences the topography and other physical characteristics of the land in which they live. Bringing Grizzly Bears into the area would put them, their livestock, pets, etc. in danger. It is difficult enough to protect against existing predators that are already present in these lands, adding a new one, one that's incredibly dangerous, would make it even harder and more dangerous. I urge you to reconsider this plan and perhaps find a different area to use as habitat for the bears. They have not been in this area for a ver long time, and the ecosystem has been doing great, there's no reason to introduce it. The people who are urging this will not be the ones to face the consequences, of putting people pets and livestock in danger.

Please do not pass this plan if you care about the people.

Correspondence ID: 13882Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Silverdale, WA 98383
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 16:13:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I disagree with reintroducing grizzly bears to the North Cascades. They pose a life-threatening risk to people and their pets as well as to ranchers and their livestock. With family who live in Montana, where grizzly bears are already a serious enough problem that kids can't go outside to play without bear spray and a handgun, I find it foolish to bring them into Washington so that we, too, may end up with the same problem. Grizzly bears are so much more powerful and dangerous compared with the black bears we are familiar with. Please do not bring back grizzly bears to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 13883Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ellensburg, WA 98926
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 16:15:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The recent grizzly bear incident in Stevens County is a clear indication of the challenges we face with predators in Washington. Our state is already stretched thin managing various predators. Given the pressures on our ungulate populations, reintroducing grizzlies seems unwise.

Correspondence ID: 13884Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 16:16:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: A few years ago I took a day hike alone in Glacier National Park. It was worrisome all the way with bear warning signs and notices on some switchbacks stating when the last grizzly bear was sighted. I tried to tag along with large family groups on my way out. It was not a good hike because of the grizzlies. The North Cascades National Park is much safer for hiking. Please don't return grizzlies to it.

Sincerely,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 13885Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98104
United States of America

Outside Organization: Washington Trails Association Recreational Groups(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,13 2023 16:23:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: November 13, 2023

Superintendent Don Striker
North Cascades National Park Service Complex
810 State Route 20
Sedro Woolley, WA 98284

RE: Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan-Environmental Impact Statement North Cascades Ecosystem
comments submitted electronically through the comment portal - <https://parkplanning.nps.gov/>

Dear Superintendent Striker,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS).

The Access Fund, The American Alpine Club, American Whitewater, Evergreen Mountain Bike Alliance, The Mountaineers and Washington Trails Association represent tens of thousands of human powered recreationists who care deeply about public lands in the North Cascades Ecosystem. Our organizations work together on issues relating to recreation, access and conservation. We have participated in grizzly bear planning efforts for many years. Our groups submitted scoping comments in 2015 on the North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan and comments in 2017 on the previous DEIS. We submitted a comment letter in 2022 during the scoping for this project. Staff from our organizations have reviewed the published materials, attended public meetings and discussed the implication of the various alternatives with members of the planning team from both co-lead agencies. This letter builds on our previous communications. We ask that you consider our input and add additional information to the final EIS regarding the impacts of grizzly bear reintroduction on recreation. We hope that our comments, which are grouped thematically, will be useful to you as you move ahead with this process.

Alternatives

Our organizations have considered the alternatives presented in the DEIS. We do not have a shared position on the merits of reintroducing grizzly bears into the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE), but we all believe that the public would benefit from a larger grizzly bear management toolkit than is available under existing Endangered Species Act section 4(d) rules. If North Cascades National Park selects one of the action alternatives, we believe the responsible official should select alternative C, the preferred alternative.

Classifying the reintroduced population of grizzly bears as a nonessential experimental population is appropriate. The DEIS states that alternative C would lead to greater social tolerance of grizzly bears and “improve the chances of establishing and maintaining a grizzly bear population in NCE” (72). Based on this analysis, alternative C would best achieve the purpose of the plan and most likely meet the needs of the recreation community. The preferred alternative would give managers greater flexibility to relocate bears and would allow managers to use deterrence to prevent conflicts from arising.

Our request:

Alternative C allows deterrence “for the purposes of avoiding human-bear conflicts or to discourage bears from using areas in the immediate vicinity of homes and other human-occupied areas” (38). To the best of our knowledge “human-occupied areas” is not defined in the DEIS. We request that the final EIS clarify the types of recreation sites (ex. campground, trailheads, backcountry camps) that fit under this definition and explicitly allow deterrence from high-use recreation areas under the proposed 10(j) rule.

Consequences for Recreation

The DEIS highlights the importance of outdoor recreation to residents of Washington and the state's economy. The DEIS states that “recreational use of federal lands in the NCE is estimated to be 8 million recreation visitor days per year” (111). It also says that “more than 264,000 jobs in Washington were supported by outdoor recreation spending” (137). The plan acknowledges that hiking, climbing, water-based recreation, snow-based sports and other recreational opportunities are important uses of the project area. The planning team assessed the potential impacts on visitor use and recreation. They concluded that in both alternative B and alternative C reintroducing bears would have both adverse and beneficial impacts. The DEIS states that the net impact would be positive as a result of reintroduction since the public would have the opportunity to view a restored population of grizzly bears.

More information on the impacts of reintroducing grizzly bears on recreation is needed in order for the public and the co-lead agencies to fully evaluate the consequences of the proposed action on recreation and rural economies. In particular, our organizations did not find sufficient discussion of the impacts of the action alternatives on backcountry recreation. We wish to know whether additional restrictions will be added that impact access to outdoor recreation. Does North Cascades National Park intend to change its Wilderness Management Plan or other management direction in ways that would impact recreational use? In the final EIS, we ask that you address how the following may be impacted or include language stating that no changes are required:

Access to developed and dispersed recreation sites by motor vehicle;

Backcountry recreation activities that utilize trailed and trail-less areas such as hiking, climbing, mountaineering, boating (e.g. packrafting), mountain biking and trail running;

Day trip party size restrictions, both minimum and maximum;

Overnight backcountry use and party size restrictions, both minimum and maximum; and

Permits for outfitters and guides.

Closures

Our organizations have communicated throughout the development of this plan that continued access to the special places in the North Cascades is incredibly important to hikers, climbers, mountain bikers and other recreationists. As such, we appreciate the language in the DEIS that specifies that releasing grizzly bears will have limited impact on public access and would not require long term closures. The DEIS says that “identified release sites would be in locations that are remote from high human-use areas” (129). It states that release sites would be surveyed and agency staff would select different locations if park staff determine that visitors are in the vicinity of a proposed release site (30). This guidance will minimize impacts on backcountry visitors during bear release activities. Our organizations noted that two of the three proposed release sites contain national scenic trails. Thank you for specifying that “the agencies do not anticipate the need to institute trail closures along the Pacific Crest Trail and other high use trails” (122).

Long term impacts from reintroducing bears on recreational access is partially addressed in the restoration plan. We appreciate that the plan suggests that reintroducing bears will not cause major changes to public access. The DEIS says:

Under all action alternatives, occasional short-term closures (a few hours up to a few days) could take place on a case-by-case basis, based on bear activity (e.g., a female with cubs near high human-use areas) or timing and location of a release... No long-term closures or modifications to public access would be implemented because of grizzly bear restoration. The agencies do not anticipate the need for lengthy closures such as those experienced in Yellowstone National Park because no similar bear congregation areas have been identified (32).

We believe that the intention to avoid extended area closures should be included in the final EIS. Additionally, we ask you to include more information on the process for determining when short-term closures are needed. In the final EIS, expectations around closures ought to be presented as clearly as possible. According to the DEIS, "grizzly bears frequently and successfully establish home ranges overlapping similar levels of human activity in other parts of their range" (67). Our organizations would like the final EIS to express succinctly that our best available science suggests that current levels of recreational use are compatible with grizzly bear recovery.

Our request:

Continue to avoid impacts to high use recreation areas and trails.

Clearly state that long-term closures are not required.

List the criteria for short-term closures; and

Share the approximate number of closures that the National Park Service anticipates will be required annually when the NCE contains a recovered grizzly bear population.

Wilderness

Thank you for including a thorough discussion of the impacts of the action alternatives on wilderness character. We hope to continue to review the analysis on this important topic, as you move forward with this process.

Our request:

The DEIS says that "Under the Wilderness Act of 1964, both the NPS and USFS would complete separate minimum requirements analyses to evaluate the necessity and impacts for all flights that require landing in designated wilderness lands under their management" (30). Please share these minimum tool documents when they are complete.

Agency Coordination

We understand that a federal agency may choose not to participate based in a NEPA process. This determination may be made based on staffing constraints. Under the relevant law "in response to a lead agency's request for assistance in preparing the environmental documents, a cooperating agency may reply that other program commitments preclude any involvement or the degree of involvement requested in the action that is the subject of the environmental impact statement" (40 CFR 1501.8). However, our organizations were surprised by the United States Forest Service (USFS) determination to not be a cooperating agency. Given that the Forest Service manages a majority of the land in the NCE, we would like to know more about this determination and whether the USFS has the resources it needs to support the management of grizzly bears on national forest lands.

Our request:

Please include a copy of the communication the Forest Service shared with the Park Service stating that they are unable to serve as a cooperating agency in the appendix of the final EIS.

Share information on the current conditions of agencies in the NCE and their preparedness to administer lands with grizzly bears.

Role of Non-Profit Partners

An important component of the proposed action is increased education of the public about grizzly bears. Our organizations expect that recreation nonprofits will have a significant role to play in helping visitors learn about recreating in grizzly bear country. The DEIS states, "Ongoing public outreach by nonprofit organizations...would promote tolerance of and coexistence with grizzly bears by addressing public safety concerns and provide information about grizzly bear ecology and

behavior” (32). If an action alternative is selected, we wish to work with you to coordinate messaging and maximize the effectiveness of our shared public education efforts.

Our request:

Proactively work with the human-powered recreation community to create education and outreach materials and programs that can reduce the risk of conflict between humans and grizzly bears.

Thank you for considering our input. We look forward to continuing to work with you on this long term project. Please contact our organizations if you have any questions or would like to further discuss our feedback and perspectives.

Sincerely,

██████████
Washington Trails Association
Policy and Planning Manager

██████████
The Mountaineers
Conservation and Advocacy Director

██████████
Senior Policy Advisor
Access Fund

██████████
Director, Community Programs
American Alpine Club

██████████
Pacific Northwest Stewardship Director
American Whitewater

██████████
Executive Director
Evergreen Mountain Bike Alliance

Correspondence ID: 13886Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bozeman, MT 59718
United States of America
Outside Organization: Property and Environment Research Center Non-Governmental
Received: Nov,13 2023 16:23:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Comment Regarding the Proposed Reintroduction of Grizzly Bears
into the North Cascades Ecosystem
Property and Environment Research Center (PERC)
Bozeman, Montana
November 13, 2023

Note: A PDF of this comment, with citations and supporting material is available at: <https://www.perc.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/11/northern-cascades-grizzly-reintroduction-comment.pdf>

Main Points:

Species reintroductions, habitat restoration, and other proactive conservation efforts are essential to recovering endangered and threatened species. But in carrying out these efforts, federal agencies must work with, not against, states, communities, and private landowners. Trust between federal agencies and local stakeholders is critically important but has too often been lacking under the Endangered Species Act.

Restoring grizzlies to the North Cascades ecosystem would move the species closer to recovery. But the proposal has provoked significant opposition from local communities and private landowners. To address these legitimate concerns, the National Park Service and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service should consider additional and more creative approaches to mitigate the costs grizzlies would impose on communities and landowners.

The Services should also plan for the reintroduction's success, including by providing more flexibility as the population grows and gradually transferring management responsibility to the state.

The Property and Environment Research Center (PERC) respectfully submits this comment regarding the National Park Service's and Fish and Wildlife Service's proposal to reintroduce grizzly bears into the North Cascades Ecosystem. Species reintroductions, along with habitat restoration and other proactive conservation efforts, are critical to the recovery of endangered and threatened species. To succeed, however, these efforts must be pursued with the local communities and landowners that are most affected, rather than be imposed on them.

The proposal to reintroduce grizzlies into the North Cascades has already stoked substantial local opposition. Such opposition has blocked previous efforts to reintroduce grizzlies and undermined the success of other species' reintroductions. To ensure that the reintroduction can move beyond a mere plan into an on-the-ground reality, and that a reintroduced population can succeed, the Services must be open to more creative options that allow reintroduction to be done with local communities and landowners, not to them. That means that the Service should consider additional ways to reduce regulatory burdens and address other costs that the grizzly's return would impose. It should also plan for the population's ultimate recovery, including providing for even more flexibility and the transfer of management authority to the state as the population grows.

The Property and Environment Research Center

PERC is the national leader in market solutions for conservation, with over 40 years of research and a network of respected scholars and practitioners. Through research, law and policy, and innovative field conservation programs, PERC explores how aligning incentives for environmental stewardship produces sustainable outcomes for land, water, and wildlife. PERC has produced extensive research on how the Endangered Species Act could be better implemented to achieve its ultimate goal of recovering species by removing perverse incentives and encouraging habitat restoration and proactive recovery efforts. Founded in 1980, PERC is nonprofit, nonpartisan, and proudly based in Bozeman, Montana.

Recovery Takes Effort, Cooperation, and Trust

The ultimate goal of the Endangered Species Act is to recover species to the point that they are no longer endangered or threatened with extinction. This is no easy task. For most imperiled species, leaving them alone is not enough. But proactive recovery efforts cannot easily be regulated into existence. Even the most well-intentioned regulation may discourage such efforts through perverse incentives. As a consequence, the Endangered Species Act's results to date have been mixed. It has been remarkably effective at one part of the recovery goal, preventing extinction so that recovery is still possible. Ninety-nine percent of listed species persist today, and hundreds of extinctions may have been avoided. But only 3% of listed species have recovered over the last half-century--far fewer than the Fish and Wildlife Service projected by now--and a similarly small percentage have populations that are improving.

PERC supports the Fish and Wildlife Service's efforts to facilitate more voluntary recovery efforts and undertake its own proactive efforts, including species reintroductions. The long-term effectiveness of such efforts depends on building trust and goodwill with states, local communities, and landowners. It also depends on creating the right incentives for conservation. To that end, PERC has urged the Fish and Wildlife Service to be more creative in its regulatory decisions and recovery projects to make imperiled species an asset rather than a liability for the local stakeholders whose actions have the greatest impact on recovery.

An Infinite Number of Options

Restoring grizzly bears to the North Cascades would be a significant, positive step toward the recovery of grizzlies in the lower 48 states. But that reintroduction will come at a cost, including human deaths and maulings, lost livestock and increased costs to ranchers, mitigation costs to reduce conflict, and changes to the ecosystem and other wildlife populations. Without policies to reduce these costs or divide them more fairly among the public, these costs will fall disproportionately on

local communities and landowners. This needlessly pits grizzlies against communities and landowners, which would be an obstacle to reintroduction and ultimate recovery.

This needn't be so. The Fish and Wildlife Service has a unique degree of flexibility it should use to address costs on local communities and landowners, while also charting a path toward the long-term recovery of the species. The grizzly bear is listed as a threatened species, rather than endangered, a status which triggers no automatic regulation of private activity. Instead, for threatened species, Congress gave the Service "an almost infinite number of options" to design regulations necessary and advisable for the conservation, i.e. recovery, of the species. For nonessential experimental populations, the Endangered Species Act also forbids the designation of critical habitat and does not presumptively regulate private activities but gives the Service flexibility to design a program to recover the reintroduced population. In other words, the Service has maximum flexibility to design a plan for grizzly reintroduction that addresses the concerns of local communities and landowners.

Despite this flexibility, the current proposal considers a narrow range of options. It considers 1) doing nothing; 2) reintroducing bears but applying existing regulations to them; or 3) reintroducing bears and issuing a less stringent regulation for the specific population, including very limited regulation of activities affecting bears on private land. Thus, the Fish and Wildlife Service has narrowed its "almost infinite number of options" to three.

Of these options, #3 is clearly the best and the Service deserves credit for designing it to address many concerns communities and landowners have about returning grizzly bears to the area. The Service's proposal focuses reintroduction and recovery on federal land and imposes relatively limited regulation on private land. For instance, the proposed rule identifies three zones, with each playing a different role in the population's recovery. Zone 1 is the primary area that will be used for reintroduction and contains the core habitat suitable for the species. Zone 2 contains suitable habitat for the species and would accommodate grizzly movement and dispersal as the population grows. And Zone 3 is everything else. Importantly, Zones 1 and 2, which would have the strictest regulations, are defined to explicitly exclude any state or private lands in these areas. All non-federal land, regardless of where it is, is considered part of Zone 3.

By classifying all state and private land as Zone 3, the Service would limit the extent to which reintroduced grizzlies are a regulatory liability for communities and landowners. For instance, incidental take would not be regulated on private land, nor would hazing and other deterrence efforts. But the proposal would still make grizzlies a regulatory liability.

Ranchers have grazing privileges for federal lands within Zones 1 and 2 that may be essential to sustaining their operations. The proposed rule acknowledges, for instance, that there are eight active grazing permits authorizing nearly 20,000 privately owned animals to graze federal lands in Zone 1. In the event of a conflict between grizzlies and livestock, the proposed rule only allows the rancher to haze or otherwise deter the bear, presumably at the rancher's expense. If deterrence is inadequate to prevent conflict, the proposed rule gives the Service the discretion--but no obligation--to relocate or otherwise take the bear involved in the conflict. And the proposed rule would only allow the Service this discretion if it is "not reasonably possible" to eliminate the conflict through deterrence and nonlethal measures, some of which would be at the rancher's expense. Preferring nonlethal solutions to conflict is obviously better for grizzly recovery, but it's also important to recognize that it can increase the regulatory liability bears represent to private parties.

On private lands, it would be easier to relocate or otherwise take a bear that poses a threat of conflict, since there's no requirement to exhaust deterrence and non-lethal means first. But, again, the proposed rule merely gives the Service the discretion; the Service should instead commit to landowners that these tools will be used.

The proposed reintroduction may also affect forest restoration activities in the area, which includes a landscape identified in the National Forest's Wildfire Crisis Strategy. The proposed rule notes, correctly, that a nonessential experimental population designation limits the consultation requirement federal land management agencies would otherwise have under the Endangered Species Act because, for these purposes, the population is treated as a species merely proposed for listing. Even in the event that the agency is required to confer with the Service or a lawsuit is filed challenging compliance with that obligation, the Endangered Species Act allows the agency to move forward while it confers or defends litigation.

But consultation is not the only way that the presence of grizzly bears might complicate the regulatory environment for forest restoration. Impacts to the reintroduced population would also have to be analyzed under the National Environmental Policy Act and interest groups could challenge the adequacy of that analysis. Being in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem, PERC is well aware that activists frequently do file such challenges against forest restoration projects. Fortunately, Washington sees significantly less litigation against forest restoration than Montana. But that would likely change with the introduction of a charismatic species like the grizzly bear. And even if reintroduction doesn't lead to more litigation, the species' presence may slow down the process for evaluating and approving forest restoration projects, extending the years it already takes to get projects moving.

PERC does not mean to suggest that this is a reason not to reintroduce grizzly bears to the North Cascades. But the potential regulatory consequences for forest restoration merit further attention than they have received in the proposed rule and

environmental impact statement. It's also worth considering how supporters of the proposed reintroduction could help address this problem. It is well established that private parties can help perform or pay for the analysis required by NEPA. In Northeastern Washington's "A to Z" project, for instance, Vaagen Brothers Lumber covered the cost of NEPA analysis for a forest restoration project under one of its stewardship contracts with the Forest Service. There's no reason that environmental organizations and other supporters of wolf reintroduction could not do the same.

Further analysis of this and the other issues identified above may help to minimize the proposal's legal risks. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, the National Park Service and Fish and Wildlife Service must consider a reasonable range of alternatives to its proposal, which should include a range of regulatory approaches for the reintroduced population. The Service must also demonstrate, under the Endangered Species Act, how any final regulation for the population is "necessary and advisable" for its conservation and recovery, a standard that requires consideration of these and other tradeoffs.

Make Grizzlies An Asset, Rather Than Liability

Even with the perfect regulation in place, introducing an apex predator to the landscape will inevitably impose liabilities on neighboring communities and landowners. To the Park Service's and Fish and Wildlife Service's credit, they acknowledge these costs and don't attempt to downplay them by focusing on the initial small size of the reintroduced population.

To determine the losses that ranchers and sheep-herders might face due to direct predation, for instance, the Environmental Impact Statement considers the effect of having 200 bears in the ecosystem (the long-term goal of the reintroduction), rather than the short term goal of 25 bears. According to the proposed rule, the expected loss of 19 cattle and 4 sheep per year to grizzly depredation in the area would cost ranchers and herders approximately \$21,000 annually. While small compared to some other costs of the program--capturing and relocating grizzlies is anticipated to cost \$150,000 per year--these costs could be significant for ranchers, who average only \$25,000 per year in net income. And this estimate only includes the direct costs of depredation. As the Services acknowledge, ranchers would also bear indirect costs, such as monitoring costs, mitigation or deterrence costs, and reduced weight of animals.

Fortunately, there are ways that the Services, states, and private parties can mitigate these costs and even make reintroduced populations an asset to communities and landowners. Recently, PERC and other conservation organizations partnered with a rancher in Montana's Gravelly Range to reduce conflicts between grizzlies and livestock and the lethal take of grizzlies that commonly results from such conflict. Under the agreement, the conservation organizations compensate the rancher for implementing strategies to reduce conflict, including adjusting the number of cattle on the allotment and timing of their presence, while increasing the profitability of the ranch.

When wolves were reintroduced to the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem, the Defenders of Wildlife raised money from its supporters to fund a private, voluntary program to compensate ranchers for livestock lost to wolf depredation. This gave the organization a financial stake in the reintroduction and an incentive to work with ranchers to find new ways to mitigate the costs predators impose on livestock operations. That model has since been expanded to include payments to ranchers and landowners who accommodate imperiled wildlife or provide habitat, with such "payments for presence" tied to the size of the population so that landowners directly benefit from its increase. PERC has recently applied the payments for presence model to conserve elk migration in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem.

To facilitate the recovery of a reintroduced population of black footed ferret, the Department of Agriculture compensates landowners for conservation practices that maintain or restore habitat. In a recent revision to its regulation of the ferret population, the Fish and Wildlife Service emphasized the importance of these incentive programs to habitat restoration and, ultimately, species recovery.

In the Environmental Impact Statement, the National Park Service notes that similar compensation might be applied to help the grizzly bear, "if private funds are available." Washington has a fund to compensate ranchers and farmers for losses caused by certain wildlife, including bears. Much of the funding and regulation for that program is addressed to wolves, so it's not clear how much compensation might be available through this program for grizzly bear depredations. But, more importantly, it's not clear why the Service does not take on this financial burden as part of the reintroduction rather than imposing it on the state. If losses max out at \$21,000 annually, as the Park Service estimates, compensation for these losses would be a small price to pay to facilitate the reintroduction, and less than 3% of the estimated annual budget for the program.

The Services should also consider how its decision might encourage conservation organizations and others to provide those funds, if the Service declines to, and develop other innovative programs to make grizzlies an asset to local communities and landowners. There are numerous ways this could be done. Reintroduction could be conditioned on the availability of private funds or programs to reward landowners who mitigate conflicts. To maintain the motivation for these efforts after reintroduction, the stringency of the regulation could also depend on conservation organizations continuing to implement

programs to reduce liabilities for landowners.

The above examples demonstrate that private conservation organizations can be part of the solution for wildlife conflict and species recovery. Compared to the ranchers in the area, our groups also have the resources to do this effectively. It's only fair that proponents of grizzly reintroduction bear more of the costs of seeing their goals achieved, rather than foisting the costs on landowners who may oppose the effort. It's also better for the long-term success of the reintroduction effort by reducing conflict, which has been a significant hindrance to the success of other reintroduction efforts.

Plan For Success

Finally, the Services should consider how the proposed regulation should adapt as the reintroduced population grows and expands, especially how it might facilitate that recovery and the ultimate transfer of management to the state. The Fish and Wildlife Service has previously determined that 200-400 grizzly bears would likely need to be established in the North Cascades to meet the recovery goal for that population. Yet, according to the draft Environmental Impact Statement, it will likely take 60-100 years for the proposed reintroduction to establish a population of 200 bears. It may be untenable to ask the state, communities, and landowners to accept decades of federal control over any activity in the area that affects a bear, even if the Service retains the flexibility in the proposed rule throughout that time. And that's assuming that the population would promptly be delisted once it hit that goal, which has not been the case when other grizzly populations have hit their population targets. To provide a better path for the recovery and ultimate delisting of the North Cascades population, the Service should provide in its rule that management responsibility for grizzly bears will transition to the state gradually as the population grows. That plan should proceed automatically as benchmarks are met, rather than be dependent on subsequent rulemakings by the Service and the litigation that could block them.

Conclusion

For decades, we've fallen short in fulfilling the Endangered Species Act's goal of recovering species so that they are no longer endangered or threatened with extinction. Proactive efforts like the proposed reintroduction are essential to improving the recovery rate. But it is also essential that those efforts be carried out in a way that is sensitive to the regulatory and practical burdens rare species can impose on private landowners. Ultimately, successfully recovering species depends on making them assets, rather than liabilities, to the communities and landowners that have the greatest influence on their long-term survival.

Correspondence ID: 13887Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America
Outside Organization: Early Winters Outfitting Business(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,13 2023 16:30:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The officers and staff of our small business, an outfitters business of over four decades, and joined by our customers all submit strongly for Alternative 'A' (no action). Over forty (40) years of high country backpacking experience supports the reality that the NCE habitat will not adequately support survival of Grizzlies - faced with starvation or survival the apex predators will leave the NCE , travel north and south in order to forage. Increased violent Human-Bear conflicts will result, more so in our more populated communities as compared to those of Montana, Wyoming, and Idaho. The result will be a net loss of the Grizzly species - the opposite of what the NPS and FWS are promoting to the public. Many Grizzlies will be taken directly resulting from domestic food conditioning, livestock depredation, attacks on domestic pets, attacks on humans, and starvation.

Leave the Grizzlies in their existing habitat where they are successfully breeding.

Also have respect for our Washington State law which in part reads, "Grizzly bears shall not be transplanted or introduced into the State. Only grizzly bears that are native to Washington State may be utilized by the department for management programs."

Consequences of Grizzly bear attacks:

The following news reports are the consequences of Department of Interior out-of-control Grizzly bear recovery programs, yet they represent a small subset of the number of actual incidences and severity of Grizzly attacks against humans and livestock.

*** 2023 GRIZZLY / HUMAN CONFLICTS ***

OCTOBER 01, 2023 BEAR COMES OUT OF BRUSH AND ATTACKS 73-YEAR-OLD

SEPTEMBER 13, 2023 GRIZZLY CHARGES HUNTER UNTIL HE SHOOTS IT

SEPTEMBER 24, 2023 PERSISTENT GRIZZLY AND HER CUB EUTHANIZED AFTER BREAK-INS

SEPTEMBER 11, 2023 DEER HUNTER SHOOTS AT ATTACKING GRIZZLY

SEPTEMBER 02, 2023 GRIZZLY KILLED HIKER NEAR YELLOWSTONE

SEPTEMBER 06, 2023 GRIZZLY CHARGES AT HUNTERS IN THICK BRUSH, SHOT DEAD

AUGUST 30, 2023 SPOOKED GRIZZLY CHARGES ANGLERS IN MONTANA WILDERNESS

SEPTEMBER 07, 2023 GRIZZLY KILLED WOMAN, EUTHANIZED AFTER BREAKING INTO HOME

SEPTEMBER 12, 2023 NAVY VETERAN, JAW TORN OFF IN HORRIFYING GRIZZLY ATTACK (AMBUSHED)

SEPTEMBER 10, 2023 GRIZZLY BEAR MAULS HUNTER IN CUSTER GALLATIN NATIONAL FOREST

AUGUST 30 2023 MONTANA MEN SURPRISE MOMMA BEAR WITH CUB

JULY 24, 2023 WOMAN FOUND DEAD IN MONTANA FOLLOWING GRIZZLY BEAR ENCOUNTER

*** ADDITIONAL GRIZZLY ATTACKS, PRIOR YEARS ***

SHED HUNTER KILLED BY GRIZZLY IN FIRST ATTACK OF 2022

Oct 21, 2022 GRIZZLY ATTACK ON 2 BOYS

WOMAN KILLED BY GRIZZLY IN CITY LIMITS, ripped from her tent, killed by a grizzly bear while camping

IN MONTANA, DEPT OF INTERIOR SECRETARY HEARS CONCERNS OVER GRIZZLY BEARS (OCT 7, 2019)

FIVE GRIZZLY DEATHS LAST WEEK ALL INVOLVED BEARS THAT WERE FEEDING ON CATTLE (OCT 14, 2019)

GRIZZLY ON ROCKY MOUNTAIN FRONT EUTHANIZED (OCT 11, 2019)

GRIZZLY BEAR EUTHANIZED AFTER GUNSHOT WOUND (OCT 8, 2019)

A FOURTH HUNTER IS ATTACKED BY A GRIZZLY BEAR WITHIN DAYS IN MONTANA (September 26, 2019)

GRIZZLY BEAR ATTACK IN WESTERN GRAVELLY MOUNTAINS (SEP 25, 2019)

SEARCH ENDS FOLLOWING BACK-TO-BACK GRIZZLY ATTACKS (SEP 20, 2019)

GRIZZLY BEAR ACTIVITY CLOSES GLACIER PARK CAMPGROUNDS, TRAILS (AUG 20, 2019)

OFFICIALS RELEASE DETAILS ON CABINET MOUNTAINS BEAR ATTACK (JUN 21, 2018)

INVESTIGATORS RECOUNT NOVEMBER GRIZZLY BEAR ATTACK (FEB 17, 2019)

14 GRIZZLIES EUTHANIZED THIS YEAR, DOUBLE THE 10-YEAR AVERAGE. (SEPT 11, 2019)

Correspondence ID: 13888Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98107
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 16:31:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I value the wildness of the North Cascades. I want grizzly bears to be a part of that wildness again. And yes I hike in the N Cascades. In addition, I support conservation efforts around grizzly bears and pretty much any animal that needs support.

Correspondence ID: 13889Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Missoula, MT 59847
United States of America
Outside Organization: Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation Conservation/Preservation(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,13 2023 16:31:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: November 13, 2023

Superintendent
North Cascades National Park Service Complex
810 State Route 20
Sedro Woolley, WA 98284

Re: Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/Environmental Impact Statement, Northern Cascades Ecosystem

The Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation's (RMEF) mission is to ensure the future of elk, other wildlife, their habitat and our hunting heritage. We represent more than 225,000 members nationwide and more than 12,500 members in Washington. RMEF's members include hunters, ranchers, guides, outfitters, other business owners, wildlife enthusiasts and other conservationists who have both recreational and economic interests in hunting and enjoying elk.

Since inception in 1984, RMEF has conserved or enhanced more than 8.7 million acres of North America's most vital habitat for elk and other wildlife, including over 500,000 acres in Washington, some of which overlaps with grizzly bear recovery zones. This work includes land acquisitions, exchanges, voluntary conservation agreements and improving habitat quality through stewardship projects such as prescribed burns, thinning, weed treatments, planting native vegetation, adapting fencing to be more wildlife-friendly, etc.

The Northern Cascades Ecosystem (NCE) supports diverse wildlife species, including the North Cascades Roosevelt elk herd. For the past several decades, managers at the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) have been working to restore the elk herd to populations within the stated objective of 1,700-2,000 elk. Still short on this goal, RMEF is concerned with how a grizzly bear restoration in the NCE will impact WDFW efforts to restore elk in this area.

RMEF has a long history of conservation work in the NCE that has benefitted elk and other wildlife, including grizzlies. In the NCE, RMEF and partners have conserved more than 700 acres of key wildlife habitat through fee land acquisitions. In addition, RMEF has directly contributed over \$162,000 and leveraged an additional \$340,000 to help with wildlife research and to enhance wildlife habitat on over 25,400 acres in the NCE. RMEF land conservation, research and habitat enhancement efforts have directly benefitted private, state and federal lands within the NCE. Grizzly bears have and will continue to benefit from RMEF's efforts.

In 2021, the State of Montana filed a grizzly bear delisting petition, followed by similar petitions from Idaho and Wyoming in early 2022. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) has completed the initial review of three petitions filed, finding that two petitions present substantial information indicating the grizzly bear in the Northern Continental Divide Ecosystem (NCDE) and the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem (GYE) may qualify as their own distinct population segment (DPS) and may warrant removal from the list of endangered and threatened wildlife. In February 2023, the Service initiated a comprehensive status review of the grizzly bear in the NCDE and GYE based on the best available scientific information to inform a 12-month finding. If those findings result in proposing one or more DPSs for delisting, it will change the context of the ongoing recovery for the rest of the population in the larger listed entity, including the NCE.

RMEF has long advocated for state management of grizzly bears, which is in line with RMEF's support of the North American Model of Wildlife Conservation, under which state management of wildlife along with the financial contributions from hunters has dramatically increased wildlife populations across the U.S. in the last 100 years. RMEF supports removal of grizzly bears from the ESA list, transferring its management to state wildlife agencies.

RMEF requests that the Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan for the NCE and USFWS proposed Rule be put on hold until the Service issues a 12-month finding on the DPSs for delisting - in order to properly analyze the effects of a proposed restoration. As such, RMEF's recommends the 'No Action Alternative - Existing Management.'

While RMEF's preferred alternative is 'No Action,' we understand that the USFWS and National Park Service (NPS) may choose to continue finalizing the proposed Rule and Plan for a nonessential experimental population (NEP). Under this circumstance, RMEF offers the following comments:

PROPOSED NONESSENTIAL EXPERIMENTAL POPULATION:

RMEF agrees with the USFWS's assessment that the presence of grizzlies in the NCE is not essential for the continued existence of grizzlies in the U.S. If the USFWS and NPS move forward with this restoration effort, RMEF supports a nonessential experimental population (NEP) and associated 10(j) designation (in Alternative C). A designation of NEP provides additional flexibility needed to manage the grizzly population and to protect livestock, wild ungulate populations, etc. through relaxed federal agency consultation requirements under section 7(a)(2).

THE PROPOSED GEOGRAPHIC BOUNDARY OF THE NEP:

RMEF supports the proposed geographic boundary (the entire state of Washington except the Selkirk Ecosystem Recovery Zone), as it allows for maximum management flexibility within the core release area as well as other locations grizzlies are expected to disperse to.

THE PROPOSED MANAGEMENT ZONE BOUNDARIES AND MANAGEMENT OPTIONS WITHIN EACH ZONE:

RMEF appreciates recognition that some areas of Washington are likely incompatible with grizzly bear presence due to high levels of private land ownership and associated development and/or potential for bears to become involved in conflicts, and that the Plan will allow more management flexibility to minimize impacts of grizzly bears on landowners and other members of the public. However, splitting the state up into three separate management zones creates unnecessary complexity in managing grizzlies going forward and locks in specific management activities (particularly in dealing with conflict grizzlies) that can or cannot be performed in a given zone.

Rather than institute a new system with multiple management zones (each with different restrictions), RMEF recommends combining Zones 2 and 3. Zone 1 could continue to be defined as the formal recovery zone as outlined in the recovery plan (excluding state and private land) and serve as the reintroduction location (on federal land). The rest of the state of Washington would be managed under a single zone approach (see specific recommendations below).

PROPOSED MEASURES TO PREVENT AND MINIMIZE HUMAN-GRIZZLY CONFLICT:

RMEF does not agree with the proposed approach to managing grizzly conflict and requests scientific backing as to the proposed, tiered system for management. Instead of multiple management zones/approaches, RMEF recommends that the

entirety of the NEP boundary allow for grizzly management as is proposed within Zone 3. These management actions allow for greatest flexibility in managing conflict grizzlies and in utilizing relocation when needed. There is currently no justification to split management zone actions when all activities still require authorization by the USFWS or an agent. The following actions should be allowed across the NEP, as currently described for Zone 3:

- o Take of grizzlies in self-defense or defense of others
- o Exemption of take resulting from otherwise lawful activities (e.g., timber harvest, road construction, recreation)
- o Intentional deterrence of bears for the purposes of avoiding human-bear conflict
- o Exemption of take associated with research and recovery actions
- o Relocation or deterrence of bears by USFWS or an authorized agent for recovery purposes, for single-conflict incidents or as a preemptive action to prevent conflict
- o Lethal removal by Federal, State, or Tribal authorities of grizzly bears involved in conflict
- o Ability for USFWS or an authorized agency to issue written, time-limited conditioned lethal take authorization to a private landowner to kill a bear presenting an ongoing threat to human safety, livestock, or other property (e.g., compost, chickens, beehives) if there is a demonstrable and ongoing threat and when it is not reasonably possible to eliminate the threat through nonlethal means.

In addition, RMEF asks the NPS and USFWS to adopt additional grizzly management tools that are described in the preferred alternative of the Environmental Impact Statement Colorado Gray Wolf 10(j) Rulemaking (USFWS 2023, Table ES-1, pp iii-xiv), such as opportunistic and intentional harassment, take of grizzlies in the act of depredation on public land, impacts to biological resources, etc.

LAND MANAGEMENT ACTIONS:

The draft Plan and proposed Rule lack a description of current habitat/land management activities outside of travel management. RMEF requests a summary of active projects designed to improve habitat for wildlife, fuels reduction, timber management, etc. within the NCE and proposed NEP boundary. This should be followed with an assessment of how grizzly restoration will affect active forest management projects on federal and nonfederal land to benefit wildlife.

Each forest plan has goals and objectives for maintaining/improving vegetative conditions to ensure healthy forests that support a variety of species, including prey for grizzlies. Elk and other big game species represent a significant prey base for grizzlies and the draft Plan and proposed Rule should include habitat management components needed to benefit those species.

LAND MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES ON FEDERAL LAND OUTSIDE OF THE NCE:

The proposed Rule indicates: 'Section 7(a)(1) of the ESA requires Federal agencies to use their authorities to carry out programs to further the conservation of listed species, which would apply on any lands within the experimental population area. As a result, and in accordance with these regulations, if we adopt this rule as proposed, some modifications to the Federal actions within the experimental population area may occur to benefit the grizzly bear, but we do not expect projects on Federal lands to be precluded or likely to be substantially modified as a result of these regulations.' RMEF seeks clarification on what forest management activities may be precluded or substantially modified in order to meet these regulations. A formal assessment should be conducted that considers the array of current and planned forest or rangeland management activities on federal land to truly identify the potential impacts on these actions due to the grizzly restoration effort.

RMEF further recommends that Section 7(a)(1) be applied to the area only within the NCE and not the entire proposed NEP boundary. Otherwise, this regulation would be applicable across the entire state of Washington, including areas that the proposed Rule recognizes are unsuitable for grizzlies. The grizzly restoration in the NCE should not impact land management activities on federal land outside of the NCE, particularly since it was determined that this would be a nonessential population.

BEST AVAILABLE SCIENCE:

RMEF expresses concern over the reliance on two outdated studies to establish that sufficient food resources would be available for a reintroduced grizzly population. While two newer studies model the habitat suitability and carrying capacity (Lyons et al. 2018 and Ransom et al. 2023) in the NCE, the Plan and proposed Rule also reference Almack et al. (1993) and Gaines et al. (1994) repeatedly to show abundant food resources exist for grizzlies. These studies measured vegetation composition, structure and presence of forage plant species in addition to mapping ranges of prey species (ungulates). The Plan and proposed Rule use the results of these outdated studies to conclude that sufficient vegetative grizzly bear foods are readily available in the U.S. portion of the NCE, and that the occurrence of wildlife prey species can sustain a grizzly bear population.

RMEF is concerned about the use of these data for such conclusions. Data from studies published in 1993 and 1994 do not appropriately represent the vegetative conditions nor the prey availability/distribution that exist now, 30 years later. The Plan and proposed Rule, indeed, recognize the drastic changes that have occurred within the NCE landscape since the recovery plan was last updated. One significant change on the landscape is the loss of whitebark pine, widely recognized as an important food source for grizzlies. The loss of this crucial resource across the NCE (Rochefort et al. 2018) will have trickling effects to other food resources preferred by grizzlies, particularly prey species (ungulates).

RMEF opposes the use of these outdated studies and requests updated science be used to inform the Plan and proposed Rule on food availability for grizzlies in the NCE through more recent vegetation surveys and coordination with WDFW on prey (ungulate) availability and distribution. The EIS should include an analysis, using updated science, to assess impacts to ungulates, given the widespread loss of whitebark pine. As noted previously, WDFW staff have been working to restore the North Cascades Roosevelt elk herd to populations within the stated objective of 1,700-2,000 elk. Still short on this goal, RMEF is concerned that use of old studies from 1993 and 1994 do not represent the current status of a primary prey for grizzlies in the NCE.

RMEF appreciates the opportunity to review and comment on the NPS and USFWS Plan and proposed Rule and looks forward to future coordination.

Sincerely,


Director of Wildlife and Habitat
Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation

Correspondence ID: 13890Project:112008Document:132104
Address: St George, UT 84770
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 16:31:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: RE: Comments on the September 2023 Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan DEIS (GBDEIS2)

Dear Superintendent Striker

By letter dated April 25, 2017, Darrington Area Resources Advocates (DARA) submitted extensive comments on the 2017 Grizzly Bear DEIS (GBDEIS1) addressing introduction of Grizzly Bears into the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE).

This (2017) letter summarized our concerns at that time as follows:

1. The GBDEIS does not present compelling evidence that a substantial grizzly bear population ever existed in the NCE.
2. The DEIS presents no evidence that the NCE is impaired in any significant way due to the absence of grizzly bears.
3. The DEIS does not describe a compelling essential need to reintroduce grizzly bears into the NCE at this time based on the current status of the species in the coterminous United States and nearby robust grizzly bear populations in British Columbia.

4. Local communities within and surrounding the NCE may be adversely impacted by introduced grizzly Bears in the long term who likely will roam off federal lands onto low elevation private lands within and adjacent to the NCE. After reviewing GBDEIS2, we believe this list remains valid today and that addressing items 1-3 in the FEIS is necessary to establish a compelling need for the proposal at all at the present time.

It is unclear to us why the original GBDEIS1 was set aside. We were encouraged that the November 14, 2022 NOI stated: "The NPS and the FWS previously proposed to restore grizzly bears to the NCE and produced a draft EIS for public review and comment in 2017 (82 FR 4416, January, 13, 2017). Public comments that were provided during that prior EIS process will also inform this new EIS and the development of alternatives." Unfortunately, GBDEIS2 provides no appendix which describes how comments received for GBDEIS1 were addressed in GBDEIS2 and for that reason we re-submit our previous comments (attached) into the record for GBDEIS2. Should a FEIS ultimately be produced we respectfully request that it include an appendix which specifically describes how comments have been responded to in the FEIS.

We turn now to our comments on GBDEIS2.

1. GBDEIS2 does not describe a compelling essential need based on the requirements or objectives of the ESA to reintroduce grizzly bears into the NCE at this time based on the current status of the species in the coterminous United States.

Only 1 element of the Purpose and Need statement for GBDEIS2 describes its relationship to the ESA: It stated there is a need to "Support the recovery of the grizzly bear to the point where it can be removed from the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife." (GBDEIS2 Pg. ii)

There is one objective related to the ESA: "Support environmental and natural resource objectives related to the grizzly bear and contribute to grizzly bear recovery in the contiguous US." (GBDEIS2 . Pg. 4).

Nowhere, however, in the GDEIS is it described precisely described the basis for the need or how the Preferred Alternative meets the stated need or objective to recover the species so that it may be delisted. The GBDEIS actually states the reverse to be the case: "Restoring a population of this size [200 Grizzly Bears in the NCS] would likely take decades [60 to 100 years]. This restoration population goal is not a recovery goal for purposes of the ESA. Recovery goals are determined through a separate process." (GBDEIS Pg. 6 emphasis added).

As described further below (Item 4), we believe there is fundamental need to describe how Alternative C contributes to the Recovery and delisting of the Grizzly in the coterminous United States.

We do not dispute that other plans or policy may call for restoration of the Grizzly (NPS Park Policies for example) but a key and unanswered question is whether Alt C. contributes, as it apparently will not, to recovery and delisting of the Grizzly bear under the ESA.

2. GBDEIS2 does not present compelling or persuasive evidence that a substantial grizzly bear population ever existed in the NCE.

We commented extensively on this question in our April 25, 2017 filing. These comments remain unaddressed but for the following;

The GBDEIS cites a new study/synthesis in support of the assertion that a substantial and self-sustaining population existed in the NCE: A Synthesis of Historical and Recent Reports of Grizzly Bears (*Ursus arctos*) in the North Cascades Region (Rine et al. 2018). "This report provides documentation of grizzly bear presence from multiple sources, including observations from in and around the NCE from 1859 to 2015." (GBDEIS2 PG. 6).

This report summarizes a review of ethnographic literature which is summarized in Table 1 (Pg.). This table displays information for 7 tribes. A fair review of this information does not produce a strong conclusion of the widespread occupancy of the NCE by large numbers of Grizzly Bears. The narrative of the report states: "It is important to note that it is not clear how long ago these recounted observations and practices transpired. They are derived from relatively recent (late-1800s to 2000) transcriptions of events and observations that may have occurred from that time to many generations prior (Smith 1988) Pg. 8) and "there is no evidence of extensive direct killing of grizzly bears by indigenous people, but ethnographic records (Smith 1988) leave little doubt that they were occasionally killed in defense of life or food (Smith 1988, Bedal Fish and Bedal 2000, Sappington and Schuknecht-McDaniel 2001, McLaren et al. 2005)." (Pg. 10)

This report addition review of the Grizzly bear hide trade records taken at Hudson Bay Fort shown on this Map (Pg.4):

Hide counts from these forts is summarized in Table 2 (Pg. 12). The data shows that 95% of the hides were recorded in the 3 forts farthest away from the NCE namely Coville, Thompson/Kamloops and Nex Perces.

3. GBDEIS2 presents no evidence that the NCE is impaired in any significant way due to the absence of grizzly bears. GBDEIS2 presents no evidence of significant impairment of the ecological functions of the NCE arising from the absence of Grizzly bears. Our previous comments related to this topic remain valid and have largely been ignored in GBDEIS2.

4. Taking action at this time to introduce Grizzly Bears in to the NCE given the need to update important plans is premature. GBDEIS2 repeats the statements made in GBDEIS1 that the Grizzly bear has been extirpated or never existed is beside the point in the end however as ", the FWS also acknowledge[s] there is no longer a population present in the ecosystem." (GBDEIS Pg. 6).

As there is no immediate imperative to implement a restoration plan, action should instead be taken to update the 24-year-old 1993 Grizzly Bear Plan (including the NCE Chapter added to the Plan in 1997) to validate that restoration of the Grizzly population in the NCE to recover the grizzly bear population in the coterminous United States. Section 4(c)(2) of the Endangered Species Act requires that "at least once" every 5 years USFWS [in this case] complete a review of listed species. The last such review for the grizzly bear was completed in August 2011. This review recommended, among other things, that the 1993 Recovery Plan itself be revised:

Except for the GYA, the recovery plan and associated recovery criteria have not been updated since the plan was released in 1993 and supplemented in 1996 and 1997 with chapters for the BE and NCASC [North Cascades Ecosystem] respectively. Thus, the plan no longer reflects the best available and most up-to-date information on the biology of the species and its habitat. We are now in the process of updating the recovery plan [emphasis added] (Pg. 14).

Other key plans driving a consideration of the reintroduction of grizzly bears, or that could be significantly affected by such reintroduction, are also dated. The Forest Plans, which apply to 74% of the federal lands within the NCE, are even older - the Okanogan Forest Plan was approved in 1989, the Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie and Wenatchee Plans both in 1990. Based on the increases in the number of grizzly bears in other recovery areas, it appears that the opposite conclusion, namely that reintroduction of grizzly bears in the NCE is not necessary may be true. We believe that continued focus on the recovery areas where grizzly bear populations are growing and/or taking action in the BE, where a Record of Decision for augmentation of grizzly bears is already in place, is where the priorities should more appropriately lie.

At the end of the day, it defies common sense that a complicated and still controversial and when all economic aspects are considered, costly restoration plan should be implemented at this time when the very basis and need for it is not affirmed by current information and updated plans.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions have any questions about this letter or our previous filing of April 25, 2017.

Sincerely,


Chair, DARA

Attachment

Photo by 

Darrington Area Resources Advocates
Post Office Box 1061
Darrington, WA 98241
A Division of Darrington Strong, Inc.

April 25, 2017

Superintendent, North Cascades National Park Service Complex
810 State Route 20
Sedro-Woolley, WA 98284.

RE: Comments on the Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan DEIS (GBDEIS)

Dear Superintendent Taylor-Goodrich:

Darrington Area Resources Advocates (DARA) is a volunteer group comprised of Darrington citizens, representatives of the Sauk-Suiattle Tribe and Hampton Mills, business owners, backcountry horsemen and others whose overall goal is to support programs and projects which capitalize on and promote the sustainable use and enjoyment of natural, recreational and historical resources which abound in the vicinity of Darrington.

We have completed a review of the GBDEIS and recommend that work cease on preparing the FEIS and issuing a Record of Decision (ROD) until the USFWS has completed the 5-year review for the grizzly bear as required by Section 4(c)(2) of the Endangered Species Act (ESA). The last such review was completed in August, 2011 and among other things recommended that the 1993 Grizzly Bear Recovery Plan itself be revised: "Except for the GYA [Greater Yellowstone Area], the recovery plan and associated recovery criteria have not been updated since the plan was released in 1993 and supplemented in 1996 and 1997 with chapters for the Bitterroot Ecosystem (BE) and NCASC [North Cascades Ecosystem, hereafter NCE] respectively. Thus, the plan no longer reflects the best available and most up-to-date information on the biology of the species and its habitat" [emphasis added] (Pg. 14).

The DEIS states: "Because there has been no confirmed evidence of grizzly bears within the NCE in the United States since 1996 (IGBC NCE Subcommittee 2016), any remaining bears in the NCE do not meet the accepted definition for a population (i.e., evidence of 2 adult females with cubs or 1 adult female tracked through two litters)" (FWS 2000a) (Pg. i). Based on this same information "Grizzly bears thus have been functionally extirpated in the North Cascades Ecosystem" (Appendix F-2). We agree with this assessment and submit therefore, that there is no "emergency" need to move forward with an FEIS until the 1993 Recovery Plan has been updated and the 2016 5-year Summary that is now overdue is completed. Information from this update and the revision of the 1993 Recovery Plan should be included in the FEIS if it is decided to move forward with it. We take this matter up in detail in Enclosure 1. In the alternative, we recommend that the ROD for the FEIS adopt the No-Action Alternative for the reasons summarized below which are described in detail in Enclosure I.

We want to make it clear that our taking this view in no way represents a lack of concern for the recovery and establishment of viable and delisted populations of the grizzly bear in the coterminous United States. We believe that at the present time, the risk of extinction of the grizzly bear is remote, success of ongoing recovery efforts is well documented, and that further recovery efforts should remain focused on the recovery areas where documented and growing populations of grizzly bears exist.

1. The GBDEIS does not present compelling evidence that a substantial grizzly bear population ever existed in the NCE.

The evidence supporting the premise that the NCE ever supported a substantial population of grizzly bears is, upon close examination, lacking. Historical grizzly bear hide counts frequently cited in the DEIS were taken at Hudson Bay Company posts well outside of the NCE. Other studies or historical documents relied on by the DEIS state that the majority of the relatively few grizzly bear sightings are based on unconfirmed reports.

2. The DEIS presents no evidence that the NCE is impaired in any way due to the absence of grizzly bears nor does it address in any substantive way impacts to listed salmonid species that occupy habitat within and adjacent to the NCE.

Other than stating the NCE is not "complete" without a grizzly bear population, the DEIS does not describe any ecosystem function or population that is impaired or imbalanced because grizzly bears are absent. In Yellowstone for example, it was documented that overpopulation of elk was leading to destruction of riparian areas which was corrected when wolves were introduced. There is no similar or other ecological imbalance in the NCE that would be corrected by the reintroduction of grizzly bears. On the other hand, the DEIS does not support with any substantive data its assertion that reintroduction of grizzly bears will not adversely impact listed salmonids that spawn in rivers and streams within and adjacent to the NCE. The absence of well supported analysis with respect to the impacts of the target grizzly population of 200 or more on these fish is

especially glaring.

The DEIS does not describe in any detail at all the likely behavior and movement of introduced grizzly bears initially and over time as the population would increase under the action alternatives and as they adapt to site specific food sources and habitat in the NCE. The DEIS does not address the likely need to restrict access to and recreational use within the NCE nor the likely movement of bears into lowland areas in the spring and fall on the west side in search of fish and on the east side in search of low hanging fruit.

3. The DEIS does not describe a compelling essential need to reintroduce grizzly bears into the NCE at this time based on the current status of the species in the coterminous United States and nearby robust grizzly bear populations in British Columbia.

Unlike the NCE, there are documented viable populations of grizzly bears in the other recovery areas. Grizzly bear populations are growing in the Great Yellowstone Ecosystem (where it has been proposed to delist the species, March 2016) and the Northern Continental Divide Ecosystem (1000 bears and growing, 2016) where a draft conservation plan has been released. In the Selkirk Ecosystem (80 bears in 2012) and Cabinet-Yak Ecosystem (48-50 bears in 2016) populations are also increasing. The up to \$8 million proposed for expenditure in the NCE to reintroduce grizzly bears would be far better spent in these other ecosystems. The DEIS has abundant narrative regarding "wilderness" and that reintroducing grizzly bears is necessary to fulfill the purposes of the Wilderness Act. This may be a desirable outcome for wilderness advocates but to our knowledge, is not required by the statute or related case law. The absence of grizzly bears did not prevent the wilderness designations within the NCE in the first place nor is their presence necessary to maintain their character or preserve their designation. We believe the focus of grizzly bear recovery should remain on other areas with documented populations at least until the 1993 Recovery Plan is updated and the 5-year Summary for grizzly bears is completed.

4. Local communities within and surrounding the NCE may be adversely impacted by introduced grizzly Bears who likely will roam off federal lands onto low elevation private lands within and adjacent to the NCE.

The DEIS describes two potential socio-economic benefits related to reintroduction of grizzly bears into the NCE. The first benefit is that reintroduction may increase tourism and associated revenue to Gateway Communities but the DEIS provides no published evidence supporting this assertion at all and no quantification of increased revenues. The North Cascades National Park is the 2nd least visited National Park in the country and less than 30,000 people visit the backcountry where grizzly bears might be seen if reintroduced. The DEIS falsely represents traffic over the North Cascades Highway as "visits" to the National Park. The second benefit is that people will take satisfaction "knowing that grizzly bears are there" in the ecosystem which unsurprisingly is not measurable in any economic sense that is supported by published evidence cited to in the DEIS.

The description in the DEIS of economic losses associated with livestock or other resources, restrictions on access, and other "encumbrances" that come with a listed species is understated and unnecessarily qualitative particularly with respect as to how impacts will change as the grizzly population grows towards the restoration goal of 200 or more bears. The premise that livestock losses, for example, can be offset by compensation relies on the State, not any commitment of federal resources to guarantee such compensation and thus is not "reasonably foreseeable" mitigation measure.

The DEIS describes only the short-term management considerations or restrictions (e.g. road or trail closures) associated with helicopter operations to insert grizzly bears into the NCE. Discussion of long term management restrictions to use and access (especially of popular trails which penetrate the heart of the NCE) areas that become occupied by grizzly bears such as those now in place in Yellowstone National Park is absent or so "qualitative" in nature that it is useless with respect to any quantification of actual impacts and evaluation of alternatives.

5. The March 10, 2017 Letter filed by the Sauk-Suiattle Indian Tribe (SSIT).

We support and adopt the views taken by the SSIT in their comment letter of March 10, 2017. The SSIT addresses better than we ever could the flaws in the Ethnographic Sections of the DEIS and the importance of salmon historically and presently to the Tribe.

6. Other

A general concern we have with the DEIS is that it appears to have been prepared without significant involvement of USDA Forest Service Staff. National Forest System lands managed by the Okanogan-Wenatchee and Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forests comprise 74% of the NCE and the plans for these forests are not mentioned at all as being relevant to the decision to reintroduce grizzly bears into the NCE (DEIS, Pg. 14).

Finally, we offer the following without malice. A recent article about the use of best available science (BAS) related to implementation of the ESA states:

There no doubt is a mismatch between the considerable expectations imposed on the federal wildlife agencies in meeting the objectives of the ESA and the resources provided them to do so. This is compounded by uncertainties regarding listed species, their habitats, and the ecosystems that support them. But too frequently the agencies base formal determinations, decisions, and findings on assertion and surmise, rather than on the best available science. They argue that data limitations and time constraints make it impossible to meet the best available science directive from Congress, and sympathetic courts to give them a free pass. This recurs repeatedly even in those circumstances where agency decisions involve species actually on the brink of extinction, or where agency actions have demonstrated impacts on sensitive sectors or subsectors of the economy. Surely the wildlife agencies are challenged to make defensible determinations, but even where the agencies have access to pertinent scientific information they may use that information in applications beyond which it is valid, selectively use data to support predetermined management responses, and employ proxy measures and surrogates without validation.

Our review of the DEIS indicates that the assertions in this article are largely true as they apply to the DEIS. We have provided citations to studies or literature which should have been considered and cited to in the DEIS in the interest of fair disclosure. More than 30 paid staff were involved in the preparation and review of the DEIS and it is their professional and ethical responsibility to use the best available science to establish and disclose without bias the implications of reintroducing grizzly bears in the NCE over the short, and particularly, the long term.

The decision to reintroduce grizzly bears in this huge area of Washington State is a major one that has impacts that will extend hundreds of years beyond the impacts of the helicopter operations that will bring the bears back into the NCE. The actual impacts of what this means, based on the BAS should have been disclosed in the DEIS and was not. It must be in the FEIS.

Please do not hesitate to contact me by phone (306-322-4817) or by email (waltdortch@gmail.com) if you have questions about the material we have provided here. Given the inability to file this document with its graphics intact via the on-line system, it has been filed in hard copy at the NPS Offices in Sedro Wooley. We are happy to provide an electronic version upon request.

Sincerely,

████████████████████

Enclosure

ENCLOSURE I
DARA COMMENTS
GRIZZLY BEAR RESTORATION DEIS

1. THE GBDEIS DOES NOT PRESENT COMPELLING EVIDENCE THAT A SUBSTANTIAL POPULATION GRIZZLY BEAR POPULATION EVER EXISTED IN THE NORTH CASCADES ECOSYSTEM (NCE).

The DEIS relies on several sources to support the assertion that the NCE once supported a "substantial" grizzly bear population. However, a review of these sources does not, on close examination, provide a basis for this assertion. In fact, these sources more strongly suggest the absence of a substantial grizzly population.

The DEIS says (Pg. 42): "At the height of the fur trade from 1820 to 1860, the Hudson's Bay Company documented 3,788 grizzly bear hides shipped from trading posts in the North Cascades region, and the last documented grizzly bear killed in the area was shot in Fisher Creek in 1967 [Emphasis added], (Sullivan 1983)."

Sullivan 1983 says (Pg. 2): At the height of the fur [sic] trade, especially during the period 1820-1860, the Hudson's Bay Company kept accurate records of all pelts taken at each of their trading posts, including three in present day Washington and one in southern British Columbia. An examination of these records shows that the market [sic] for bear hides increased after 1840 and the number passing through each outpost consecutively [sic] rose. Peak years at the various posts were: Fort Colville, 382 grizzly bear hides in 1849; Fort Nez Perce (Walla Walla), 32 hides in 1846; Thompson's River (B.C.), 11 hides in 1851. Four hides were also taken at Fort Nisqually [sic] (near Tacoma) during the period. Unfortunately, the trading areas of these posts overlap the present boundaries of Washington and it is not possible to say how many of these bears were taken in the state [emphasis added].

Note that the DEIS states 3788 hides shipped but that number is not found in Sullivan. This number appears to have originated in the "North Cascades Ecosystem Recovery Plan Chapter." In Grizzly Bear Recovery Plan Supplement. June 23, 1997 (NCRP) (Pg. 2, excerpt below). The WDFW files cited to are not referenced in the References Section of the Chapter and could not be located at the time of this writing.

Map 1.

Location of Hudson Bay Company (HBC) Posts Where Grizzly Bear Hides were Recorded

Location of Hudson Bay Posts in Sullivan (1983) and NCRP (1997) 1-Thompson River (now Kamloops), 11 hides, (NCRP 75 hides) 2 - Fort Colville, 382 hides (NCRP 3477 hides), 3 - Walla Walla, 32 hides (NCRP 236 hides), 4 - Fort Nisqually, 4 hides (NCRP 0). None of these posts are within the NCE and arguably none are in the North Cascades Region. Using Glacier Peak as a center point for the NCE it is 160 miles from there to Colville, 207 miles to Walla Walla, 180 miles to Kamloops and 104 miles to Nisqually.

By offering this statement, the DEIS intends for the reader to conclude that these hides were taken from within NCE region with an unstated but very significant inference that hides taken from the region might be from within the NCE itself. The problem here is that there is no evidence is provided that states where or when the bears were killed, only where their hides

turned up. Nor is there any discussion of the historical catchment area of these individual HBC posts. Absent these data points, these hides could have come from almost anywhere in the area formed by present day WA, MN, WY, ID, OR, BC, or Alberta

The DEIS then states that various reports document a substantial population of grizzly bears in the NCE.

DEIS says (Pg. 42): The NCE historically supported a substantial grizzly bear population, according to records compiled by Bjorklund (1980), Sullivan (1983), Almack et al. (1993), and others.

DEIS says (Pg. 42): Bjorklund (1980) summarized and mapped 16 historical (prior to 1950) and 14 recent (1950-1980) grizzly bear observations in the NCE; however, he did not distinguish between confirmed and unconfirmed observations

DEIS says (Pg. 42): More reliable results come from Sullivan (1983), who interviewed 346 people claiming to observe grizzly bears in the NCE. He estimated that the sum of these attestations amounted to approximately 100 individual human-grizzly bear encounters spanning 130 years.

Sullivan's report says this:

Pg. 3

Pg. 7

Pg. 4 Class 1 reports

Pg. 4: For Class 2-4 reports:

Pg. 5

In our view, Sullivan's data does not provide solid evidence of a substantial population of grizzly bears in the NCE. He documents only 12 class 1 reports of grizzly bears from 1900-1967, 8 of which are on the eastern edge of the NCE and one within Manning Park. A careful review of Table 2 of his report suggests that his comment that including many of the Class 2 and some of the Class 3 and 4 reports would produce a record of 100 observations is suspect based on his own warnings about the reliability of the data) but does even that number establish documentation of a substantial population? 100

observations over a period of 130 years within a 9,800-square mile seems to document a very insubstantial population. Finally, it is reasonable to think that hunters and hikers have been carrying cameras into the NCE for many decades and that if there were many bears at all there would be pictures of them taken since 1967 particularly in the well trailed and open east side of the NCE.

Bjorklund says:

(Introduction):

Bjorklund (Introduction):

Bjorklund Observation No. 4 (cited below as almost certainly establishing a viable population in the North Cascades:

A fundamental problem with relying on Bjorklund in general and in particular with respect to this citation given its use below is that, as stated in his introduction, "the reliability of observers and accuracy of accounts is not analyzed at this time." It is not unreasonable to ask whether the 1887 report of Albert Rogers was made by a sober, reliable, and knowledgeable individual with no motivation to exaggerate, or falsify his information? What did he say or write, to whom, when, and why? The statement says "sighted." Not "reported";... so how was this information from Rogers transmitted, documented, and verified?

Finally, Bjorklund makes this statement (Pg. 7):

Based on the Class 1 standard used by Sullivan and Almack only 1 of the 31 Bjorklund observations is a certain Class 1 (Rocky's kill at Fisher Creek), 3 others may be (kills) 1913, 1923, 1953 (all cited to Majors which we have not been able to review). Hardly documentation of a substantial population. Note too, that Observation 4 (in 1887) cited by Bjorklund as evidence of a viable population in the NCE is not even a Class 1 observation.

The DEIS citing to Bjorklund as establishing evidence of a substantial and viable population of grizzly bears in the NCE is unreasonable at best.

Almack says Pg. 21:

The Almack observations are displayed in Tables 1-4 beginning on page 33 of his report.

Class 1 and 2 observations are defined as (Pg. 5):

Almack et al 1993 Pg. ii.

Almack Pg. 74. No bears were trapped during the study period.

Almack Pg. 75. No bears were photographed at these sites during the study.

Almack Observations (from Tables 2 and 3 beginning on Pg. 33)

Class 1 Observations total 22, 1 in 1859 and 21 from 1964-1991. 11 of these were bears (the others tracks a food cache and a skull). Of the 11 bear observations 3 were in BC, 3 near Winthrop, 1 in the North portion of the NCNP, 2 near Cle Elum, 1 near Chelan and 1 on the Nooksack River (1859).

Class 2 Observations total 82, 1 in 1859, 81 from 1964-1991). 76 of these were bears (the others tracks and digs). Of the 82 bear observations 21 were near Winthrop, 8 near Cle Elum, 7 near Twisp, 6 in BC, 4 near Chelan, 4 near Entiat, 4 near Ross Lake, 3 near Darrington, 3 in the North portion of the NCNP, 3 near Skykomish, 2 in the South Portion of the NCNP, 2 near White River, 1 near the Stehekin Road, 1 in Kittitas County and 1 near Packwood.

Assuming, arguendo, that all the Class 1 and Class 2 observations are valid does not significantly bolster the already weak conclusions from Sullivan. 102 observations during a 27-year period in a 9,800-square mile area when people are generally carrying cameras and backcountry use is increasing dramatically does not add up to a convincing argument there were many bears in the NCE during this period at all and the majority of those that might have been were on the eastern edge of the NCE.

Finally, Almack concludes this with respect to the observations presented in the report (Pg. 21):

This sweeping conclusion is based on 2 observations described in Table 2 of the Almack Report:

Observation 12 (1988) Video of 2 adults near Cle Elum; and,
Observation 20(a) (1991) Observation of 1 adult and 1 cub near Chelan.

The comments above for Bjorklund regarding the confirmation of the reliability of the reports to begin with apply here as well. The age of the cub in Observation 20(a) is not established and depending on the age of this animal could have come from BC or somewhere else outside of the NCE. In any case, it is hardly credible to cite these two observations as establishing that a "widely-distributed and reproducing grizzly population" is present in the NCE.

DEIS says (Pg. 43): These earlier [Historical] accounts indicate that grizzly bears existed historically throughout the Cascade Mountains and likely inhabited the coastal regions of Washington and Oregon (Almack et al. 1993).

Almack et al (1993) says (Pg.2):

Almack notes an absence of observation of grizzly bears based on historical expedition journals.

As to west side occupation, while Almack describes Custer killing a Grizzly bear on the Nooksack and observing others he goes on to state (Pg. 2):

We have yet to find actual evidence supporting what Almack admits is an impression that grizzly occupied the west slope of the NCE (see discussion of Underhill (Collins) below).

Almack then describes that miners then "poured" into the North Cascades

The intent here is to establish that miners "pouring into the North Cascades" created the "second major impact" on the survival of grizzly bears in the North Cascades [the first being the trapping discussed above]. This conclusion however is based on uncited "second-hand information" and a single personal communication with D. Tresch in 1986.

Almack next describes the "rapid human encroachment" which followed the "mining invasion" of the North Cascades which though unstated must be interpreted to be the 3rd and final major impact on the grizzly bear population in the NCE.

The image presented here of massive trapping, the mining invasion, and rapid human encroachment, while dramatic, is misleading at best with respect to its influence on the still pristine core area of the NCE which was not massively trapped, invaded by miners or waves of humans and thousands of sheep, military expeditions or boom towns. As noted in the DEIS at Pg. 69: "Almack et al. (1993) and Gaines et al. (1994) mapped out areas of human activity in the NCE including roads, timber operations, livestock grazing, population centers, campgrounds, and other recreation areas (e.g., ski areas, air strips, etc.). Both studies found that the majority of the NCE (68%) was free of open roads; only small portions of Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest were grazed (11% for Okanogan and 3% for Wenatchee); and a small percentage (4%) of the area in the NCE was within a large zone of influence around population centers and other areas." The basic question that arises here is this. If in fact (as it appears to be) that a substantial grizzly bear population in the NCE was not trapped out, killed by miners or rapid human encroachment where did they go? A plausible answer is that was never a substantial population of grizzly bears in the NCE.

DEIS says (pg. 42): In addition to records of pelts, other evidence of historical grizzly bear presence in the NCE is found in writings about Native Americans, early USFS history, and the archaeological record (Underhill 1945).

The DEIS does not provide citations to early USFS History. The reference to Underhill 1945 is described as Valley of the Spirits: The Upper Skagit Indians of Western Washington. p 52. (DEIS Pg. 184).

Underhill says (Pg 52):

This is the only place grizzly bears are mentioned in this book and hardly documentation of a substantial grizzly population, hunting success or evidence grizzly bears were a significant part of Indian culture or diet.

We reviewed Ms. Underhill's other book Indians of the Pacific Northwest, US Department of the Interior, 1944. There is one reference to grizzly bears: "The coast of British Columbia and southern Alaska is, say the animal men, the bear center of the world. It has more bears than any other place in either hemisphere and the coasts of Washington and Oregon, on its fringe, are a close second. The bears are mostly of the black (or really brown), not so fierce as a grizzly and interested mostly in salmon and berries" (Pg. 51).

DEIS says (Pg. 42): Lastly, five Holocene archaeological sites in eastern Washington have produced grizzly bear remains that could be evidence of prehistoric grizzly populations in the nearby mountains of the NCE (Lyman 1986).

It is not clear how this is relevant, interesting nonetheless that the DEIS states it could be evidence of grizzly bear populations in nearby mountains. Perhaps the Selkirks? Hardly conclusive about anything in the NCE.

Conclusion

Close examination of the references cited in the DEIS which purport to establish that a substantial population of grizzly bears in the NCE was extirpated by trappers, miners and other rapid encroachment by humans produces a very reasonable doubt that this sequence of events is true for the NCE. The FEIS should address this weakness and provide the rationale for accepting as documenting a substantial population of grizzly bears occupied the NCE historically and have been extirpated by the influences of man.

2. THE DEIS PRESENTS NO EVIDENCE THAT THE NCE IS IMPAIRED IN ANY WAY DUE TO THE ABSENCE OF GRIZZLY BEARS NOR DOES IT ADDRESS IN ANY SUBSTANTIVE WAY THE IMPACTS TO LISTED SALMONID SPECIES THAT OCCUPY HABITAT WITHIN THE NCE.

There are three key questions that should be central in the decision to move forward with the reintroduction of grizzly bears into the NCE.

Question 1. Whether grizzly bear reintroduction is necessary to prevent the extinction of grizzly bears and/or is essential to species recovery in the coterminous United States.

In our view, the answer to this question presently is no. See our comments on Issue 3.

Question 2. Whether that the NCE ecosystem is impaired in any way due to the absence of grizzly bears.

We believe the answer to this question is also no. The DEIS presents no substantial evidence that the ecological condition or function of the NCE is impaired due to the absence of the grizzly bears. Specific DEIS ecosystem comments consist of the following:

DEIS Pg. vii: "The reestablishment of grizzly bears as part of the ecosystem would result in improved ecosystem health over the long term."

This statement is made in varying ways in several places in the DEIS. We find no substantive discussion or supporting evidence in the DEIS that the ecological health of the NCE is impaired due to the absence of grizzly bears.

DEIS Pg. (PDF): viii: "Release of grizzly bears would result in lasting beneficial impacts on wilderness character by restoring a native species that has not had a viable population in the NCE in many years."

We submit that wilderness character is not an ecological consideration per se, rather a human psychological matter; essentially a value judgement. The DEIS does not describe any ecological benefit related to wilderness character. Instead it suggests human psychological benefits that may be an important to some (see, for example, DEIS Pg. 3). However, these alleged benefits are not ecological benefits or factors that have a bearing on the recovery of the grizzly bear in the NCE; or anywhere else for that matter.

DEIS App F-6: "Restoration of this species would therefore restore a significant aspect of the natural processes of ecological systems within the Glacier Peak, Pasayten and Stephen Mather Wildernesses to a state in which they are substantially free from the effects of modern civilization. This restoration is therefore necessary to administer these wilderness areas as wilderness."

Again, the DEIS provides no evidence with regard as to whether reintroduction of the grizzly would restore any impaired species or ecological function in the entire NCE (not just wilderness) other than the vague and unsubstantiated statement quoted above. The assertion that reintroduction is necessary to "administer the wilderness areas as wilderness" has no basis in the Wilderness Act itself which establishes no substantive requirements on the administering agency to reintroduce species of any kind in wilderness. While this might desirable to some, it is not a requirement of either the Wilderness Act or the ESA.

Question 3. Whether reintroduction of grizzly bears will impede the recovery of listed salmonids that are dependent upon habitat within or adjacent to the NCE.

The answer to this question is yes.

The historical importance of salmon in the life and culture of "west side" Indian tribes is well documented and, unlike the inferences of the importance of grizzly bears to these tribes as asserted in the DEIS, indisputably documented. The economic value of the salmon fishery, both commercial and recreational in 2006 was \$135 million. The State of Washington is making substantial and sustained investments to restore, maintain, or enhance salmon populations. The Recreation and Conservation Office of Washington State alone invested over \$800 million in such efforts between 1997-2015. Presently listed salmon species and their general location within or adjacent to the NCE are shown in the map below.

Map 2.

The stream reaches that provide spawning habit for these species within or adjacent to the NCE could be displayed by overlaying the boundary of the NCE on the map below, which we have not had the time to do.

Map 3.

Even without such an overlay, a visual comparison of this map to the map above and the DARA map below begins to tell the story of the overlap of typical grizzly bear range with habitat occupied by listed fish. It seems obvious that a DEIS addressing the ecosystem of the NCE should address this in detail, but it does not. Instead the DEIS concludes, without citing substantial evidence of any kind, that reintroduction of grizzly bears in the NCE will have no significant impacts to listed fish in the short, and much more importantly, long term. More significantly, the DEIS appears to deliberately exclude, or at least was prepared in ignorance of, existing scientific information which contradicts the DEIS' "qualitative" conclusions shown below.

Map 4.

The DEIS states that "It is difficult to predict where bears might move; therefore, areas outside the NCE are described generally for resources that could be affected by bear movements and behavior or associated management actions" (DEIS Pg. 3).

As noted above and elsewhere, this assertion is used to avoid describing what bears will likely do once inserted into the NCE itself and, in wandering outside of the NCE, what areas they will likely occupy and what they will likely forage for despite a monumental quantity of verified scientific data that could address these questions more precisely as our range map above begins to depict. In short, the DEIS does not describe in any substantive and scientifically supported way the behavior and impacts (good or bad) that reintroduction of grizzly bears will have on the NCE ecosystem. Mapping of the location of seasonal food sources, in this case for example, salmon spawning habitat within and adjacent to the NCE, would inform how likely it would be that grizzly bears will be attracted to such locations. Despite all these seemingly obvious questions and the easily accessible information to fairly address and disclose them, the DEIS instead offers the following:

DEIS Pg. (PDF) vii and 110: "Fish are not expected to be a primary food source for grizzly bears, and the number of grizzly bears in the ecosystem would not be sufficient to generate any adverse impacts on fish populations as a result of predation."

There are no citations to scientific or commercial information within the DEIS which supports this statement. The documentation of grizzly bears feeding on fish when they are available is extensive and spectacularly ignored in the DEIS. Our citation to the opportunistic feeding behavior when a similar conclusion is asserted for livestock depredation in the DEIS is repeated here: "The Grizzly Bear 5-year Evaluation and Summary states: 'Grizzly bears display great diet plasticity and switch food habits according to which foods are available' (USFWS August, 2011, Pg. 24).

DEIS Pg. 108:

Under alternative C, grizzly bear restoration activities would not involve any disturbance of fish habitat. In the short term, the number of grizzly bears in the ecosystem would be very small, and the population is expected to remain confined to the northern portion of the NCE for at least the first several decades following initial restoration activities. While it is possible that grizzly bears, as opportunistic omnivores, could use fish as a food source, fish are not expected to be a primary food source and the number of grizzly bears present in the ecosystem would not be sufficient to create any pressure on fish populations as a result of predation [emphasis added].

Here, again the DEIS offers no citation to scientific or commercial information which supports this statement. It is documented, of course, that grizzly bears feed on salmon and that they quickly learn to catch them efficiently at river bottlenecks in Alaska and, in our case, would likely do the same at salmon spawning sites restored in many areas within and adjacent to the NCE at considerable cost. It is also documented that the primary food sources of grizzly bears change over the seasons and that a primary food source for grizzly bears in temperate rain forests is salmon (No citation is provided here because the authors of the DEIS know this very well!). The DEIS should explain what action will be taken, and by whom and at what cost when grizzly bears (like Herschel the infamous sea lion) eventually begin to prey on salmon in such "gravy train" feeding locations.

DEIS Pg. 110:

Under alternative D, long-term impacts on fish from grizzly bear restoration activities would be essentially the same as those described for alternative C. Initial restoration activities would not involve any disturbance of fish habitat. The number of grizzly bears in the ecosystem is expected to grow more rapidly than under alternative C; however, fish are not expected to be a primary grizzly bear food source in the NCE, and the number of grizzly bears in the ecosystem in the first one to two decades would not be sufficient to generate any substantial short-term adverse impacts on fish populations as a result of predation.

Our comment made above applies again here. No scientific or commercial information is cited in the DEIS (and plenty of such data exists that contradicts it) to support this "qualitative" assertion.

Conclusion: The FEIS, if it is issued, should address this major flaw in the DEIS and fully disclose, in a level of detail that is supported by habitat mapping and the BSA the short and long term impacts to listed fish that will arise with the creation of a population of more than 200 grizzly bears in the NCE.

3. THE DEIS DOES NOT DESCRIBE A COMPELLING AND ESSENTIAL NEED TO REINTRODUCE GRIZLY BEARS INTO THE NCE AT THIS TIME BASED ON THE CURRENT STATUS OF THE SPECIES IN THE COTERMINOUS UNITED STATES.

The DEIS states on Pg. 42 that the USFWS, in its EIS for grizzly bear recovery in the Bitterroot Ecosystem, defined a minimal existing grizzly bear population as one that was established by:

verified evidence within the previous 6 years, consisting of photos within the area, verified tracks and/or sightings by reputable scientists or agency personnel, of at least two different female grizzly bears with young or one female seen with different litters in two different years in an area geographically distinct from other grizzly bear populations. Verifiable evidence of females with young, to be geographically distinct, would have to occur greater than 10 miles from the nearest non-experimental grizzly bear population recovery zone boundary (FWS 1993a).

The DEIS also states there have been few confirmed siting's of grizzly bears in recent decades in the NCE on either side of the border and that efforts to obtain grizzly bear samples at various periods from 1998-2013 within high quality grizzly bear habitat (including 23% of the U.S. portion of the NCE) detected 1 female bear. The DEIS concludes: "Based on the information gathered to date in the NCE, there is no evidence to support the conclusion that there is a population of grizzly bears in the ecosystem, as defined above" (DEIS Pg. 42). Appendix F-2 of the DEIS states that based on this same information: "Grizzly bears thus have been functionally extirpated in the North Cascades Ecosystem." We agree with this assessment and submit, based on this same information, that there is no need to take urgent "triage" action to airlift grizzly bears into the NCE at this time.

Action should instead be taken to update the 24-year-old 1993 Grizzly Bear Plan (including the NCE Chapter added to the Plan in 1997) and to attempt to validate the DEIS' conclusion that reintroduction of grizzly bears into the NCE is still necessary to recover the grizzly bear population in the coterminous United States. Other key plans driving a consideration of the reintroduction of grizzly bears, or that could be significantly affected by such reintroduction, are also dated. As noted, the Grizzly Bear Recovery Plan is 24 years old. The Forest Plans, which apply to 74% of the federal lands within the NCE, are even older - the Okanogan Forest Plan was approved in 1989, the Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie and Wenatchee Plans both in 1990.

Map 5.
Recovery Areas

Table 1.
1993 vs 2017 Grizzly Bear Distribution in US Recovery Areas

Recovery Area	1993 Grizzly Population	2016 Grizzly Population	2016 ESA Status
GYE	236	757 and growing	Proposed for de-listing
NCDE	549-813	1000 and growing	Delisting process underway (Conservation Plan drafted and NF Management Plans under amendment)
CYE	Less than 15	48-50	Threatened
SE	26-36	80	Threatened
BE	Unknown	Unknown (estimate 0)	Threatened
NCE	Not estimated (Almack 1993 says 10-20)	DEIS says no longer a population	Threatened

The DEIS states:

The eventual loss of grizzly bears from the NCE would continue to put pressure on the species, reducing the likelihood of achieving recovery under the ESA. Although cumulative actions may provide benefits to grizzly bear habitat, the existing very low estimate of bears in the NCE and the decision under alternative A not to restore them would contribute substantially to overall adverse cumulative impacts on grizzly bears. (Pg. 124).

As with many assertions in the DEIS, there is no reference to studies or analysis that describe what is meant by "pressure on the species" or that support the statement that no action in the NCE to reintroduce bears would "contribute substantially to overall adverse cumulative impacts on grizzly bears."

In fact, based on the increases in the number of grizzly bears in other recovery areas, it appears that the opposite conclusion,

namely that reintroduction of grizzly bears in the NCE is not necessary, could just as easily (and more defensibly) be made. Instead perhaps, continued focus on the recovery areas where grizzly bear populations are growing and/or taking action in the BE, where a Record of Decision for augmentation of grizzly bears is already in place, is where the priorities should more appropriately lie.

The best time to take up these questions is before, not after, millions of Federal taxpayer dollars are spent and the lives of the bears themselves are perhaps lost in an ill-considered effort to reintroduce them into the NCE. And the best way to address these questions is to revise the 1993 Recovery Plan and complete the 5-year Grizzly Bear Summary required by the ESA - both of which are now overdue.

Section 4(c)(2) of the Endangered Species Act requires that "at least once" every 5 years USFWS [in this case] complete a review of listed species. The last such review for the grizzly bear was completed in August, 2011. This review recommended, among other things, that the 1993 Recovery Plan itself be revised:

Except for the GYA, the recovery plan and associated recovery criteria have not been updated since the plan was released in 1993 and supplemented in 1996 and 1997 with chapters for the BE and NCASC [North Cascades Ecosystem] respectively. Thus, the plan no longer reflects the best available and most up-to-date information on the biology of the species and its habitat. We are now in the process of updating the recovery plan [emphasis added] (Pg. 14).

We inquired of USFWS staff (March 8, 2017) as to the status of the 2016 5-year plan. Their response was: "We are not currently working on a new 5-year review. Other high priority grizzly bear efforts have exhausted our capacity at this time. I do not have an estimate of when we will be able to dedicate time and personnel toward completing a new review."

In 2012, there were 15,000 grizzly bears in south-central British Columbia (DEIS Pg. 47). While the DEIS describes that the NCE is isolated from this population it does not discuss its ecological connection with the SE, CYE or NCDE Recovery Areas as shown in Map 5. The 2011 5-year summary does take up the Canadian grizzly population and states on Pg. 7:

Continuing, the 2011 5-year summary states on Pg. 8:

So, "while there is no evidence of "marked biological separation between grizzly populations across the international border between the lower 48 states and Canada," USFWS concludes that based on the "best scientific information" that differences in control of exploitation and regulatory requirements place the Canadian population of grizzly bears in higher risk than their American siblings because they are not protected under something like the ESA. And because of this, should be ignored in consideration of whether the populations they are connected to in the United States could be delisted accordingly. We submit that if there actually was evidence the Canadians were mismanaging their robust populations on their side of the border in 2011 it would have been cited in this summary. None is. The DEIS, on the other hand, says this on Pg. 47:

The current range of grizzly bears in British Columbia has been divided into 56 grizzly bear population units (GBPUs) that delineate individual grizzly bear populations for conservation and management... Each GBPU has been assigned a conservation status of either Threatened or Viable. The objective for the nine Threatened GBPUs in British Columbia is population recovery to prevent range contraction and ensure long-term population viability. The objectives for the remaining 47 viable GBPUs includes maintaining current population abundance and distribution, and providing sustainable harvest and viewing opportunities where appropriate [emphasis added].

We submit that this information of "good management" of Canadian grizzly bear populations in south-central BC itself warrants reconsideration and validation of what appears to have been an arbitrary demarcation between the populations in the 2011 5-year summary and that this validation be undertaken and documented in the 2016 5-year summary.

We believe that the clear priority is to revise the 1993 Recovery Plan as recommended by USFWS itself in the 2011 5-year summary and complete the overdue 2016 5-year summary. This will ensure that the best available science, and the favorable

trajectory of grizzly populations in other recovery areas (and the status and management of the BC population across the border), have been used to update the Recovery Plan. This will serve to validate that the reintroduction of grizzly bears into the NCE remains a priority for recovering the grizzly bear in the coterminous United States. As described above, there is no present species or ecosystem "emergency" related to grizzly bears in the NCE that overrides taking the time to update the 1993 Recovery Plan and produce the 2016 5-year summary.

4. LOCAL COMMUNITIES WITHIN AND SURROUNDING THE NCE MAY BE ADVERSELY IMPACTED BY REINTRODUCED GRIZZLY BEARS WHO LIKELY WILL ROAM OFF FEDERAL LANDS ONTO LOW ELEVATION PRIVATE LANDS WITHIN AND ADJACENT TO THE NCE.

The Socioeconomic Analysis (SA) in the DEIS is superficial, unnecessarily qualitative and does not adequately address or disclose potential impacts of the action alternatives. Involvement by the Forest Service appears to have been minimal despite the fact the most of the federal lands within the NCE are comprised of NFS lands (74%). The 2006 FS FEIS for the Greater Yellowstone Area provides a very good example of the scope and level of detail related to socioeconomic issues and should as a model for the level of detail that should be provided in the FEIS and considered in the ROD.

A fundamental problem in this and other sections of the DEIS (see our discussion in Issue 2) is the failure to use easily produced maps and other available information to tell the "whole story" to begin with and support the conclusions taken up in the SA. DARA modified a map (following page) in the DEIS to depict the well documented home ranges of grizzly bears and how these relate to resources or uses of lands within the NCE.

Map 6.

Maps such as this based on available information and science should have been used throughout the DEIS elsewhere in our comments and below to tell a different kind of story than, for a profound example what is told on Pg. 39 of the DEIS: It is difficult to predict where bears might move; therefore, areas outside the NCE are described generally for resources that could be affected by bear movements and behavior or associated management actions.

This statement epitomizes what is wrong in the DEIS and needs to be corrected in the FEIS. The Almack 1993 report is cited to support the DEIS assertion there was a substantial population of grizzly bear in the DEIS. That same report contains the following maps:

Almack 1993 Pg. 80

Almack 1993 Pg. 81

Superimposition of these maps onto the DARA map above shows that it is possible to predict where grizzly bears are likely to head in the spring in the NCE. Superimposing the location of foods preferred by grizzly bears throughout the year would further describe where grizzly bears are likely to be throughout the year. As described below, this same approach should have been used in a number of places in the SA in the DEIS. It begs the question why they were not and establishes the need to

provide this kind of information in the FEIS.

Turning to the SA itself, the DEIS describes the methods and assumptions used in the Socioeconomic Analysis as follows:

DEIS Pg. 145: Methods and Assumptions

The analysis of socioeconomic impacts considers potential effects on employment, population, and revenue from natural resource-related activities and revenue from park and national forest visitation that may result from grizzly bear restoration under each alternative. Impacts for this resource topic were analyzed using information on population, employment, and key regional industry sectors provided by the U.S. Census Bureau; information on the economic contribution of national park visitation in the NCE provided by the NPS; and information on timber sales and grazing leases provided by the USFS. A qualitative analysis was performed by subject matter experts based on professional judgment supported by the information described above [emphasis added].

Cited to information in the DEIS related to socioeconomics is mostly "inventory" type data (numbers of this or that) while conclusions rest nearly entirely on qualitative analysis based on professional judgement which is not described in terms of how professional judgements were made (assumptions used, etc.). No quantitative data related to changes in revenue or employment or other socioeconomic factors associated with action alternatives is presented. Qualitative conclusions which are contradicted by existing written evidence or consultation with professionals more familiar with the subject matter should be revised accordingly in the FEIS as described below. There is no substantive evaluation of the impacts associated with the reintroduction of grizzly bears related to revenue and employment. Instead, qualitative assertions are made in the narrative for Alternative B which are then "adjusted" by qualitative assertions for Alternatives C and D. The quantitative precision that exists at all in this respect relates to estimates of new NPS and USFWS staff that will be needed to implement the action alternatives and estimates of those implementation costs in Appendix D.

The SA addresses 4 components: The restoration of grizzly bears in the NCE has raised concerns about economic impacts on natural resource-based industries such as mining and logging. Concerns about depredation of livestock or agriculture, such as fruit orchards, have also been raised. In addition, revenue to local businesses may be affected due to changes in tourism and hunting revenue as a result of grizzly bear restoration (DEIS Pg. 10).

A significant flaw in the DEIS is not to address the impacts of grizzly introduction on listed salmonid species occupying habitat within and adjacent to the NCE which is taken up in our Is

Timber Harvest

The DEIS describes the impacts to Timber Harvest under Alternative B to establish the "baseline" for comparison of impacts associated with Alternatives C and D:

Leaseholders of timber lands could be adversely affected by release of grizzly bears if grizzly bears move through leased lands while leaseholders are harvesting timber. However, any timber harvest on USFS lands would be subject to ESA consultation requirements, which may allow operators to temporarily disturb bears while continuing to operate. Impacts on timber operations from grizzly bears would be temporary and intermittent because timber is not harvested all the time, timber leases are generally located along the periphery of suitable grizzly bear habitat, and grizzly bears are not expected to be on these lands all of the time. Under alternative B, there would be little to no potential for lost work hours and employment based on the small number of bears released. If a timber company chooses to temporarily stop work as the result of safety considerations of their workers, any lost time would be minimal. Any impacts could be mitigated by allowing workers to harvest other lands if available, although some small, temporary, and intermittent impacts on employment and income of site workers could be possible [emphasis added] (Pg. 149).

The DEIS describes the impacts to timber harvest under Alternatives C and D are the same as described above for mining.

The emphasized text at the close of the paragraph above is a classic example of what is wrong with the DEIS SA. There is no quantification of the area of lands on NFS that are managed for timber production that would be affected in the long or short term by the action alternatives. There is no disclosure of likely impacts to long term harvest levels under the action alternatives. The statements that impacts associated with bears walking into ongoing harvest operations could be dealt with by ESA consultation requirements and that safety issues could be mitigated by allowing workers to work on other lands if available is almost laughable in its ignorance about how harvest operations work and the cost of moving workers and

equipment around. The authors of the DEIS can and should have provided examples of where ESA consultation has allowed harvest operations to continue when a grizzly bear walks into a harvest area. The statement that some small, temporary, and intermittent impacts on employment and income of site workers could be possible does not appear to be a well-considered, documented and certainly not well supported statement at all. As described above, the FS FEIS for the GYA provides a relevant example of the level of detail that can and should be developed and disclosed in the FEIS to document impacts to activities like timber harvest.

The DARA map above shows the extent of overlap between grizzly bear range on timber management areas which should be disclosed and analyzed quantitatively in the FEIS.

Mining

The DEIS describes the impacts for Alternative B to establish the "baseline" for comparison of impacts associated with Alternatives C and D:

Similar to impacts described for timber harvests, holders of mining claims may be adversely affected if grizzly bears pass through leased lands while mining is in progress. However, because of the small number of bears released under the primary phase of alternative B and the fact that the closest mining claim is at least 15 miles from the nearest potential release area, the likelihood of these impacts would be very low. In the event that grizzly bears are present in or near mining leases, they are expected to move through in minutes to hours; therefore, these impacts are anticipated to be t

Correspondence ID: 13891Project:112008Document:132104

Address: La Grande, OR 97850
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 16:31:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I lived around many Grizzly, Brown and Black Bears also Wolves in Alaska. The experience made me a better Human.

Please BRING Predators back.

Correspondence ID: 13892Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tacoma, WA 98409
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 16:32:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is in regards to the proposed idea of reintroduction of grizzly(brown bear) population in the north cascades in WA State this includes the experimental population or restore population. 10(j) Short answer: Absolutely NO, these proposals you provided leaves out another idea Alternative A Minus the "current endangered species act" instead put in its place "create new rules". why cant this be done? especially if the bears start going over the Canadian border if a decision is made not to reintroduce but with the new rule option we can capture and relocate them if needed. I love hiking and experiencing the outdoors I have seen all kinds of wildlife in my travels, I have had close encounters with a black bear. these were surprise encounters. luckily the bear acted proper and ran away. if this was a Grizzly bear I would have been more then likely attacked. In my opinion introducing the grizzly in WA creates a guaranteed risk to life for people of WA.

Correspondence ID: 13893Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Arlington, WA 98223
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 16:38:10

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Regarding the Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan EIS, I support the No Action alternative, with a bit of a heavy heart. While trying to expand the range of this amazing bear is a noble intention, I worry that the cost in both lives of

grizzlies and humans could likely end up being higher than this plan takes into account. There is a key difference between the North Cascades Ecosystem and the other ecosystems where grizzlies already exist or were recently introduced. The amount of backpacking recreation in the NEC is very high, and has really boomed in recent years as the population in nearby Seattle, Bellingham and Washington state in general has increased dramatically. One key corridor driving a lot of this backcountry recreation is the Pacific Crest Trail, yet I could find little or no mention of the PCT in the grizzly restoration plan. Other grizzly ecosystems held up as models in the draft restoration plan do not have a comparable trail with anywhere near that amount of use. My own personal experience (having backpacked in the Glacier Peak Wilderness, Lake Chelan Sawtooths, Stephen Mather, Pasayten, Alpine Lakes, Boulder River, Henry M. Jackson for the past 30 years) is that not only has the number of thru-hikers on the PCT exploded in the past decade, but the backcountry experience level and bear-savvy of the majority of thru-hikers has declined. Privately and in volunteer backcountry ranger roles I have interacted with many, many backpackers who sleep with their food. They don't carry bear cans, and they don't even hike with any ropes or means to hang their food even when educated by uniformed agency personnel. The go-light trend in gear means most thru-hikers do not consider carrying bear cans an option -- they often don't have packs big enough to carry a can in the first place. This plan talks about sanitation and public education, but without a specific focus on the PCT, this could be a disaster for both bears and people.

The difference between other ecosystems where bears are being managed, compared to the NCE, is they are either national parks, where backcountry staffing and frontcountry messaging can be combined in a more effective way, or they are much more remote wilderness areas like the Selkirks that get way less numbers of backpackers. There is a tendency in this plan to focus on North Cascades National Park, but the glaring omission is the PCT. The plan also ignores the very understaffed (ie: almost nonexistent) backcountry ranger presence in the national forests in the NCE. Bear cans were only added as a requirement in the Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest last year for the first time, and I can tell you from personal experience that most backpackers were unaware of the new rule. The few people who knew about it were pretty lax about their hanging techniques, and the even fewer who had cans would often leave them open in camp while they wandered off to find water or dip their toes in a lake.

Many of the release points in the NCE are outside of the national park. One, the Green Mountain horse pasture, is just a few miles away in either direction from two popular car-camping campgrounds, where people are pretty lax about keeping clean camps, to put it mildly. And last year's contractor never bothered to show up, so there was no host for either of the campgrounds that could have helped educate people. This plan has no plan for the specifics of such situations, no recognition that this is a much more challenging grizzly restoration than the Selkirks, much more likely to have even higher bear mortalities than the Selkirk relocations, with much more likelihood of human/bear conflicts and injuries and deaths to both. Grizzlies don't like being around people, and I have wondered many a night sitting high on Miners Ridge or at Pumice Creek on Glacier Peak why there aren't at least a few more grizzlies around in some of those remote parts. Over the years, I've come to the sad conclusion that there are simply too many people, even in these remote corners of the Glacier Peak Wilderness. This reintroduction plan strikes me as something that's too little, too late, the genie's out of the bottle, and you're dooming these bears to roaming wilderness areas that in many places are still teeming with people. The timing of the season for PCT thru-hikers and the likely places grizzlies are going to want to hang out could hardly be worse. In one word: huckleberries. The PCT wanders through some truly amazing patches of huckleberries along the Dolly Vista section, White Pass, Pumice Creek, Harts Pass and so much of that northern larchland in the western Pasayten Wilderness ... Image Lake, near the PCT, that gets a lot of visitation, too, including clueless weekenders. On and on, the point is, right when the bears need to gorge on huckleberries, a huge bubble of thru-hikers will have worked their way north through Washington and will be hitting all these areas, sleeping with their food, hikers not even bothering to bury their feces or TP, trees often too small to hang food even without cans. And this restoration plan has no contingency plan for that other than "public education." And if Option C is chosen, well the agencies at least have a little more flexibility to shoot a few more bears ... but how many innocent, if clueless, hikers have to get mauled in the process, and how many bears have to die?

I really hope I'm wrong and just overreacting, but that's why I'm in favor of the No Action alternative. Maybe the grizzlies have given up on this area for a reason, sad to say.

Correspondence ID:	13894Project:112008Document:132104
Address:	La Grande, OR 97850 United States of America
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual
Received:	Nov,13 2023 16:39:20
Correspondence Type:	Web Form

Correspondence: Please, bring back grizzlies to their rightful habitat. Humans & the environment need them. We highly support this.

Correspondence ID: 13895Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Auburn, WA 98001
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 16:39:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To whom it concerns,

Grizzly bears have every right to inhabit their historic native lands. And since, grizzlies are on the threatened species list, it makes even more sense to restore them to their natural habitat. Additionally, they play a vital role in the health of the environment and other wildlife species within the ecosystem. Grizzlies also are a prominent part of the regional Native American and First Nations cultures and they contribute to the richness of the Pacific Northwest. Natives lived with grizzlies for thousands of years, so modern man can learn to do so as well. Grizzlies should be re-introduced into the North Cascades area.

Sincerely,
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 13896Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Port Angeles, WA 98363
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 16:41:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation, the Preferred Alternative.

I love Wilderness (designated Wilderness according to the Wilderness Act of 1964) as well as USFS and BLM non-Wilderness backcountry. But I want these lands to be wild and that includes having wildlife. So I am in favor of Alternative C. As Edward O. Wilson wrote: "When people state the common belief that being in nature relaxes them, that it helps them recover from stress and tragedy, that it's a healing process to be in nature, we now know there's a solid basis for that. The research has been done and it is true that it's good for the human mind to be able to live and experience in really natural situations. Instinctively, without understanding what's happening, they know that in certain wild environments, they have come home." That would include the grizzly bear.

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 13897Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Olympia, WA 98502
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 16:41:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: After learning about the positive impact the reintroduction of wolves had in Yellowstone, I think reintroduction of another missing link in the food chain in the North Cascades is a great idea.

Correspondence ID: 13898Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Anacortes, WA 98221
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 16:41:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The bears need to be reintroduced into their historic range. They are an apex species that would make this area of the Cascade biosphere more whole.

I see Alternative B to be a clearer and more easily managed process. However either B or C would get them back out into the landscape.

The real conflict would be between humans and the bear - and the survival of the bear should be the major concern - meaning that some areas may have to be closed to visitors, hikers, etc.

Good luck and thanks for allowing comment on this important matter.

Correspondence ID: 13899Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98501
United States of America

Outside Organization: Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife State Government(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,13 2023 16:43:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Grizzly Bear Restoration in the North Cascades Ecosystem and the proposed rule to designate a non-essential experimental population (NEP) under section 10(j) of the Endangered Species Act. WDFW is committed to grizzly bear recovery in Washington. We are an active partner on the Interagency Grizzly Bear Committee and partnered with the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) in the management and recovery of the extant population of grizzly bears in the Selkirk mountains of Washington state. Should grizzly bears occupy the North Cascades ecosystem in the future, we look forward to continued partnership with both the National Park Service (NPS) and USFWS (together hereafter, "Services"). WDFW is a cooperating entity in the DEIS process and we have consulted with USFWS in development of the proposed NEP rule. Our role has been to provide technical expertise and on-the-ground knowledge to inform the Services' decision making. State law limits WDFW's participation in any action that would translocate bears from outside of Washington into the state and also requires our participation in all discussions about grizzly bear management (RCW 77.12.035).

Below, our comments focus on: 1) the interaction of our state authorities with the potential implementation of the preferred action alternative; 2) our support of proposed flexible management tools under the 10(j) designation; and 3) highlighting the need for greater investment by the Services in outreach and conflict preparedness and response capacity.

The legal authorities surrounding a potential action to reintroduce grizzly bears in Washington State are complex. We recognize that federal statutory authorities include the US Fish and Wildlife Service responsibility to recover species under the Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C § 1535) and the National Park Service authority to manage natural resources, including wildlife, within their boundaries through the Organic Act (54 U.S.C. § 100101 et seq.). WDFW has management authority for wildlife in the state of Washington (RCW 77.04.012), and as such regulates the importation, possession, and transportation of wildlife (RCW 77.12.047, WAC 220-450-030, WAC 220-450-010). Washington State law also states that grizzly bears shall not be transplanted or introduced into the state (RCW 77.12.035). Should the Services select an action alternative, the complicated and overlapping nature of these regulations and authorities would most easily be resolved if grizzly bears were released onto National Park Service lands, where federal authority is more straightforward. Should bears be released onto other ownerships, such as US Forest Service lands, administrative complications would be heightened. In the scenario of non-national park releases, WDFW would need to consider our position regarding RCW 77.12.035 and our role and responsibility to permit the importation and release of wildlife in the state of Washington on non-national park lands. Therefore, if an action alternative is chosen, we strongly encourage the Services implement releases only on National Park Service lands.

Further, should the Services select an action alternative, WDFW strongly suggests the current preferred alternative that includes the designation of a non-essential experimental population under section 10(j) of the Endangered Species Act. The 10(j) designation will provide USFWS, Tribes, and WDFW critical tools and flexibility to manage grizzly bear populations. Grizzly bears can cause significant damage and pose a threat to human safety, particularly if they become accustomed to

associating humans with food rewards. We applaud the clarity in the proposed rule that human safety is paramount and that all grizzly bears in the experimental population "...may be taken in self-defense or defense of others, based on a good-faith belief that the actions are necessary to protect any individual from bodily harm." Further, we appreciate and support the described expanded management tools under the 10(j) that are aimed at minimizing and mitigating human-bear conflict as well as their application into varying management zones on the landscape. The management tools described include: allowances for producers to implement deterrence measures; allowances for WDFW, USFWS, or Tribes to relocate bears in order to deconflict with human activities or prevent a bear from becoming habituated to humans; allowances for WDFW, USFWS, or Tribes to lethally remove a conflict bear under certain conditions and when non-lethal measures have been implemented and were not proven successful.

These measures are a needed complement of options for wildlife managers to have at their disposal to address the sometimes dynamic and rapidly evolving situations that unfold when large carnivores and humans share a landscape. Nuisance conflict situations that are inadequately responded to may escalate to human safety issues or incidents that would require agency actions up to and including lethal removal if inadequate management flexibility is not provided and response tools are not available early in a conflict situation. We strongly encourage USFWS to expeditiously finalize the rule to designate a non-essential experimental population as proposed.

Adequate funding resources both for outreach and for conflict response must be a paramount consideration if an action alternative is chosen and is to be implemented. The Department's own experience with large carnivore conflict has shown that tools and personnel resources need to be ready to respond at a moment's notice, and not be marshalled over a period of days, or weeks. This would likely be the case if there are not adequate federal resources ready to respond given that the Department is already heavily taxed with other human-wildlife conflict issues in the same geographic area. Without considerable new investment by the Services, the result would likely be increased risk of incident escalation, adding to safety and property risks to the public and potentially negatively impacting grizzly bear recovery.

Regardless of whether the Services move forward with a reintroduction action in the North Cascades ecosystem, WDFW looks forward to our continued partnership on our shared efforts to recover grizzly bears in Washington. To discuss these comments in more detail please feel free to reach out directly to [REDACTED], Wildlife Diversity Division Manager, at [REDACTED]

Sincerely,
[REDACTED], Director

Correspondence ID: 13900Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 16:45:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Strongly urge Alternative 'A' (no Action).

NPS and FWS are already aware that the Grizzly is the top-of-the-food-chain apex predator that requires an enormous home range, as well as a diverse habitat in which to survive. History has proven that when that habitat changes due to diminished food sources, increased human presence, and wildfires the Grizzly has no choice but to expand its home range. In fact, in the states of Montana, Wyoming, and Idaho the species has been documented at expanding their home range up to three times their original roaming space. This of course will result in tragic losses of life - both of Grizzlies and their human victims.

Presumably the premise for the recovery initiative driven by NPS and FWS is to increase the overall Grizzly bear population. In fact, we believe the opposite will be the case. We believe a net loss of the animal population will result as a direct consequence of the increased incidence of Grizzly-human conflicts. Please consider the following -

- The combined human populations represented by communities located in towns and cities affected by NCE Alternatives 'B' or 'C' is significantly greater than those of existing Grizzly recovery zones. This alone will statistically lead to increased bear-

to-human interactions.

- The draft EIS has documented in other recovery zones that the majority of incidents involving Grizzly-to-human conflicts occur on private lands, not inside the recovery zone boundaries.

- While fewer Grizzlies are planned for insertion during the initial 5-year period, our higher density human population centers, animal propagation through breeding, and the expected increase in range taken by the predator will result in a disproportionate taking of human life as well as Grizzly losses.

From a purely practical standpoint, the merit of relocating Grizzlies that are factually demonstrated to have expanded in both range of habitat (two to three times expansion) and in breeding numbers is difficult to justify. Your Record of Decision should be based on merit, not politics.

Correspondence ID: 13901Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Olympia, WA 98502
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 16:49:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Reintroduction of grizzlies to the North Cascades will be an asset for its beautiful and valuable ecosystem as well as culturally and spiritually for Washingtonians.

Correspondence ID: 13902Project:112008Document:132104
Address: STEHEKIN, WA 98852
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 16:50:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear NPS,

I am writing to comment on the the NPS plan to re-locate grizzly bears to the North Cascades.

I am against this plan, but in order to create an educated response, I am asking for an extension to the comment period of at least 6 months to year. The time provided up to this point is not adequate for a working citizen to review the EIS.

I have not had a chance to review the EIS yes, but other reasons I am not in favor of this plan are: the impact to visitors of the North Cascades National Park, the unnecessary expense of the monitoring of the bears and of citizens encounters with the bears, the pressure on the animals in the park that are already being reduced by the presence of wolves, and the economic impact to the communities that rely on visitorship to the North Cascades National Park.

Thank you for considering this,

Sincerely,

Correspondence ID: 13903Project:112008Document:132104
Address: EDMONDS, WA 98026
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 16:52:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear National Park Service Representative,

I ask that you not proceed with the Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan or attempt to promote an increase in the grizzly bear population in the North Cascades. My reasoning is based on the reported attacks and killings of experienced hikers and hunters in the northwest over the past several years, and person experience. In Glacier National Park in 1997, while walking on a bike path to Apgar Ranger station and hiking from Granite Park Chalet to Goat Haunt via 50 Mountain Campground, my spouse and I encountered 9 bears, 5 of which were grizzly bears. When walking to Apgar Ranger station, we had no packs and were on our way along a busy bike path through the forest near the entrance to the park to get our permits and bear spray. We did not see and startled a sow and her cub about 10 feet from us on the side of the path. We had been talking, being very careful of our surroundings. The cub scrambled up a tree, and the sow tracked us for 100 yards walking in parallel to us about 10 feet away as we walked back toward the way we came. Later, at a pass above 50 Mountain Campground, in a rain/snow storm, we found in the middle of the path a hole the size of a basketball, an overturned rock, and a pile of steaming scat. Then later while approaching Kootenai Lake, hiking on the main trail through dense vegetation, while singing and talking the whole time, we startled a juvenile grizzly bear about 10 feet from us.

These encounters were too close for comfort. I don't want similar experiences in the North Cascades. If the bears are reintroduced, I will not feel safe with bear spray alone, and will opt to carry a firearm. The reports from grizzly bear supporters of the plan who dismiss these encounters and say that they are rare are not accurate at least for me; they are not consistent with my experience, and we followed all the rules to minimize contact and encounters with the bears.

Thank you,

Correspondence ID: 13904Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Snohomish, WA 98296
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 16:53:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm a 27 year resident of WA State and I support the proposed reintroduction of brown bear / grizzlies back into the North Cascades. I am fully away of what this means. I've done extended backpack trips into dense grizzly country (the Gallatin Range out of Yellowstone NP). Hiking, backpacking, living with grizzlies can be achieved in a relatively safe manner. There are no guarantees and I learned when hiking through the Gallatin range but with proper behavior and awareness...risks can be minimized and species can co-exist. Grizzlies are native to the range and the system can be healthier overall when the ecosystem is restored. Grizzlies are essential to that mixture. We learned how the reintroduction of wolves to Yellowstone made the ecosystem healthier. The same can be done with grizzlies and the North Cascades. Our policies shouldn't by default always favor humans. Grizzlies in the North Cascades gives them a chance. It does mean that humans have to be more aware of their surroundings and modify their behavior. Just because some humans don't want to do this or are afraid of large carnivores in the wild doesn't mean the reintroduction shouldn't take place. We shouldn't always default to favoring humans. Giving grizzlies a chance doesn't have to put humans at risk...humans can...and will adapt.

Please...I'm urging you...please proceed with this reintroduction. We need to reverse decades and centuries of destruction of native species. This is a step in the right direction.

Correspondence ID: 13905Project:112008Document:132104
Address: SHORELINE, WA 98177-2506
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 16:56:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Plan A is the only Reasonable approach. Don't introduce new Grizzlies into the N Cascades. It will only lead to attacks on humans. Recent news events show that humans and grizzlies don't mix. An experienced couple in Banff NP

and their dog- DEAD; a female bicyclist in a MT campground- DEAD; Idaho hunters killed 2 grizzlies in self-defence, as did a hunter in MT: 3 Grizzlies DEAD/Euthanized; A MT woman DEAD, killed in her own home by a Grizzly. You know that the number of hiker's, backpackers, hunters, trail runners increase each year at a fast pace, and it's hard to find a backcountry campsite during the summer in the N. Cascades. Thousands of PCT Thru and Section hikers, joined by the booming population of the Puget Sound area. You know that many of these newer hikers don't follow good practice: campsite and popular trail areas are littered with feces and toilet paper; people cook in their tents to avoid mosquitos or rain; food is not secured at night. Adding Grizzlies to the N. Cascades will increase the number of attacks on humans (many of them stupid humans) and then the bear has to be euthanized for doing what comes naturally. If they stray into killing livestock, they will be killed. It's not fair to the bear and dangerous for humans. If Grizzlies are introduced into the N. Cascades, I, several friends I've spoken with, and probably many, many others will be taking our firearms with us in the backcountry, which raises a whole another level of dangerous.

NO NEW Grizzlies. If they come on their own, a few at a time, we will have to live with that, but please, don't Set Up human-grizzly conflict by moving any bears into the N Cascades.

Thank You,

Correspondence ID: 13906Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98119
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 16:59:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am all for restoration of local ecosystems and reintroducing grizzlies to do so! Please reintroduce the grizzlies

Correspondence ID: 13907Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Troy, MT 59935
United States of America
Outside Organization: Yaak Valley Forest Council Conservation/Preservation(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,13 2023 16:59:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Public Comments Processing
Attn: FWS-R1-ES-2023-0074
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, MS: PRB/3W
Falls Church, VA 22041-3803

RE: NORTH CASCADES ECOSYSTEM DRAFT GRIZZLY BEAR RESTORATION PLAN/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

These comments are submitted on behalf of the undersigned groups, individuals, and our supportive members that work in collaboration to promote the safety and welfare of all grizzlies south of Canada with the goal of establishing a large-scale grizzly bear ecosystem recovery zone with appropriate linkages, ensuring the long-term viability of bears in face of the imminent effects of climate change.

We appreciate the opportunity to offer comments on the Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/Environmental Impact Statement for the North Cascades Ecosystem.

We support Alternative A: No Action.

Grizzly bears should be allowed to immigrate naturally back into the North Cascades Ecosystem from British Columbia and the recovering protected grizzly bear population in the conterminous 48 states. Grizzly bears should not be removed from an ecosystem where they are protected as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) and placed into an ecosystem where those protections will be diminished under the ESA 10(j) rule. All grizzly bear populations and individual grizzly bears are essential to recovery of the species.

We support a recovered and interconnected population of grizzly bears fully protected under the Endangered Species Act inhabiting all suitable habitat within and between designated Grizzly Bear Recovery Zones. Both long term survival in each

of the designated Grizzly Bear Recovery Zones and the overall recovery of grizzly bears in the conterminous 48 states is dependent on interconnecting core habitat currently designated in recovery zones and protecting explorer bears traveling in these connectivity corridors. Explorer bears, an essential component of interconnected populations, would be the very bears at risk with the 10(j) rule in effect. Current isolated populations, and a newly established and isolated NCE population of grizzly bears must be linked.

Translocating a grizzly bear puts the bear at risk of injury or death resulting from capture, chemical immobilization, transport, and release. It is far better to let grizzlies populate the North Cascades Ecosystem on their own. No grizzly bear should be subjected to these risks to be part of a non-essential population.

Allowing the NCE grizzly bear population to be managed under the 10(j) rule sets an unwarranted precedent for future reintroductions. When the grizzly bear was listed as threatened under the Endangered Species Act in 1975, populations were not listed as discrete entities, the grizzly bear was listed as, "the Grizzly Bear of the 48 Coterminous States." The grizzly bear population in the conterminous 48 states should remain one population and be managed as such with focuses on protecting core habitat, connecting core habitat with migration corridors, and protecting explorer bears outside of recover zones.

In 1993 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Grizzly Bear Recovery Plan (Plan) identified six ecosystems, with recovery zones at the core of each, to further recovery efforts. Each recovery zone was supposed to represent an area large enough and of sufficient habitat quality to support a recovered grizzly bear population. Current science shows none of the recovery areas is of sufficient size to independently support a recovered population. (Allendorf et al. 2019). Current recovery strategy recognizes that grizzly bears would need to move and reside permanently in areas outside the recovery zones and that connectivity between recovery areas would be necessary for isolated populations to increase and sustain themselves at recovery levels.

Reintroduction under the 10(j) rule will inhibit the goal of population connectivity and remove protections outside of recovery zones laid out in the Plan. An integral part of the goal of restoring grizzly bear populations is to implement measures within the authority of the NPS and USFWS is to minimize human-caused grizzly bear mortalities. Reintroducing grizzly bears under the 10(j) rule decreases protections and will increase the likelihood of human caused mortality.

The Plan's goal is a recovered and interconnected population of grizzly bears, therefore the NCE population cannot be managed as a discrete population under 10(j). First, this assumes explorer bears will not be immigrating and emigrating into and out of the NCE Recovery Zone and secondly, this movement is and should be the goal of the program; to achieve recovery of grizzly bears as one interconnected, interbreeding and sustainable population, with the ultimate goal of removal from the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife.

Reintroducing artificially relocated bears to yet another additional isolated population of grizzly bears in the North Cascades will likely not meet the goal of species recovery and removal of Federal ESA protections.

Respectfully submitted,

[REDACTED]
Conservation Director
Yaak Valley Forest Council

[REDACTED]
Chair
Save the Yellowstone Grizzly

[REDACTED]
Conservation Ecologist

[REDACTED]
President
Gallatin Wildlife Association

[REDACTED]
President

Flathead-Lolo-Bitterroot Citizen Task Force

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Chair
Swan View Coalition

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Executive Director
Alliance for the Wild Rockies

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Forest Policy Director
Friends of the Clearwater

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Montana Wilderness Education School
Swan Valley, Montana

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Director
Conservation Congress

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

President
Friends of the Bitterroot

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Program Director
Friends of the Wild Swan

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Executive Director
Wilderness Watch

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Award-Winning Freelance Journalist / Environmental Attorney / Documentarian

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Grizzly Activist
Whitefish Montana

[REDACTED]

Address: Puyallup, WA 98374
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 17:02:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support this effort 100%! Grizzly bears would be an incredible addition to the wildlife in the area, as they once were. Recreation can be done with safety measures and prevention.

Correspondence ID: 13910Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 17:02:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To whom it may concern,
I live in the N. Cascades ecosystem full-time, and spend as much time hiking in the the mountains and in the neighboring wilderness areas as possible, including N. Cascades National Park and the Pasayten Wilderness. I share my neighborhood on the valley floor with black bears and have assisted in efforts to educated our community about how to co-exist with bears. While there is much more work to do in this regard, folks in the Methow Valley are paying attention to their own behavior as potential bear attractants. I love that I get to hike in a place where being alert and aware may allow me to see wildlife and to stay safe. In my many miles of hiking I've had far more miles of no sign of black bears than those miles occasionally littered with bear sign, informing me of their proximity. I support intact ecosystems without hesitation. I know that if grizzlies are reintroduced I will carry my bear spray faithfully with the same level of alertness I do now. I support the reintroduction plan as presented which seems reasonable and conservative, with ample time to adjust as events unfold.

██████████

Correspondence ID: 13911Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 17:04:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Reference: [https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-40/part-1502#p-1502.2\(b\)](https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-40/part-1502#p-1502.2(b)) and [https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-40/part-1502#p-1502.2\(f\)](https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-40/part-1502#p-1502.2(f))

Recommend Alternate 'A' (No Action)

The National Park Service and US Fish and Wildlife Service are proposing actions involving Grizzly bears that if enacted will have been implemented only through the agencies' willful contravention of Federal law, NPS Management Policy, and Washington state law. Both agencies are official Lead Agencies in the administration of the North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Environmental Impact Statement (September 2023).

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires Federal agencies to assess the environmental effects of proposed major Federal actions prior to making decisions. Federal law further mandates lead agencies that are privileged to publish Environmental Impact Statements to comply with the requirements of Code of Federal Regulations PART 1502 (Environmental Impact Statement). This process is required so that full and fair discussion of significant environmental impacts occurs. Clearly the public have been denied this opportunity. By its conduct and practice of omission of relevant information, and having concealed information from the public, intentional information hiding that has direct consequences to public safety, the National Park Service and US Fish and Wildlife Service are in violation of both NEPA and CFR Part 1502.

Grave consequences resulting from any agency Record of Decision that would place Grizzly bears onto public lands will include unnecessary human deaths and injuries to the public. Despite the available statistics of historical injuries and deaths

available to NPS and FWS both of these agencies have been silent on these threats in the subject EIS as well as in public meetings that are now concluded. Withholding relevant information from the public, especially where that information is material to, and represents threats to public safety, is a serious breach of the public trust, one which will result in tragic outcomes to those who have been led astray by these agencies.

Examples of "information hiding" include the withholding of reports from the public that empty bear spray canisters have been found next to the dead bodies of those killed by grizzlies; or despite viable populations of Grizzlies in Montana, Wyoming, and Idaho, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has ignored petitions by these three states to delist the Grizzly; or that the previous Director of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services stated before Congress that the grizzly is biologically recovered. The Director stated this based on the thousands of Grizzlies in Montana, Wyoming, Idaho, and Canada. In other words, for many years the Grizzly bear species has enjoyed a full recovery in these recovery zones and through their prolific breeding and enormous range expansion the management programs of NPS and FWS have been shown to be completely inadequate as evidenced by the increasing deaths and injuries, the majority of which are occurring outside recovery zone boundaries on private lands.

Citations of NEPA, CFR Part 1502, NPS Management Policy, and Washington state law:

- Pursuant to CFR Title 40 Chapter V Subchapter A, Part 1502.2(b) states, "Environmental impact statements shall discuss impacts in proportion to their significance."
- Pursuant to CFR Title 40 Chapter V Subchapter A, Part 1502.2(f) states, "Agencies shall not commit resources prejudicing selection of alternatives before making a final decision."
- In accordance with NPS policy at Section 4.4.2.2 of the 2006 Management Policies Manual states: "The Service [NPS] will strive to restore extirpated native plant and animal species to parks whenever all of the following criteria are met: 2) The species does not, based on an effective management plan, pose a serious threat to the safety of people in parks, park resources, or persons or property within or outside park boundaries."
- Section 1.9.1.4 of the 2006 NPS Management Policies manual emphasizes that human life must not be compromised, rendering analysis in the final NCE/EIS a necessity, and states: "The safety and health of employees, contactors, volunteers, and the public are core Service values. In making decisions on matters concerning employee safety and health, NPS managers must exercise good judgment and discretion and, above all, keep in mind that the safeguarding of human life must not be compromised. "
- The Revised Code of Washington (RCW 77.12.035) unambiguously prohibits transplantation or introduction of grizzly bears into the State, including Federal initiatives. RCW 77.12.035 states in part - "Grizzly bears shall not be transplanted or introduced into the State. Only grizzly bears that are native to Washington State may be utilized by the department for management programs."

Correspondence ID: 13912Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Missoula, MT 59807
United States of America
Outside Organization: Wilderness Watch Non-Governmental(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,13 2023 17:04:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Wilderness Watch
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
November 13, 2023

Office of the Superintendent
North Cascades National Park Complex
Grizzly Restoration EIS

810 State Route 20
Sedro-Woolley, WA 98284

Sent via: <https://parkplanning.nps.gov/commentForm.cfm?documentID=132104>

Dear North Cascades National Park Complex Grizzly Recovery Planning Team:

Wilderness Watch is providing these comments on the Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan-Environmental Impact Statement North Cascades Ecosystem (DEIS). Wilderness Watch is a national nonprofit wilderness conservation organization dedicated to the protection and proper stewardship of the National Wilderness Preservation System. Wilderness Watch strongly supports grizzly bear recovery in the North Cascades provided it can be accomplished in a manner that is both respectful of and protects the area's wilderness character and does not result in the unnecessary deaths or harassment of grizzly bears. As such, we feel there are major changes needed to the proposal and DEIS in order for it to accomplish these goals. We also oppose the issuance of a 10(j) rule because it will likely result in the additional loss of grizzly bears and greater deterioration of the Wildernesses in the Cascades, Northern Continental Divide, and Greater Yellowstone Ecosystems.

Attached to this comment is the comment on the 10(j) Rule. While the National Park Service (NPS) may choose to ignore the comments on the 10(j) rule, these two issues are integrally linked.

On occasion, we quote from our past comments and submissions to summarize key points rather than repeat them verbatim in their entirety because you already have those comments and they are part of the record. Also, most of the points made in those past comments are still relevant as the errors in this DEIS remain. Thus, we incorporate by this reference our past comments and submissions for the various iterations of grizzly recovery proposals in the NCE that have been undertaken.

Introduction

A few key points, summarized or alluded to from past comments that are applicable to the current DEIS, are listed below. It is not an all-inclusive list:

- The use of helicopters, trucks, or other mechanized equipment is incompatible with Wilderness. The DEIS proposes a decades-long assault of motorization, grizzly augmentation, and invasive monitoring in Wilderness that are clearly not the minimum necessary. We go into more detail later in this comment.
- The failure to even analyze a pro-active natural recovery alternative biases the DEIS. Further, the real reason for rejection of this alternative is political, rather than scientific, as proven by comments recently made by the North Cascades National Park Complex Supervisor. We go into more detail later in this comment on this issue.
- Connectivity is a major issue. Population ecologists recognize that long-term survival of grizzlies in the lower 48 states can't occur without connectivity to other populations. As such, the fate of any US North Cascades population would be based upon habitat protections, connectivity, and grizzly protection in British Columbia.
- Given the grizzly bear's low reproductive rate, any recovery, regardless of the method employed (augmentation or natural recovery), will take several decades. Augmentation risks the loss of bears from elsewhere, who are placed in unfamiliar surroundings further delaying connectivity and recovery of other populations. Natural recovery does not pose that risk.
- For social and ecological reasons, natural recovery is preferable. Grizzlies that find their own way into the Cascades are likely to find more human acceptance and will be better equipped to deal with humans, than if those bears are released by federal agencies. While the NCE has good habitat, it is also heavily used and adjacent to millions of people.
- Bears from the Northern Continental Divide Ecosystem (NCDE) and Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem (GYE) are not recovered. Removal of grizzlies in those places would prevent recovery of a connected population in the US Northern Rockies including bears which are currently recolonizing the Bitterroot Ecosystem (BE).

The tenor of the DEIS strikes a discordant note as it frequently refers to the national park units and the national forests as

NPS and USFS lands. For example, see DEIS at 12. These are not lands owned by either agency, but the American public as a whole. This erroneous sense of proprietary rights reveals an ugly truth about how the agency views its appropriate role and public service.

Wilderness

Natural recovery is a better option for the long-term well-being of the bears as well as for Wilderness. The use of helicopters, trucks, or other mechanized equipment is incompatible with Wilderness. Options for restoring populations of grizzlies should include measures that are compatible with and respectful of the region's wilderness character including non-motorized and non-mechanized translocation and monitoring of the animals, if that option is selected. Further, even radio collars trammel the wildlife and therefore the Wilderness itself. Wilderness is as much a process as place. It is "untrammeled by man" (wild or unmanipulated or unconfined) with "primeval character and influence." These relate directly to a process that is devoid of human intent to manage habitat or wildlife. In this case, if grizzlies are present in the Wilderness or if it is likely they will expand into the Wilderness, then it should not be necessary to augment them.

Our past comments address the essence and requirements of the Wilderness Act. They are part of the record. When it comes to the statutory requirements of the Wilderness Act, the DEIS is inadequate. We focus on three of these inadequacies in the section that follows:

- The DEIS does not mention the Wilderness Act in the section on statutory direction for grizzly recovery beginning on page 18.
- The DEIS fails to show that translocating bears is the minimum necessary for preservation of the Wilderness, as required by the 1964 Wilderness Act. Similarly, it fails to show that translocating grizzly bears via helicopter into Wilderness and the associated heavy-handed management of collaring, monitoring, and return helicopter intrusions, is the minimum necessary.
- The DEIS downplays the impacts of the heavy-handed action alternatives on Wilderness. Our past comments detailed the problem of the MRA/MRDG process. The dissection of the wilderness attributes via the fatally flawed MRA/MRDG process, which is employed as the protocol for analyzing impacts to Wilderness in this DEIS, downplays the impacts to Wilderness and fails to recognize the essence of Wilderness.

The omission of the Wilderness Act as statutory direction sadly reflects the disregard the NPS shows toward Wilderness. The routine use of helicopters as packstock for trail work and other activities is emblematic of this problem (see DEIS page 96). It seems the agencies view Wilderness as a hurdle to overcome rather than the wild place it is; the domain of creatures like the grizzly.

The DEIS fails to show that translocating bears or the extensive use of helicopters and collaring is the minimum necessary for preservation of the Wilderness. Regarding the translocation of bears and the minimum necessary we wrote in our past DEIS comments (footnote omitted):

The DEIS does not make the case that translocation of bears in Wilderness is necessary. Natural recovery was not analyzed in the DEIS, and thus underlying factors limiting natural recovery were not adequately disclosed and analyzed. If habitat limitations, human-related conflicts, connectivity limitations, or other factors are limiting natural dispersal and recovery, the agencies must explain why those underlying factors cannot be addressed to encourage natural recovery, or alternatively, why those underlying factors will not similarly limit translocation success. In other words, natural recovery would need to be fully considered before translocation could be determined necessary and viable. Additionally, the DEIS inadequately addresses the issue of translocation outside of Wilderness. We address these issues in more detail under the Alternatives section.

Assuming translocation is necessary, the DEIS does not make the case that helicopter use, especially at the levels proposed in the action alternatives, is the minimum necessary. Also, the ongoing collaring and recapture of bears (which is only mentioned and not analyzed in the DEIS) is not shown to be the minimum necessary. Noninvasive monitoring techniques, for example, are not considered and risk factors associated with capturing, collaring, and active transmittal of telemetry data are not disclosed and analyzed.

Looking first at natural recovery, or at least migration from Canada to the US, a news report quoting the superintendent is revelatory. An article from the Skagit Valley Herald on February 12, 2023, entitled National park superintendent talks about challenges facing North Cascades, states:

Since his arrival at the park in late 2021, Striker's thought has been that if Canada does relocate grizzly bears and if they end up establishing a population in North Cascades National Park, then managing them as an experimental population is no longer an option.

"... We are going to be stuck with the normal fish and wildlife rules that say you pretty much can't do anything," he said.

Striker believes the best approach is to get an experimental population in place before the bears arrive on their own.

So much for the claim in the DEIS that grizzly bears won't make it down to the US North Cascades, the basis for rejecting analysis of a natural recovery alternative. The superintendent apparently believes natural recovery will happen and he wants to prevent grizzlies that do come from Canada from full protection under the ESA! Hence, the rush to bombard the Wilderness with helicopters to bring grizzlies taken from other places under an experimental, nonessential population designation. We expect better from our public servants. In sum, the DEIS dissembles the public regarding the possibility of natural recovery even though natural recovery as it relates to the US North Cascades is apparently viable. Therefore, it would be the minimum necessary to protect Wilderness.

If translocating bears were the minimum necessary, and we greatly doubt it because of indications to the contrary as explained in the preceding paragraph, then the next step would be to do it in a way that is the minimum necessary to protect Wilderness. The DEIS states grizzlies will be trapped (supposedly most of the capture would occur outside of Wilderness, though page 108 of the DEIS suggests it could occur inside) and transported in trucks to a staging area. The protocol is to relocate grizzlies away from roads and trails. However, grizzlies are mobile and contact with humans is inevitable, especially in areas that see so much recreation use like the North Cascades. Rather than having all action alternatives confine grizzly placement in the NCE to helicopters (all) in Wilderness (with few or no exceptions), putting grizzlies in remote or relatively remote areas not in Wilderness is an option that should have been explored. Temporarily closing primitive roads for placing grizzlies is preferable. Using helicopters in non-Wilderness backcountry areas is not preferred because of the risks helicopter pose as evidenced by a recent accident at Copper Lake.

Ironically, the agencies' reluctance to temporarily close areas to human use as expressed in the DEIS is belied by the fact the roadless Copper Lake area was recently closed to public use to recover a crashed helicopter (see the footnote above). This behavior sends a signal to the public that the agencies place little value on protecting Wilderness. These options discussed above are less intrusive to Wilderness and would be the minimum necessary if indeed translocating bears is required, yet are not considered by the agency.

Figure 11 (page 107) of the DEIS shows that a portion of the Western Pasayten potential release zone is in roadless country outside of Wilderness and near staging area G. Places like the South Fork Slate Creek and Boulder Creek are remote, trailless areas inside the release zone. The headwaters of the West Fork Methow River and its southern tributaries and the South Fork Trout Creek are trailless areas bordering the release zone. Even better is using the road over Hart's Pass rather than accessing this region via helicopter. The flat near the mouth of Sliver Creek west of Ross lake is in non-wilderness and trailless area bordering the North Unit Park zone and close to staging area A (DEIS Figure 11), but it would require helicopter or boat access.

Other areas where bears might be placed would include Sibley Creek northwest of Cascade Pass Trailhead via the Sibley Creek 1540 route or helicopter in the upper reaches. The non-wilderness portion of Alma Creek, Rhodes Creek (Thunder Creek area) out of the Wilderness, the far reaches of the Baker Lake Road, and areas near Lucerne and Holden could be considered. This list is not exhaustive.

Further, page 92 of the DEIS states, "there is a corridor 100 feet wide, and 50 feet either side of the center of the Cascade and Stehekin River Roads, which is not part of the wilderness designation." These trailheads could be release sites. The Cascade Pass Trailhead is accessible by wheeled vehicle and could be temporarily closed; the Cottonwood Camp is temporarily unavailable to wheeled traffic and could be a release site--it is within the South Unit, Park and GPW (DEIS page

107)- though it would have an impact on the surrounding Wilderness as it would have to be accessed by helicopter. While it is not a preferred site, it is outside of Wilderness.

Even if none of the above suggestions for translocation areas outside of Wilderness prove adequate, the point is the agency has not done a thorough analysis of options outside of Wilderness. Only part of one translocation area is located out of Wilderness.

The Wilderness Act contains a "narrow" exception authorizing helicopter use only where necessary to "further the wilderness character of the area." Wolf Recovery Found., 692 F. Supp. 2d 1264, 1267-68 (D. Id. 2010) (quotation omitted). This exception permits otherwise-prohibited activities only in the "most rare of circumstances" in which denying the activity would itself compromise the integrity of the Wilderness. Id. at 1268. Invoking this provision on such a broad scale (144 landings) would contravene the statutory language and its interpretation by the federal courts, and would permit the exception to swallow the rule that helicopter use is prohibited in Wilderness. See id. ("Helicopters carry 'man and his works' and so are antithetical to a wilderness experience. It would be a rare case where machinery as intrusive as a helicopter could pass the test of being 'necessary to meet minimum requirements for the administration of the area.'").

The only logical conclusion is the DEIS fails to show that either translocating bears or a motorized assault on the Wilderness is necessary to protect the Wilderness and recover grizzly bears. The indication by the superintendent that translocations just north of the border in Canada would lead to a natural recovery south of the border, something the agency wants to prevent, and the failure to consider areas outside of Wilderness for translocation are two fatal flaws in the DEIS.

The DEIS downplays the impacts of the heavy-handed action alternatives on Wilderness. Some background dissecting the Wilderness Act into competing parts is in order because this erroneous fragmentation of wilderness attributes is the basis for making the Wilderness Act a procedural rather than a substantive law, via the flawed MRA/MRDG process.

The DEIS at 91 cites to Landres et al. 2015. This flawed protocol is the subject of the Cole et al. 2015 critique which has already been provided to you. Aside from the fact it is not legal or logical there are three other problems with this approach illustrated in the bullet points below that relate directly to the Landres et al. Reference.

1. The Origins and Consequences of Defining Wilderness Character through Fragmenting The Eloquent Whole of the Wilderness Act

Landres and others identified their various attributes of wilderness character by dissecting the Wilderness Act. It was an exercise in reductionism. From our communications with Landres, the main purpose behind this exercise was to be able to objectively monitor changes in wilderness character in the National Wilderness Preservation System. Hence, the protocol cited in the DEIS, Keeping it Wild 2. While this process to define wilderness character was undoubtedly a well-intended effort, as time has passed, it is clear it has serious negative unintended consequences for Wilderness. Other wilderness specialists and researchers recognize these failings in their pointed critique (again, see Cole et al. 2015). A prime example of a negative consequence is the erroneous idea that managers could trade off various components of wilderness character against each other, thereby reducing the Wilderness Act into a procedural process via the MRA/MRDG process. This management mindset, which effectively repeals and rewrites the Wilderness Act, is a recent development. It is doubtful even those wilderness specialists who defined wilderness character in a reductionist manner would concur. That leads to the second point below.

2. This bizarre dissection of the Wilderness Act conflates the essence of Wilderness, its character, with other attributes.

Footnote 2 provides an introduction to this topic. Cole et al. 2015 continue on page 4:

The five-quality KIW2 definition confuses wilderness character with a list of all the things we value in wilderness and would like to protect and preserve. By making all wilderness values a part of wilderness character, and treating all those values as equal in importance, this definition negates the intended purpose and meaning of wilderness character. Most onerously, it undervalues the importance of protecting wildness. Wilderness character cannot be protected above other wilderness attributes and values if all attributes and values are included in the definition of wilderness character and wildness cannot be

emphasized when it is just one of many values that managers might protect.

In recent years, our concerns about the inappropriate KIW2 definition of wilderness character have grown, as those who developed it have promoted its use--not just as a monitoring framework--but as the basis for wilderness stewardship (Landres et al. 2011). Without meaningful public involvement, the agencies charged with wilderness management have incorporated the five-quality definition into their stewardship policy and guidance and it has been incorporated into stewardship decision making processes such as the Minimum Requirements Decision Guide (Arthur Carhart National Wilderness Training Center n.d.). Wilderness stewardship decisions based on an inappropriate definition of wilderness character are likely to be inappropriate and ultimately will harm wilderness. Of particular concern is the internally contradictory nature of the KIW2 framework, which makes it acceptable to trade-off degradation of a quality such as "untrammeled" for improvement in another quality such as "natural." This gives managers almost infinite discretion in deciding which values will be protected and which will be compromised to achieve their goals.

In this article, we provide a more appropriate definition of wilderness character and a rationale for why wilderness character should be defined this way, arguing that our definition is more consistent with the Wilderness Act and better for wilderness than the five-quality KIW2 definition. We address concerns that some have raised with our approach and conclude with specific recommendations for moving forward in a manner that meets many of the goals of KIW2, despite the need to develop a more appropriate definition of wilderness character.

In a program review initiated by the four federal agencies, including the NPS, and conducted by the Pinchot Institute for Conservation in 2001, the importance of untrammeled (or wildness) is emphasized. The purpose of the study was to examine the critical administrative or stewardship issues facing Wilderness. One of the eight "fundamental principles" for stewardship emphasized the need to preserve the wildness in Wilderness. As the Pinchot report stated, "Protection of the natural wild, where nature is not controlled, is critical in ensuring that a place is wilderness... Since wild is a fundamental characteristic of wilderness that is not attainable elsewhere, if there is a choice between emphasizing naturalness and wildness, stewards should err on the side of wildness." This clear direction, developed at the behest of the agencies, precedes the flawed MRDG/MRA process and the monitoring protocol. Neither the MRDG/MRA process or the monitoring protocol have gone through rulemaking.

3. The Monitoring Protocol Itself Does Not Offer Support for the Manipulation Proposed for the Wilderness in the North Cascades

In *Keeping It Wild 2: An Updated Interagency Strategy to Monitor Trends in Wilderness Character Across the National Wilderness Preservation System*, Landres et al. 2015. RMRS-GTR-340 has this to say about untrammeled:

To preserve the Untrammeled Quality of wilderness, managers need to exercise restraint when authorizing actions that manipulate any aspect of the wilderness--in general actions that trammel should be avoided as an essential principle of wilderness stewardship unless it can be shown that these actions are necessary to preserve wilderness character as a whole (Kaye 2014).

Landres et al. 2015 at 34. It is hard to conceive of trammeling actions that would be necessary for this purpose. The Strategy cited above and its associated Monitoring Selected Conditions Related to Wilderness Character: A National Framework.

Landres, et al. 2005. RMRS-GTR-151 cite two of the Forest Service's preeminent wilderness researchers in describing how the untrammeled quality of Wilderness affects management. Cole (2000) in Framework states that untrammeled "suggests more about the process of management than it does about the outcomes of management." (Emphasis added). The Strategy paper states,

Lucas (1973, p. 151) stated, "If ecological processes operate essentially uncontrolled within the Wilderness frame of reference, the results, whatever they might be, are desirable by definition. The object is not to stop change, nor to recreate conditions as of some arbitrary historical date, nor to strive for favorable change in big game populations or in scenic vistas. The object is to let nature 'roll the dice' and accept the results with interest and scientific curiosity."

Landres et al. 2015 at 33. The action alternatives that affect the Stephen Mather, Pasayten, and Glacier Peak Wildernesses are not consistent with this guidance.

In other words, the fragmentation of the Wilderness Act into inconsistent and competing directives is the wrong approach. It misses the essence of Wilderness and violates the laws of statutory construct. Regardless, the monitoring protocol is not to be used as a decision-making tool as is being done in this case.

The DEIS admits on page 94 that the NPS “participates in a number of actions that may trammel wilderness in an effort to protect other qualities of wilderness character.” See also page 99 for Forest Service actions. As noted above, this approach is contrary to statutory construction and any reading of the Wilderness Act. The actions, supposedly on the part of natural , always affect the wildness/untrammelled essence of Wilderness.

We really don't know how many helicopter flights and landings will be done or the time frame for this project. The DEIS suggests 144 (page 30) and 10 years, but other pages (compare 26 and 33) implies more helicopter flights could be used in the adaptive management phase, which will last from 60 to 100 years. Further, the DEIS's analysis that 144 helicopter landings and the trammeling actions are only temporary ignores the fact that a trammeling is permanent (see pages 104 to 110). Under the twisted rationale expressed in the DEIS (including the MRDG), it would be okay to allow motorized use in Wilderness to enhance the recreational public purpose of wilderness, say for two weeks every year, since it is only temporary. Downplaying the impacts as the DEIS does is like saying that a violent assault on a person has no lasting effects once the assault ends. In essence, the proposal is an administrative decision to de-designate Wilderness, at least for decades.

The MRDG (and elsewhere in the DEIS too) makes the same mistake we raised in our past comments. The following bullet points summarize those concerns:

- The draft MRDG determination of necessity is made in step one before weighing the various wilderness attributes, which occurs in step two. While untrammelled is the preeminent wilderness attribute, it is buried by the flawed MRDG protocol and reduced to a second-class status.
- The second step of the MRDG confuses the public purposes (plural) of Wilderness) in section 4(b) of the Wilderness Act with the singular purpose mentioned in section 4(c) of the Act (see page E-9). Prohibited uses in section 4(c) are only allowed if they are the minimum necessary for the singular purpose of the Act. If prohibited uses could be waived to facilitate, for example, recreational use, which is found in section 4(b), then motorized use and buildings could be constructed to enhance recreation.
- The finding of necessity in the draft MRDG (and elsewhere in the DEIS too) is contradictory to agency actions elsewhere. If it is necessary to translocate bears in the NCE, why is it no longer necessary in the Bitterroot Ecosystem grizzly recovery area, where the decision to do was withdrawn? Removing bears from one threatened population to another could endanger both populations and would have a negative impact in both cases on Wilderness (see also DEIS on page 108, which only does a cursory analysis of impacts to removing grizzlies from Wilderness for translocation to the NCE). The tradeoffs rating in the MRDG are in error. Page E-16 fails to include the ongoing trammeling of collaring grizzlies, which could entail more trammeling or motorized use in Wilderness. Only one item is counted as trammeling in the checklist. The features of other value turns the Wilderness Act on its head. It considers that use of helicopters beneficial to Wilderness. Such a conclusion is absurd. Even then, the MRDG rating system shows this action has more negative impacts.

In sum, the Wilderness analysis in the DEIS (including the MRDG) is inconsistent with the Wilderness Act and NEPA. As shown above, it downplays the extensive damage to Wilderness from the proposal. It refuses to look at alternatives that recovery grizzlies and protect Wilderness. It ignores fully analyzing issues like vegetation removal in Wilderness for the sole purpose of landing sites (page 14) and soundscapes, which affect areas in and out of Wilderness (page 15). The DEIS needs to be drastically altered to include options that don't invade Wilderness and do an adequate analysis of impacts on Wilderness in the NCE and the US Northern Rockies.

Grizzly Bears

In our past comments we noted:

The paucity of information about grizzlies in British Columbia in the DEIS is troubling because the purpose and need is premised on a conclusion that no natural recovery could ever take place. Even if that conclusion were accurate, and no connectivity is or would be available in the future, the number of bears that would occupy the NCE are too few for long-term viability (see Attachment K). Thus, the action alternatives that are studied would effectively condemn the translocated bears or their offspring to eventual extinction under that assumption.

In sum, the purpose and need is premised on a conundrum. The assumption that connectivity of grizzly populations in the NCE and elsewhere in BC is no longer possible, so translocation to the NCE is necessary. Yet, the NCE is not large enough for long-term viability of grizzly populations without connectivity. Without more information about the situation in BC, and without an alternative fully exploring natural recovery and efforts the agency may take to increase the success of natural recovery, it is impossible to gauge the need and ultimate effectiveness of more intrusive translocation efforts.

The DEIS promotes taking bears from the NCDE, GYE, and in British Columbia. It does not evaluate the impacts of taking bears from the two sub-populations in the US Northern Rockies, both listed as threatened. Will recovery be hampered by the removal of bears from those two sub-populations and in the Bitterroot Ecosystem, where bears are just now returning? How does taking grizzlies out of their territories in Wilderness in the Northern Rockies affect those Wildernesses and others in the US Northern Rockies, such as the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness where grizzlies are starting to recolonize?

The experimental, nonessential listing under section 10(j) of the ESA could easily fail as well. There is far more latitude to kill grizzlies under the experimental population designation than under full protection as threatened or endangered, which the population currently warrants. In fact, the NCE recovery area has inclusions within it that are Management Zone 3, "that may be incompatible with grizzly presence" under the 10(j) rule (see DEIS pages 36 and 37).

Since there are no food storage orders currently for the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest, and the Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest just initiated such an order this year, it seems premature to consider releasing bears until a program is in place and operating for some time that deals with sanitation, food storage, and public education (DEIS page 25). The 10(j) rule and the lack of preparation for recovery or augmentation are serious threats to grizzlies and the Wilderness.

Page 7 of the DEIS shows a map of where grizzlies are located in various units in BC, but it does not do the same for the US. Having a better visual representation is important.

Summary

As our earlier comments stated:

Wilderness Watch urges the agencies involved to take all measures necessary to promote the natural recovery of grizzlies to the North Cascades Ecosystem. We urge you to encourage the government of British Columbia to take all necessary measures to protect grizzlies in the ecosystem on the Canada side of the border. Only after measures are in place to protect existing populations of grizzlies, and those measures are shown to be inadequate to allow the natural recovery of grizzlies in the area should augmentation be considered.

Grizzlies should be an important part of the wild Cascades. However, the DEIS fails to make the case that augmentation, especially with the proposed means that harm Wilderness, is truly needed or that it will have some measure of success. The grizzly bears and the Wilderness deserve nothing less than a well-considered analysis, which this DEIS fails to accomplish.

Please keep us updated on this proposal.

Sincerely,


Conservation Director

Correspondence ID:	13913Project:112008Document:132104
Address:	Fairbanks, AK 99708 United States of America
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual
Received:	Nov,13 2023 17:07:05

Correspondence Type:

Web Form

Correspondence: 13 November, 2023

RE: Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Environmental Impact Statement, North Cascades Ecosystem

Dear Superintendent,

I wanted to first state that I personally support the restoration of grizzly bears in the North Cascades, and that I support National Park Service's preferred Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation.

Although there are many different facts, values and points-of-view that need to be considered regarding how best to restore bears there, I believe that the grizzly bear belongs in the North Cascades and that the responsible thing to do is for agencies to help restore a sustaining population of bears in the habitat.

I also want to share a position statement that The International Association for Bear Research and Management (IBA) prepared for an earlier Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/EIS Impact Statement, dated January 2017. The IBA is the global professional society of bear specialists and I want to make sure their comments and perspectives were considered in this EIS. Though the alternatives and approaches may have changed somewhat, there are quite a few points that should still be relevant and considered for this effort. IBA's earlier submission on the previous Restoration Plan/EIS follows.

Sincerely,

██████████

23 October 2019

Superintendent, North Cascade National Park Service Complex

810 State Route 20

Sedro-Wooley, WA 98284

and submitted at:

RE: International Association for Bear Research and Management comment on Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/EIS Impact Statement, dated January 2017

Dear Superintendent:

The International Association for Bear Research and Management (<https://www.bearbiology.org>) is the professional organization of bear researchers and managers involved with the world's 8 bear species. We have more than 500 members from all continents with bears, publish the peer-reviewed journal "Ursus" and the newsletter "International Bear News", fund research and conservation projects, and hold scientific conferences worldwide. Two components of our mission statement are to "Support sound stewardship of the world's bears through scientifically-based population and habitat management" and "Provide professional counsel and advice on issues of natural resource policy related to bear management and conservation." We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the draft plan to restore grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE) in Washington State.

The grizzly bear existed as the apex predator in NCE until recent times, but the population was decimated by over-killing during the last century. Similarly, the North Cascades National Park, within the NCE, lacks grizzlies and it is consistent with the mission of the National Park Service to correct the imbalance that exists without the presence of this apex predator. The ecological importance of apex predators has been demonstrated in many studies including Jacoby et al. 1999; Terborgh and Estes 2010; Estes et al. 2011; Ripple et al. 2013, 2014. Grizzly bears south of Canada are currently listed as "threatened" under the US Endangered Species Act (ESA). The NCE has been identified as one of 6 areas south of Canada that retain all the elements necessary to support recovery of a healthy grizzly bear population in North America, including bear foods, remoteness, large landscape extent, and large areas of public land ownership, including National Parks. The ESA requires that plans be developed for recovering grizzly bear populations in all six of these areas. In the NCE, grizzly bears are classified as "warranted but precluded" for uplisting from "threatened" to "endangered" status. There is no evidence that a permanent population of grizzly bears has existed in the NCE since the species was listed in 1975, although, as noted in the draft EIS, individuals have been sighted there on rare occasions. In Canada, immediately north of the US-Canadian border and adjacent to the NCE, there is also no confirmed grizzly bear population; Apps et al. (2014) suggest the population is extinct there as well and is highly threatened in disjunct areas a bit further north.

There is no evidence that any natural recovery of a grizzly bear population has occurred in the NCE on either side of the US/Canada border since grizzly bears were listed in the US. Based on this experience and the NCE's isolation from other grizzly bear populations, there is no reason to believe that restoration of bears to the NCE can be accomplished with the "no action" alternative "A" proposed in this EIS. Intentional specific actions, as proposed in

alternatives B - D, are essential for restoring a viable grizzly bear population to the NCE. In the portion of Canada adjacent to the NCE, road densities may be high enough north of Highway 3 to hinder restoration of grizzlies there, but south of Highway 3, environmental conditions remain good for sustaining a population (T. Hamilton, BC Government [ret.] personal communication).

We commend the US National Park Service and the US Fish and Wildlife Service for the draft EIS which is comprehensive in scope and presents 3 reasonable action alternatives. We recommend adoption of action Alternative "C" (incremental restoration) as being the most likely to result in acquisition of the information on limiting factors that is required to ultimately restore a successful population with the minimal number of bears lost to avoidable mortalities. Additionally, we believe it is possible that a successful breeding population likely can be established with the translocation of 25 bears using the protocols described in the EIS for Alternative "C". If experience indicates that problems are arising, such as low encounter frequency between males and females, this can be addressed by introducing more males or by switching to Alternative "D" as outlined as a fallback in the draft EIS.

It is our opinion that Alternative "B" (Ecosystem Evaluation Restoration) would involve translocating too few bears initially (10) to permit adequate evaluation of factors limiting success. Alternative "B" therefore would likely result, in time, in the decision to subsequently implement Alternative "C" or to repeat "B" with an additional small sample of 10 bears. Experience with black bear restorations as well as brown bear restorations in Europe indicate that the 4-year evaluation period proposed for Alternative "B" is too short to meaningfully assess population recovery, particularly with such a small number of bears. Alternative "C", because of the larger number of translocated bears, would better enable identification of key problems and allow more accurate inferences about limiting factors and how best to overcome them during further translocations. Further, some costs, such as capture, reintroduction, monitoring, and information-education could be reduced on a "per bear" basis by amortizing these costs over more bears.

Alternative "D" (Expedited Restoration) would also be acceptable. However, this alternative would reduce the ability to adequately, expeditiously, and economically adjust to mortalities that occur and to prevent unnecessary avoidable losses of bears (responsive management). Avoidable mortalities could reduce popular support for population restoration, including among people generally supportive of restoration efforts, and we suggest that the more gradual approach of Alternative "C" would prove more effective at avoiding unnecessary mortalities. Moreover, we believe that a more gradual approach, as long as some reproduction is documented within 5 years after initiation of translocations, is also likely to reduce public concerns and opposition to restoration efforts.

It is our opinion that all the alternatives, especially "C" and "D", would benefit from the management flexibility provided by designating the population as a 10(j) (experimental) population. It is probably inevitable that some "take" will be necessary under a 4(d) exemption. The rule for section 4(d) take should make it clear that killing of bears involved in repeated instances of livestock depredation will be allowed. This is the case in other recovery areas, even without 10(j) designation, and procedures have been developed in these areas to address the concerns of and the consequences to livestock owners. The same stipulations in the 10(j) rule should be clear, including the allowable take of individual bears deemed to be threatening to human safety. These assurances must be made clear from the start in the 10(j) ruling, despite the possibility that it could prompt opposition to grizzly restoration among some people who are opposed to allowing any lethal control of bears.

Though we support a 10(j) ruling, we are concerned that implementing 10(j) and the associated rule-making process will delay the beginning of the restoration, which has already experienced delays since the current EIS was published in January 2017. For this reason, we recommend proceeding with the 10(j) rule-making on an expedited timetable to assure that the current momentum is not lost.

We have several comments and suggestions on the draft EIS that we believe would be useful for you to consider in the process of preparing the final EIS. These are:

1. Be more explicit in the introductory materials (Purpose and Needs statement) for the final EIS that the North Cascades Ecosystem is one of 6 official recovery zones identified in the recovery plan for grizzlies under the U.S. Endangered Species Act (ESA). In these designated recovery areas, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is required by the ESA to develop a recovery plan like the current (draft) EIS. The NCE, therefore, is not an optional area for recovery under the ESA.
2. Give additional emphasis to the importance and need of close cooperation with the government of British Columbia and First Nations peoples and tribal entities on both sides of the border. Cooperative efforts should include comprehensive, long-term, post-reintroduction transborder studies focused initially on movements and habitat use, recruitment, mortality, and human/bear conflicts and cooperatively conducted and funded between US and Canadian scientists. On the Canadian side these studies should focus on the area south of Highway 3 where habitat conditions and road densities are most conducive to reestablishment of a viable population connected to a restored NCE population on the US side. Discussions on restoration

strategies should include Canadian representative(s) from the Ad Hoc group of BC government officials, First Nations representatives, and environmental NGOs, currently chaired by Dr. Garth Mowat (Provincial Large Carnivore Specialist, Wildlife & Habitat Branch, Ministry of Forests, Lands, Natural Resource Operations & Rural Development [garth.mowat@gov.bc.ca]). We suggest that you consider giving this representative(s) a voting seat on the NCE subcommittee of the Interagency Grizzly Bears Committee (IGBC).

3. Consider translocating female bears from a more diverse age class than is currently identified in Alternatives "B" and "C" and more like that in "D". Information from augmentation efforts in the Cabinet-Yaak recovery effort in northwestern Montana suggests that subadult females may be the least likely to exhibit homing movements. The practical logistics of capturing bears, however, include the fact that a bear's age cannot be estimated until it is in hand in most cases. This means that some young adult females without offspring will be captured and rather than releasing them we suggest that such bears might be reasonable candidates to translocate to the NCE. Females without cubs in the fall might be pregnant, based on experiences with black bear (Joseph Clark, personal communication) and European brown bear (Andreas Zedrosser, personal communication) restorations; translocating females immediately prior to the denning period increases chances that they will den in the release area. If they emerge in the spring with newborn cubs and consequently low mobility, it could contribute to the likelihood they will remain in the NCE. In any case, information gained from the movements and behavior of young adult females released in the NCE site will inform future captures and releases. Similarly, age of males targeted for translocation need not be limited to males of 2-4 years of age as indicated for Alternatives "B" and "C". Young males are less likely to exhibit homing behavior than older males (Miller and Ballard 1982) and might be more likely to remain where released. However, for the same practical and logistic reasons as mentioned above, some males up to 10 years, as indicated for Alternative "D", could also be considered for fall translocation.

4. Emphasize translocating bears in the fall to encourage denning in the recovery area. This recommendation is based on the assumption that bears denning in the area will be less likely to attempt to "home" following translocation. Restorations of black bears into the southeastern states were most successful during winter when bears were removed from dens to be translocated to new habitats (Eastridge and Clark 2001; Murphy et al. 2015, 2018, 2019). Although this winter-release technique is not feasible or advisable for grizzly bears, it is likely that much the same effect can be obtained with captures and releases timed for the immediate pre-denning period. Numerous studies have shown that pregnant females are the first to enter dens in the fall (e.g. Servheen and Klaver 1983, Miller 1990, Van Daele et al. 1990, Clark et al. 2002, Haroldson et al. 2002, Schwartz et al. 2003, Pigeon et al. 2016). For males, fall release is also most recommended. However, once there are estrous females established in an area, male bears that have reached breeding age may be more likely to stay near their release site if translocated during the breeding season. In all cases, we strongly recommend taking a scientific approach to designing and documenting the results of translocation protocols. This will allow those implementing the restoration to compare methods and then adapt. Little will be learned if the protocols are done haphazardly.

5. The information gained from the reestablishment of black bear populations cited above should be better exploited to inform the final EIS. Similarly, experiences gained from restoration of brown bear populations in Europe, such as in northern Italy, may be informative. There, 7 females and 3 males, taken from a source population in Slovenia, were released during 1999 - 2001 to augment a critically low population, and the lower threshold of a minimum viable population (goal of 40 - 60 individuals) was reached in 2012 (Mustoni et al. 2003, Tosi et al. 2015).

6. The draft EIS is perhaps too specific and limited with regards to source populations. Now that trophy hunting is no longer allowed in British Columbia (since 2017), there will likely be less competition for bears to translocate from hunters and guide outfitters. Regardless, it seems sensible to not limit potential source stocks in the final EIS by specifically identifying them. Obviously, it would be less expensive to get bears from areas closer to the release site and such nearby bears may be preferable from some standpoints (such as possible genetic adaptations to local conditions). On the other hand, bears from more distant areas may provide additional genetic diversity and corresponding resilience. Brown bears were restored successfully to southern France (Quenette et al. 2001) and northern Italy (Tosi et al. 2015) from Slovenia--distances of >1600 and >400 km, respectively. It is necessary, of course, to translocate bears from source populations that have similar food economies to what they will experience in the NCE (plants, berries, ungulate neonates).

7. The above comments on sources notwithstanding, new evidence of potential problems to the health of bears translocated to the area has come to light since the draft EIS was written. This concern needs to be taken into consideration in the final EIS. Robbins et al. (2018) identified an encysted fluke (*Nanophyetus salmincola*) containing an endosymbiont in Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha* and possibly other species of Pacific salmon) from US Pacific Northwest states that may cause salmon poisoning disease (SPD) in bears exposed by eating infected salmon. This means that the potential for grizzlies introduced into the NCE to feed on infected salmon must be analyzed in the Final EIS. As suggested by Robbins et al. (2018), this new complication might also mandate studies to see if black bears endemic to the NCE have been exposed to this

pathogen. Further studies on the development of resistance to SPD may also be warranted as suggested by Robbins et al. (2018).

8. Translocations of large numbers of grizzly bears are rare. The draft EIS considers the personal safety of biologists involved and mortality risks to bears. The final EIS would benefit from mention of the 1979 experience in Alaska, when 49 grizzly bears were translocated from a study area during spring, by helicopter, fixed wing aircraft, and truck, as part of a moose calf survivorship experiment (Miller and Ballard 1982). During this effort, one bear died during capture and no biologists were injured (S. Miller, Alaska Department of Fish and Game [retired] personal communication). In 1979, immobilization drugs available were less safe for bears than those currently available that are used widely on all bear species (Cattet et al. 1997, 2003).

9. When translocations occur, it may be helpful to encourage bears to remain in the immediate release area by perhaps pre-positioning road kill ungulate carcasses at release sites especially in remote high elevation sites unlikely to be inhabited by black bears. Such efforts have yielded mixed results (Gordon Stenhouse, personal communication), however, they might help to keep newly translocated bears close their release sites.

10. We believe the cost estimates for action alternatives listed in Appendix Table D-3 are reasonable. We note, however, the absence of estimates for documenting changes in population abundance. Assuming bears successfully reproduce following translocation, we suggest this type of monitoring needs a well thought out design, and would be based on creating a genetic database, initially from biological samples taken from every individual translocated to the NCE or handled thereafter; the database would be updated with opportunistic collection of hair and scat samples (DeBarba et al. 2010). In time, this could form the basis for periodic and systematic sampling for population monitoring (Bellemain et al. 2005, McLellan et al. 2019). The EIS should also indicate if and how radio-collars will be used to monitor bears translocated into the NCE (Preatoni et al. 2005).

11. If translocation of bears to the NCE is successful, the hope is that the population will grow. It will be necessary to monitor population growth and, in the long term, achievement of the desired target of 200 individuals; this will require considerable long-term funds in addition to the estimated costs itemized in Table D-3. We suspect that the most cost-effective means of monitoring population growth with minimal disturbance will be based on DNA hair-snaring and rub tree studies (e.g. Kendall et al. 2009, 2016, McLellan et al. 2019). Additionally, we recommend that the final EIS be specific about what age cohorts will be included in the targeted population of 200 bears (i.e. with cubs and yearlings be included or just independent bears?). We suggest that the target be 200 "independent" bears (bears > 2.0 years old). Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

██████████
President

International Association for Bear Research and Management (IBA)

cc: ██████████ Large Carnivore Specialist ██████████

References Cited

Apps, C., D. Paetkau, S. Rochetta, B. McLellan, A. Hamilton, and B. Bateman. 2014. Grizzly bear population abundance, distribution, and connectivity across British Columbia's southern Coast Ranges. Draft Version 2.0. Aspen Wildlife Research and Ministry of Environment, Victoria, British Columbia.

Bellemain, E, Swenson, J., Talmon, D., Brunberg, S., and Taberlet, P. 2005. Estimating population size of elusive animals with DNA from hunter-collected feces: four methods for brown bears. *Conservation Biology*. Wiley Online. DOI:10.1111/j.1523-1739.2005.00549.x

Cattet, M.R.L., Caulkett, N.A., Polischuk, S.C., and Ramsay, M.A. 1997. Reversible immobilization of free-ranging polar bears with medetomidine-zolazepam-tiletamine and atipamezole. *Journal of Wildlife Diseases* 33: 611-617.

Cattet, M.R.L., Caulkett, N.A., and Lunn, N.J. 2003. Anesthesia of polar bears using xylazine-zolazepam-tiletamine or zolazepam-tiletamine. *Journal of Wildlife Diseases* 39: 655-664.

Clark, J.D., Huber, D., Servheen, C. 2002. Bear Reintroductions: Lessons and Challenges. *Ursus* 13:335345

- De Barba, M., Waits, L. P., Garton, E. O., Genovesi, P., Randi, E., Mustoni, A., & Groff, C. 2010. The power of genetic monitoring for studying demography, ecology and genetics of a reintroduced brown bear population. *Molecular Ecology*, 19, 3938-3951. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-294X.2010.04791.x
- Eastridge, R., and J.D. Clark. 2001. Evaluation of 2 soft-release techniques to reintroduce black bears. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 28(4):1163-1174.
- Estes, J.A., J. Terborgh, J.S. Brashares, M.E. Power, J. Berger, W.J. Bond, S.R. Carpenter, T.E. Essington, R.D. Holt, J.B.C. Jackson, R.J. Marquis, L. Oksanen, T. Oksanen, R.T. Paine, E.K. Pikitch, W.J. Ripple, S.A. Sandin, M. Scheffer, T.W. Schoener, J.B. Shurin, A.R.E. Sinclair, M.E. Soule, R. Virtanen, and D.A. Wardle. 2011. Trophic Downgrading of Planet Earth. *Science* 333: 301-306.
- Haroldson, M.A., M.A. Ternent, K.A. Gunther, & C.C. Schwartz, C.C. 2002. Grizzly bear denning chronology and movements in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem. *Ursus* 13:29-37.
- Jacoby, M.E. G.V. Hilderbrand, C. Servheen, C.C. Schwartz, S.M. Arthur, T.A. Hanley, C.T. Robbins, and R.M. Michener. 1999. Trophic relations of brown bears and black bears in several western North American ecosystems. *J. Wildlife Management* 63:921-929.
- Kendall, K. C., J.B. Stetz, J. Boulanger, A.C. Macleod, D. Paetkau, and G.C. White. 2009. Demography and genetic structure of a recovering grizzly bear population. *J. Wildlife Management* 73:3-17.
- Kendall, K.C. A.C. Macleod, K.L. Boyd, J. Boulanger, J.A. Royle, W.F. Kasworm, D. Paetkau, M.F. Proctor, K. Annis, and T.A. Graves. 2016. Density, distribution, and genetic structure of grizzly bears in the Cabinet-Yaak Ecosystem. *J. Wildlife Management* 80:314-331.
- McLellan, M., McLellan, B., Sollman, R., Lamb, C., Apps, C., and Wittmer, H. 2019. Divergent population trends following the cessation of legal grizzly bear hunting in southwestern British Columbia, Canada. *Biological Conservation* 233: 247-254.
- Miller, S.D., and W.B. Ballard. 1982. Homing of translocated Alaskan brown bears. *J. Wildlife Management* 46(2):869-876.
- Miller, S.D. 1990. Denning ecology of brown bears in south-central Alaska and comparisons with sympatric black bear population. *Bears: Their Biology and Management* 8:279-287.
- Murphy, S.M., J.J. Cox, J.D. Clark, B.C. Augustine, J.T. Hast, D. Gibbs, M. Strunk, and S. Dobey. 2015. *Journal of Wildlife Management* DOI:10.1002/jwmg.886.
- Murphy, S.M., J., S. Laufenberg, J.D. Clark, M. Davidson, J.L. Belant, and D.L. Garshelis. 2018. Genetic diversity, effective population size, and structure among black bear populations in the Lower Mississippi Alluvial Valley, USA. *Conservation Genetics* <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10592-018-1075-6>. May 25, 2018.
- Murphy, S.M., J.T. Hast, B.C. Augustine, D.W. Weisrock, J.D. Clark, D.M. Kocka, C.W. Ryan, J.L. Sajecki, and J.J. Cox. 2019. Early genetic outcomes of American black bear reintroductions in the Central Appalachians, USA. *Ursus* 29:119-133.
- Mustoni, A, Carlini, E., Chiarenzi, B., Chiozzini, S., Lattuada, E., Dupré, E., Genovesi, P., Pedrotti, L., Martinoli, A., Preatoni, D., Wauters, L.A., Tosi, G. 2003. Planning the brown bear *Ursus Arctos* reintroduction in the Adamello Brenta Natural Park. A tool to establish a metapopulation in the Central-Eastern Alps. *Hystrix Italian Journal of Mammalogy* 14(1-2):3-27.
- Pigeon, K.E., G. Stenhouse, & S.D. Coté. 2016. Drivers of hibernation: linking food and weather to denning behaviour of grizzly bears. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* 70:1745-1754.
- Preatoni, D., Mustoni, A., Martinoli, A., Carlini, E., Chiarenzi, B., Chiozzini, S., Tosi, G. (2005). Conservation of brown bear in the Alps: space use and settlement behavior of reintroduced bears. *Acta Oecologica*, 28(3), 189-197.

Quenette, P.Y., Alonso, M., Chayron, L., Cluzel, P., Dubarry, E., Dubreuil, D., Palazon, S., Pomarol, M. Preliminary results of the first transplantation of brown bears in the French Pyrenees. *Ursus* 12:115-120.

Ripple, W.J., R.L. Beschta, J.K. Fortin, and C.T. Robbins. 2013. Trophic cascades from wolves to grizzly bears in Yellowstone. *J. Animal Ecology* 1-11.

Ripple, W.J., J.A. Estes, R.L. Beschta, C.C. Wilmsers, E.G. Ritchie, M. Hebblewhite, J. Berger, B. Elmhagen, M. Letnic, M.P. Nelson, O.J. Schmitz, D.W. Smith, A.D. Wallach, and A.J. Wirsing. 2014. Status and ecological effects of the world's largest carnivores. *Science* 343, 2014.

Robbins, C.T., N.L. Woodford, G. G. Clyde, C. Minor, O.L. Nelson, M.M. Brewer, P.H. Khalife, and J.R. Hawley. 2018. Salmon poisoning disease in grizzly bears with population recovery implications. *J. Wildlife Management* DOI: 10.1002/jwmg.21502.

Schwartz, C.C., S.D. Miller, and M.A. Haroldson. 2003. Grizzly Bear (*Ursus arctos*). Pages 556-586, in G. A. Feldhamer, B.C. Thompson, and J.A. Chapman, eds. *Wild Mammals of North America. Biology, Management, and Conservation*. Second edition. The Johns Hopkins Univ. Press. Baltimore and London.

Servheen, C., & R. Klaver. 1983. Grizzly Bear Dens and Denning Activity in the Mission and Rattlesnake Mountains, Montana. *Bears: Their Biology and Management* 5:201-207

Servheen, C. 1990. Status and conservation of the bears of the world. *International Conference Bear Research and Management Monograph No. 2*.

Terborgh, J. and J. Estes, Eds. 2010. *Trophic cascades: predators, prey, and the changing dynamics of nature*. Island Press.

Tosi, G., Chirichella, R., Zibordi, F., Mustoni, A., Giovannini, R., Groff, C., Zanin, M., Apollonio M. 2015. Brown bear reintroduction in the Southern Alps: To what extent are expectations being met? *Journal for Nature Conservation* 26:9-19.

Van Daele, L.J., V.G. Barnes, & R.B. Smith, R.B. 1990. Denning characteristics of brown bears on Kodiak Island, Alaska. *Bears: Their Biology and Management* 8:257-267.

Correspondence ID: 13915Project:112008Document:132104

Address: REDMOND, WA 98052
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 17:11:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Another Alternative should be considered with restoration to occur in the Capitol Forest and in Discovery Park

Correspondence ID: 13916Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Cusick, WA 99119
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 17:12:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I don't agree with letting grizzly bear this far south. We have enough problems trying to keep the elk and deer population up. This year has been one of the worst hunting years in history because we don't have enough big game to hunt. We need to remove more predators instead of bringing more in.

I Nickales E. Bezanson Vote No .

Correspondence ID: 13918Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Newcastle, WA 98056
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 17:20:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello, I'm not an expert, just a hiker. I'm not sure what your objective is. Large mammals, including wolves, mountain lions and grizzlies, scare me. I don't see what the animals gain from being deliberately introduced. There's always going to be conflicts. I guess if they came down from Canada on their own, leave them. But why introduce them?

Many brown bears inhabit areas close to where I live in Newcastle. People get them in their yards in Issaquah and elsewhere all the time. They get a taste for people food and trash, to the point that some must be killed. I encountered a fairly small brown bear on a trail on Cougar Mt., close to where I live. I'm glad they were interested in the shrub they were eating and not me. I really don't want to encounter a grizzly in the N. Cascades!

I'm sorry this isn't more scientific or statistical. I just want to voice my opinion to not introduce them. I'd hate for someone to die in Washington from a grizzly attack and then F&W has to kill the animal.

Thank you,
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 13920Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bothell, WA 98011
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 17:24:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please, for the health of all living beings in the Pacific NW RETURN Grizzly Bears to the Pacific North West and Washington. The Science is clear that they will help us restore healthy habitat .
The eyes of the future are looking back at us and praying we see before our own time.

Thank you for your consideration, your service, and all you do for America.

Correspondence ID: 13921Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Stehekin, WA 98852
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 17:27:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We are totally against introducing grizzly bears to the North Cascades National Park Complex! You are not "re"introducing! Where is the proof they have ever been here on a permanent level? We would appreciate seeing that proof!

There are already black bears in this area. Introducing grizzlies will eliminate whatever sparse food source is available for them, and there certainly is not enough food source for bears the size of the grizzly, as well as the black bear. One or the other are doomed to die or leave, and my guess is it will be the lesser of the two, so why waste all this time, energy and tax dollars on a project that is doomed, and is also against the wishes of the taxpayer?

A big question we have is who are the actual individuals, not the agencies, but the individuals, who are pushing this agenda? We would appreciate that list, because in the event there is any injury to persons or their animals after the introduction of these very aggressive animals to this ecosystem, we want to know who to file the class action suit against.

The tenacity of the government to interfere with nature on this level and against the interests of the public is astounding. And the failure of the National Park Service to defend the public's right to a safe and enjoyable experience in their national park is unconscionable. It goes entirely against the mission of the National Park Service which was created by the Organic Act of 1916"

" To conserve the scenery and historic objects and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

Grizzlies in this area will definitely impair the enjoyment here for future generations.

I repeat, we are totally against the "re"-introduction of the grizzly to the North Cascades National Park Complex.

Correspondence ID: 13922Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 17:29:45

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support restoring grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem. These animals hold cultural and ecological significance in the region, and co-existed here for thousands of years before they were extirpated from their historic range in the North Cascades after the arrival of European settlers. Through this reintroduction plan, we have an incredible opportunity to bring back grizzlies, who as a keystone species, have a positive effect on ecosystem functionality. With the numbers of individuals proposed for reintroduction through this plan, it's highly unlikely that I would ever see one in the wild, but I wholeheartedly support bringing them back - help us keep the North Cascades wild and resilient.

Correspondence ID: 13923Project:112008Document:132104

Address: MOUNT VERNON, WA 98273
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 17:32:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear NPS: I am fully in favor of grizzly bear recovery in the North Cascades. They are part of the original fauna and belong their. The bears play an important role in a fully functioning ecosystem and need to be restored.

I am a frequent backcountry user and have visited grizzly bear territory many times primarily in Yellowstone, Glacier, Denali, and Wrangell-St. Elias National Parks, The actions we need to take in the backcountry to minimize bear risks are not overbearing and largely mimic the actions we need to take in black bear territory, which is practically everywhere.

In particular, I support the Preferred Option, involving the introduction of a limited number of bears and their designation as a Nonessential Experimental Population. This alternative acknowledges the limitations imposed by our current society but provides a path towards successful recovery.

I wish to thank NPS and its partners for this effort.

Correspondence ID: 13924Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spokane, WA 99258
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 17:33:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Point 1: Restore a grizzly bear population as part of the natural and cultural heritage of the North Cascades. Of all of the objectives listed I think this one is the most important. Reintroducing grizzly bears into a part of the

country where they have lived in the past and making sure that even after they are introduced they can continue to live in that ecosystem in the future is a very important step in the direction of helping grizzly bears get off of the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife. For the reintroduction process to be cohesive, the input of the tribes, the NPS of the NCE, and all the residents must be taken into account. One of the objectives in taking action is, to "Provide Pacific Northwest residents and visitors with the opportunity to again experience grizzly bears in their native habitat." Although having Grizzlies around is definitely great for the biodiversity of the Northern Cascades, I am not sure that visitors would be so keen on seeing grizzlies in their natural habitat unless it were through the lenses of some binoculars or a camera. It would be rare for grizzlies and humans to come into contact in the northern cascades, however, if that scenario were to happen with a camper making dinner or a hunter who recently just killed a deer, the end result is almost always a bear getting shot or possibly a human getting severely hurt. Ignoring that scenario, I would say that the positive effects of reintroducing the grizzly bear to the northern cascades ecosystem such as increased biodiversity, an increase in the population of an endangered animal, and, a strengthening in the spiritual connection between tribes and the bear are reason enough to have them reintroduced. The "no action alternative" is also a decent option if the risks of reintroduction to humans are too great. Having bears naturally find their way back west to the northern cascades would take a lot longer for the population to be back to 200, but this option is likely received more positively by the public/people who would be affected by this reintroduction.

Correspondence ID: 13926Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 17:42:31

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I fully support the proposed Alternative C to reintroduce Grizzlies to the North Cascades under the 10(j) clause. While I am enthusiastic about a reintroduction of Grizzlies without the 10(j) clause (under Alternative B), I believe the added management tools provided in Alternative C reach a compromise with other stakeholders such as ranchers, and it is important to have their buy-in on this topic. Generally, I believe that Grizzlies are an important part of the North Cascades ecosystem, so I fully support plans to reintroduce Grizzlies to this area in a way that has as much community support as possible, while still respecting the lives of these animals.

Correspondence ID: 13927Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 17:42:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: With a lot of trepidation and hesitation, I support the preferred alternative with the 10(j) option. However, I still have strong concerns about whether there will be adequate monitoring of the bears and sufficient preventative measures taken to reduce the chances of human-bear interaction and risks to human safety.

The North Cascades has many more people recreating in it than it did even 25 years ago when the recovery zone was initially put into place. And if the bear population does reach the point where some migrate into the southern portion of the NCE, then there will be even higher chances of human-bear interactions and problems.

Snoqualmie Pass/Alpine Lakes? Mt. Rainier National Park? Whoa. Those are areas with far more people out recreating than the North Cascades. And that does not account for how many more people will be out there in 60-100 years when the bear population has grown. Greater encounters and problems will be bad news for the bears as well as the people.

I noticed in your presentation (during the FAQ portion) that one of the suggestions to prevent bear problems in the backcountry is not to hike alone. For many people, that isn't practical. I live alone and do the majority of my hiking alone with my two dogs. The dogs keep me company and obviously can act as an early warning system, but obviously they also could cause more issues for themselves and for me if we were to encounter a grizzly.

If I were planning a hike, I would sure want to know where the grizzlies were at that time. Live monitoring capability to give

people an idea of the area they might be currently frequenting would help in deciding where to (or not to) hike.

Here are some questions and issues I hope NPS and USFW will answer for the public and address if bears are reintroduced:

What plans do NPS and USFW have in place for 'real time' monitoring and for alerting the public about current bear activity?
A sign once you get to the trailhead is not sufficient.

How closely/how often will the bears be checked on/monitored?

Will they be microchipped in addition to wearing collars?

Will monitoring be applied to Canadian bears that may cross into the North Cascades once Canada reintroduces grizzlies?

What plans do the agencies have for on-the-ground (i.e trailheads, campgrounds, along HWY 20 and access roads, in communities next to North Cascades) education and communication with people recreating?

Correspondence ID: 13928Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98273
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 17:43:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please DO NOT reintroduce these predators into the North Cascades. This is a very dangerous idea.

Correspondence ID: 13929Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America
Outside Organization: None Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 17:46:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Howdy again

A couple of things I noticed in the Draft:

First, several times you mention that reintroducing grizzly may increase tourism. I believe it will be a net reduction in tourism on trail and campground use. I intend to hike the same amount as before introduction, not more or less. But, many of the folks that I regularly hike with at least say they will not hike where grizzly are present. Why do you suggest a net increase possible after reintroduction?

You compare the North Cascades to Yellowstone. I do not think you can do that. Yellowstone has lots of roads and most of their trail use is geyser or thermal feature short paths with lots of use. The large amount of people around these thermal feature makes bears avoid these areas. My experience at Yellowstone suggest that folks do not in significant numbers use many of the trails. Some years ago while at the Old Faithful Area, I went on a 6-7 hour day hike into a remote geyser. While there were many hundreds of folks in the Old Faithful geyser area, I saw no one on my hike. So saying millions of folks do not have bad encounters with bears is misleading. You are cherry picking your statistics.

You say several times that you do not anticipate trail or area closures except for short periods. I do not think you are being realistic. It may be true in the first few years, but I think you will at some point in the future you will be more like Yellowstone where there are a dozen areas that have multi week or month closures every year. How are you going to avoid these type of closures in the future in the North Cascades? How will tourism increase if large areas are closed or restricted in the North Cascades?

Reply requested

Thank you

Correspondence ID: 13931Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bothell, WA 98011
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 17:47:45

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think the dangers of grizzly reintroduction directly to North Cascades outweigh any benefits. I don't see how this kind of apex predator benefits the ecosystem.

Human safety shall be the first priority. Ecosystem restoration goes after this.

Correspondence ID: 13932Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Omak, WA 98841
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 17:49:24

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: After reading the draft EIS, I am left with no confidence in the DOI, USFW, NPS and their experimental plan to introduce grizzly bears into the NCE.

These departments, along with the IGBC, seem to be rushing towards a final EIS with their chosen action alternatives B or C and with blatant disregard to the neighboring communities who do not support the action alternatives.

Here are some of the many concerns I obtained from the draft EIS:

- Vague spiritual and cultural tribal reasons without any actual tribal support.

As a tribal member of the Colville tribe, a direct descendant of Wenatchi, Entiat and Mose-Columbia tribes, and with other family connections to tribes in WA, OR, MT, and CA, I am not convinced there is any large amount of local tribal support for the action alternatives B or C.

Non-tribal supporters are being lied to and misled by this draft EIS with very vague "spiritual and culture heritage" reasons for taking action.

Moreover, the Environmental Justice section on page 16 implies that the members of the Colville tribe, with a minority and low-income population, was not included from further analysis as it was determined they "would not be disproportionately affected" because "restoration activities would not be focused" in the nearby reservation, which includes the town of Omak.

Way further down on page 156, the drafters of this plan interestingly recognize local tribes traditional territories. What was suspiciously left out was that the Colville Reservation (where local tribes were forced to relocate to) once included the "North Half" which encompassed a larger area than the present day reservation. Additionally, the Mose-Columbia reservation included the area between the North Half and into the Cascades Mountains where the parks now exist. The Wenatchi tribe (one of the twelve tribes included in the Colville Tribes) was promised a reservation in their traditional territory around where Wenatchee, Cashmere, and Leavenworth are today. (Also troubling is the residents of Chelan County were not scheduled an in-person meeting for the draft EIS proposal held in their county.)

It is wrong of the drafters of the EIS to not include the minority and low-income populations of the present day towns in Okanogan and Chelan counties from analysis on whether they would be disproportionately affected by grizzly bear

restoration. By not including tribal members and direct descendants who still populate these counties, the drafters of the EIS appear to not be concerned for the safety of tribal communities, and plan to not be held liable for any negative impacts. Again, the drafters defer to vague spiritual and cultural reasons in order to gain supporters from non-tribal people for their action alternatives B and C.

Furthermore, the Ethnographic Resources sections acknowledge that grizzly bears will negatively impact tribal hunting, root gathering, huckleberry picking, and additional tribal activities, many of which are private and sacred.

How again is the introduction of bears a benefit to the Washington State North Cascades tribal communities? The drafters of the EIS cannot pick and choose portions of indigenous cultures to support their agenda while actively planning to negatively impact or damage other portions. It appears the bears are expected to stay within their own NCE reservation. Every tribal community understands the bears ranged down and beyond the Columbia River, something which non-tribal supporters seem unaware of. Grizzly bears were also hunted by tribal communities, something non-tribal supporters seem to want to overlook. Probably because they are being guilted by the biologists of this draft EIS into righting some perceived wrong of the past ("white hunters hunting down the last grizzly in the Cascades.") The action alternatives of the draft EIS are no better than colonization.

- Absolutely no indication from the departments and agencies behind this plan that they will 1) cease the experiment if it goes terribly wrong and 2) claim responsibility ahead of implementation.

It is terrifying that the group of educated people behind this draft EIS have not indicated that they will fully cease the experiment if something goes terribly wrong. There seems to be a lot of "unknowns" in the draft EIS, so it seems that the departments should claim full responsibility of ALL of the outcomes ahead of implementation.

It seems that no number (one or one hundred) of potential human injuries or deaths will stop this group of people from plowing ahead with their goal of 200 bears.

It appears no amount of impact to people's livelihoods, specifically agriculture, will not change the proposed path of this experiment.

In the draft EIS, there are numerous examples where the departments have actually no idea what will happen in 60 to 100 years. The drafters of the EIS will be long retired or gone from this Earth after a majority of the grizzlies are set loose.

It appears the drafter's plan is to just kick the can down the road for the next generation to deal with. The drafters provide absolutely NO solutions to the next generation. How is this any better than the generations that came before us all?

By pushing forward with this plan, the drafters are not better teachers and are not thinking well of the seventh generation.

By not claiming responsibility for the destructive elements of their experiment, the departments behind this draft indicate they will not be held liable for their own actions, and therefore are no better than an eco-terrorist group.

- Climate change is bad for everything, but not for grizzly bears.

In the draft EIS, human-caused climate change is acknowledged to be detrimental for many other predators, prey animals, their food sources and habitats... but climate change is actually good for grizzly bears.

What a ridiculous supporting argument that you all came up with in order to push this plan forward!

In the recent 2023 legislative session, WA state Democrats passed many bills regarding climate change actions. The taxpayers of our state will now be endlessly funding climate change projects. People are actively being informed that, in order to do our part, we will need to upend lifestyles with electric vehicles and no new homes will be allowed to use natural gas. But, here the departments of the EIS are stating we should support introduction because one study shows huckleberries might increase.

- The sole argument to introduce grizzly bears is to remove them from threatened or endangered status. ID and MT are actively addressing de-listing grizzly bears, but officials are conveniently pushing back an answer well after the final EIS for the NCE is implemented.

It seems the Interagency Grizzly Bear Committee has an agenda they want to push onto the state of WA before Idaho and Montana are proved to have too many bears. It's very false and misleading to convince the state of WA that we need to save these "threatened" bears when they are clearly thriving elsewhere in the country.

This plan to introduce bears goes back decades. Now that the bears are obviously recovering and likely becoming unmanageable with more possibilities of lethal take, the drafters of this plan should step down and hold off until after the final decisions are made in ID and MT. Otherwise, the agencies and departments supporting the EIS continue to act as discreditable and dishonest bureaucracies.

- The draft EIS doesn't bother to address how black bears already benefit the ecosystem with seed dispersal, nutrient availability, and forest health.

By not addressing how black bears benefit the ecosystem, the draft EIS again appears to be written in a dishonest manner. We must somehow imagine that grizzlies are a superior species of bear and will perform a miraculous ecosystem recovery. By not addressing black bear benefits to the ecosystem, I cannot support an even deadlier bear being introduced in to the NCE and will never believe that the increased safety risk from grizzlies is outweighed by the supposed benefits of grizzlies. By intentionally leaving black bear benefits out, I will never support the departments for choosing to experiment with human safety under the guise of "ecosystem benefits."

- Using politics as a tool to change the RCW (no grizzly bears from out of state.)

With an upcoming legislative session and a liberal Democratic majority in both houses, the issue of introduction seems planned to become a partisan issue and planned to cause further division. The RCW was mentioned by the IGBC in a meeting years ago, so it's no speculation on my part that the agency and department would factor in the current political climate to try and work in their favor.

It's no doubt there will be a strong effort to try and work around the RCW of WA. Shame on the departments and agencies working towards turning resident against resident on an issue that will affect everyone's safety. As neighbors and residents, everyone on the political spectrum is at an equal disadvantage if any one of us finds ourselves facing a deadly bear in the NCE.

So after the law is changed and the EIS is finalized, non-profits will be funded and employed to educate the public with "tolerance" and "co-existence." The departments and agencies are working to rush this in before the 2024 presidential election, which points to an agenda that further doesn't care about the public's safety or concerns. It instead points to a group of people with degrees lording over the rest, because "we're educated" and "we say so." Very totalitarian.

- Last but not least, agriculture, specifically small family-farms, orchards, apiarists, ranches as well as agritourism, seems to be taking second place to the supposed benefits of grizzly bear introduction.

Why anyone in their right mind would want to willingly make a negative impact to the local food supply is beyond my comprehension. Everyone eats. Agriculture, specifically organic, provides many benefits to the ecosystem. Are the agencies now not in support of healthy pollinator populations? Many farmers are land conservationists. People (such as farmers) who work outside daily, and not just play outside (like hikers), have a strong will to keep land healthy because they know first-hand what it provides. Many supporters of bear introduction are living in their city bubbles, staring at smart phones, do quick weekend activities in the Cascades, and have little idea what it takes to provide food to their local natural food store or farmer's market.

Agri-tourism is safe and educational. Visitors want to U-pick apples and pears in the Fall; not fend off a bear. It takes years, many seasons, and many hands to build a successful farm. Let's not work to destroy what we have gained as North Central WA communities.

To knowingly put farmers, orchardists, beekeepers, and ranchers at a disadvantage means the drafters of this EIS support increased food prices, small businesses going out of business, and families losing their lands and livelihoods. The departments and agencies behind bear introduction are moving the residents of WA from local sources and towards unsustainable dependence other states and foreign countries.

Older experienced farmers are retiring and aging out of the industry. Younger beginner farmers face many hurdles obtaining land. Tools, feed, supplies, and infrastructure are costly. It's not an easy or enticing field to enter, but it's increasingly vital that younger generations become farmers themselves. We should be lifting these young people up and not give them an experiment to deal with for years to come.

Born and raised in WA state, I am a someone who wasn't raised on a farm but figured out around age 28 that I wanted to contribute to food security with my own farm. I am now in my 40s. Throughout my life, I have lived on each side of the Cascade Mountains and in many cities and towns including Arlington, Omak, Auburn, Sumner, Wenatchee, Chelan, Spokane, and Seattle. I have watched as human population and homes increased in formally rural and sparse areas of our state, as well as the increased tourism to formally rural and sparse areas of our state.

Since 2010 as people fled disgusting Seattle for a more rural life East of the Cascades, the housing inventory quickly dwindled in my hometown of Wenatchee. Prices increased. There became a housing shortage. Old orchards were destroyed for housing developments. It took me many years to find a home with acreage in North Central WA. I'm not about to lose what I wish to gain with my new farm, because biologists have decided we are lacking a grizzly bear experiment.

The draft EIS indicates that tourism may increase for those wishing to "experience" grizzly bears in the NCE. I do not agree that we are lacking a tourism industry for this "experience" nor is it a viable benefit to our state. Every year, tourists irresponsibly raft and need rescuing on the Wenatchee and Icicle Rivers or irresponsibly hike/rock climb/Instagram and need rescuing in the Cascades. These ill-equipped and uneducated visitors place a heavy burden on the local rescuers and underfunded medical facilities who work to save their lives. Natural attractions such as rivers and mountains are unmovable; they will always attract the foolhardy. Purposely creating a "zoo" in the wild and launching grizzly bear maulings onto communities with limited services is an unwise financial undertaking. Shame on the officials for encouraging this stupid idea.

The area where I attended high school, Lake Chelan and Manson, rely solely on tourism and agriculture. Popular boat cruises bring travelers and employees into Stehekin and Lucerne - right where the departments know the grizzly bears will roam. The incredibly crowded and growing communities that live and work throughout the entire Lake Chelan area would be negatively impacted by grizzly bear introduction and will see no supposed benefits.

Leavenworth and surrounding areas already have increasing unwanted encounters with black bears. This is another area heavily reliant on tourism and is filled with farms, orchards and ranches. These communities will be negatively impacted by grizzly bear introduction and see no supposed benefits.

Many ranchers and farmers drove down from the Methow Valley to speak against introduction of bears at the in-person meeting in Okanogan. The towns of Mazama, Winthrop, and Twisp, even with their liberal-voting eco-minded population, will without a doubt be negatively impacted by grizzly bear introduction and will see no supposed benefits.

Concerned residents from neighboring counties drove hours to attend the Okanogan meeting and to speak against introduction. Retired wildlife professionals with working experience in Alaska and Montana spoke against introduction. The majority of Okanogan County residents at the meeting spoke against introduction. Every former and current LEO that I know is against introduction. Every town from Oroville to Brewster will be negatively impacted by grizzly bear introduction and will see no supposed benefits.

I attended the Okanogan meeting with an open mind willing to accept that my view might change after listening to officials. So, that didn't happen, because the officials had nearly nothing to present except portions of the EIS on placards. One physical copy of the draft EIS was present which no one could take home. I saw no real effort by officials to encourage people to support the draft EIS.

After I paid for a physical copy of the draft EIS and read the entire draft, I can further see why. As a tribal member, a new farmer, and a lifelong Washington resident, there is nothing in the draft to support except the non-action alternative A. No Action. No to grizzly bear introduction in the North Cascades. Not now. Not ever.

Correspondence ID: 13933Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ronald, WA 98940
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 17:53:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I live in the proposed reintroduction zone and do not want to encounter a grizzly bear. In recent years, grizzlies have been known to attack and kill humans, at times without apparent provocation. I carry a pistol in the woods in case of threat from other animals that inhabit my area, namely wolves and cougars. My pistol will not save me, my family, or pets from a grizzly. They are dangerous, powerful animals and should not be introduced to areas where they do not currently reside, especially when encounters in human habitation areas are probable. Don't make me fear for the lives of my loved ones and have to consider moving away from my home.

Correspondence ID: 13935Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lake Stevens, WA 98258
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 17:57:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am in support of option A

Correspondence ID: 13936Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Alexandria, VA 22303
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 17:57:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the plan to restore grizzly bears in the North Cascades Ecosystem

Correspondence ID: 13937Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Vancouver, WA 98682
United States of America

Outside Organization: Simply Thyme Catering Business(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,13 2023 17:59:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzlies should be returned to the North Cascade.

Correspondence ID: 13938Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98119
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 17:59:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not favor Grizzly reintroduction. The risk to people from grizzly bears is too great. In addition to the likelihood of dangerous or fatal encounters, the remoteness of the area--all the areas in the reintroduction plan, not just North Cascades National Park--makes rescue and care for people affected or injured by grizzlies much more difficult and costly.

There will also be an adverse economic effect on the region as grizzly presence will reduce visitation and use of the areas by recreationalists and others.

Correspondence ID: 13939Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98118
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 18:00:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As much as having grizzlies in the North Cascades will make me more aware of my camping practices... I am very much for reintroducing grizzlies to this area. It is sparsely populated wilderness, perfect for introducing and restoring biodiversity,

Correspondence ID: 13940Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Stehekin, WA 98852
United States of America

Outside Organization: Retired Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 18:00:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the "Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Environmental Impact Statement" for the North Cascades Ecosystem. I am retired and now split my time roughly 50/50 between Seattle and Stehekin. For the last 50+ years I have spent a lot of time within the boundaries of the "North Cascades Ecosystem" (NCE) pursuing recreational activities including hiking, backpacking, backcountry skiing, climbing, kayaking, ... For about the last 20 years, I have lived part time in Stehekin. I have missed experiencing the presence of grizzly bears that were once in the NCE. I hope that those following me in the NCE will have the opportunity for that experience through reintroduction of grizzlies through this restoration plan.

I have read the "Executive Summary" of the "Plan" and scanned much of the text. With that information, I can say:

I do not support Alternative A: No Action. It really is no action, based on the discussion of the very low probability that a viable grizzly population could develop through grizzly immigration into NCE from Canada.

I strongly support the active reintroduction of grizzlies laid out in Alternatives B and C.

I prefer Alternative B, which expresses the strongest commitment to maintaining a viable population of grizzlies identified as a "Threatened Species" managed under the requirements of ESA 4(d) rule.

I understand motivations for Alternative C arising from potential conflicts related to public service facilities or private property with in or adjacent to NCE. I have some concern about the proposed solution through designation of grizzlies as a "Nonessential Experimental Population" (NEP) to be managed under ESA10(j). My concern is somewhat relieved by almost all of the NCE being within NEP Zone 1. (Fig. 4). My understanding of the comparison of ESA 4(d) and 10(j) (Table 2) is that there is little difference in Zone 1.

Correspondence ID: 13941Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ocean Shores, WA 98569
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 18:00:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do NOT believe it is necessary or wise to re-introduce Grizzly bears to the North Cascades. I think they are quite capable of finding their way if they so desire.

Correspondence ID: 13943Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98112
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:00:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I would like to restore the North Cascades ecosystem to a healthier state and grizzly bears are a healthy part of that!

Correspondence ID: 13946Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Malott, WA 98829
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:00:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: National Parks is America's best invention.

Correspondence ID: 13947Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Port Townsend, WA 98368
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:00:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support reintroducing the grizzly bear into the northern cascades!!

Correspondence ID: 13949Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Everett, WA 98203
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:02:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: They deserve to be here more than we do! They were here long before us, before people came and destroyed their land hunted them to almost extinction. It is disgusting what human has done! So yes, I believe they need to be here. It's part of nature. When you take down a major predator, it affects the whole food chain.

Correspondence ID: 13950Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America
Outside Organization: Sierra club Conservation/Preservation
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:02:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: It's time to restore grizzly bears to the north cascades!

Correspondence ID: 13951Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Gig Harbor, WA 98336
United States of America
Outside Organization: Conservation Northwest Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:03:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support Alternative 3 including Section 10j.
Allowing the introduced population to be "experimental" allows for flexibility in management and outcomes.

Correspondence ID: 13952Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Sequim, WA 98382
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:03:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please bring back wolves. I'm not so sure about grizzlies, but you NEED to bring back wolves.

Correspondence ID: 13954Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Port Townsend, WA 98368
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:04:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I applaud the interest in returning Grizzlies to the N Cascades Ecosystem. This top predator helps to maintain the balance in an ecosystem and would be of benefit to this one.

Correspondence ID: 13959Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Port Angeles, WA 98362
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:06:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please restore grizzly bears to their traditional range in the North Cascades.

I hope you will also ban hunting grizzlies there.

These beautiful, iconic apex predators have been here far longer than we have, and they have the right to live their lives freely. Please protect them and return their ancestral homeland to them.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 13962Project:112008Document:132104
Address: seattle, WA 98177
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:10:19
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this important issue. I appreciate the thoughtfulness of the federal agencies involved to ensure you hear from the public that care deeply about this issue.

When settlers arrived in Washington and other Western States, they began a massive extirpation campaign of wild inhabitants like the Grizzly bear, grey wolf, and other species that they viewed as competitors and threats to their exotic livestock. The biodiversity and resilience of our ecosystems have suffered greatly since strongly interacting species like bears, wolves, and beavers were removed from these systems that they co-evolved with. The Endangered Species Act is this country's recognition of these egregious wrongs, and sets a path for agencies to correct for these past mistakes and try to make these systems our very lives depend on whole again, and requires federal agencies to take actions such as the restoration of grizzly bear populations you are now proposing.

I welcome the restoration of grizzly bear populations to the North Cascades. I have hiked in bear country in Alaska and Montana in this country, and in countries in Europe that have recovering brown bear populations, and understand and accept

both the behavioral changes necessary to be safe in brown bear country, and the risks associated with it.

I strongly support the federal agencies' efforts to restore grizzly bear populations to Washington State's North Cascades Mountains, where conservation science shows there is ample bear habitat and prey for bears.

Thank you for accepting my comment in support of your proposal.

Correspondence ID: 13963Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Vancouver, WA 98685
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:10:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Let the bears be in their ancestral homeland. They need to be there !!!!!!!

Correspondence ID: 13966Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Helena, MT 59620
United States of America
Outside Organization: Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks State Government(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:11:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Sir or Madam,

Below are comments from FWP related to the Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/EIS for restoration of grizzly bears in the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE). The State of Montana does not offer herein a position on an alternative, but rather provides considerations and concerns about the grizzly bear restoration plan for the North Cascades. FWP also separately provided comments on the proposed 10(j) rule that would be necessary for implementation of Alternative C.

First and foremost, it is absolutely imperative that this effort, and the subsequent need for bears for this effort, not influence delisting of either the Northern Continental Divide Ecosystem (NCDE) or Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem (GYE) populations. These populations are recovered, and delisting must be a top priority for the USFWS.

The restoration plan identifies as one of the needs "to support the recovery of the grizzly bear to the point where it can be removed from the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife" (Restoration Plan page 3). Montana supports this need, but it is unclear how that can be met with a stated recovery objective of 200 bears in the North Cascades. A better explanation of how the NCE fits within overall grizzly bear recovery and delisting would be beneficial, as would a clear explanation of what would be needed to designate and delist the NCE as a distinct population segment if it met its recovery goal. This should include a discussion on long-term expectations for effective population size, genetic management, and ultimate distribution.

The Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/EIS identifies the boundaries of the recovery zone, based primarily on federal land boundaries, but fails to identify the areas grizzly bears may inhabit if the restoration plan is successful (i.e., the greater NCE). The analysis is focused primarily on just the recovery zone and implies that is the only place grizzly bears are expected to be. This ambiguity frustrates meaningful public comment. FWP recommends that the area be defined and depicted on a map, with an opportunity presented for additional public comment. At present, one could infer from this restoration plan and the proposed 10(j) rule that the NCE is most of the State of Washington.

Grizzly bear recovery has been ongoing in Montana for at least four decades. This includes recovery of the NCDE and GYE ecosystems, augmentation and recovery in the CYE, and management of bears in transition areas, even as bear populations have significantly expanded. FWP and the USFWS have learned a lot during that time, but it seems much of what has been learned is being ignored and the same biased or incorrect assumptions are being carried forward into this proposal. This includes: assuming bears will only stay on protected federal lands and will not move onto, or create a management concern on, private lands; assuming minimal efforts, like food storage regulations on public lands, will alleviate most conflicts;

asserting that source bears must come from the same “food economy” as where they are going; assuming that bears to be used for this effort will be easily captured; and assuming that only bears with no history of conflict can be moved. Starting with these outdated, disproven assumptions will limit the success of this effort. FWP encourages the USFWS and partners to really look at what stakeholders have learned from over 40 years of recovery efforts and based on that, anticipate, plan for, and communicate the most-likely outcomes upfront. Do not soft-pedal or minimize the difficult challenges associated with this effort, but rather recognize the capacity and resources needed to adequately manage bears and bear conflict, and get those resources in place well before they are needed. The USFWS should defer to states in determining the scope and scale of impacts of Endangered Species Act (ESA) actions to state and local communities as they are ones facing those impacts. Montana is concerned that the USFWS is summarily concluding that impacts will be minimal without providing the State of Washington a full narrative of the costs and impacts of grizzly management from other states. Allowing the USFWS to determine what the state and local impacts of an action sets a concerning precedent for other states, including Montana.

The State of Montana is concerned that this proposed rule will divert resources from other higher priority grizzly bear recovery efforts. Currently the NCDE and the GYE populations have met, and exceeded, recovery criteria. Yet, the USFWS has not successfully delisted these bears. Given that the USFWS has not directed any additional resources towards grizzly bear management, FWP is concerned that resources and capacity in the Grizzly Bear Recovery Program and Ecological Services program are being, and will continue to be, diverted to the NCE effort at the expense of recovery and delisting efforts (i.e., rulemaking) in the other more established ecosystems. The USFWS highest priority should be completing the delisting process for recovered populations (NCDE and GYE) including the necessary remnant analysis. Along those lines, the Restoration Plan provides an estimate of anticipated costs to implement the proposal (Appendix C), but provides no commitment of resources to address those costs, and fails to anticipate increasing costs as the population increases, including resources needed for implementation such as the capture and translocation of bears, and subsequent management, monitoring, and conflict prevention work. As should be obvious from the GYE and NCDE, and even the CYE, significant staff and financial resources are necessary to successfully restore, recover, and manage grizzly bears. In Montana and Wyoming, most of that responsibility has fallen on the state fish and wildlife agencies outside of the National Parks, requiring those states to contribute several million dollars per year. We strongly disagree with the note at the bottom of Table C-2 implying that funding for conflict specialists, monitoring technicians, and livestock damage preventative measures will not be needed in the near term. Montana has learned that these types of resources need to be in place to prepare an area for when bears show up, versus responding after the fact.

FWP currently has 12 full-time bear conflict positions plus additional seasonal positions to address and prevent grizzly bear conflicts. FWP also has four full-time positions focused on monitoring the NCDE grizzly bear population. The U.S. Geological Survey grizzly bear study team consists of several staff dedicated to monitoring the GYE population. The minimal funding provided by the USFWS for this work has been reduced in recent years while the population, and resulting conflict work, has expanded. Increasing grizzly bear distribution without a corresponding commitment of resources is irresponsible and results in reduced tolerance for grizzly bears and, more generally, the ESA. There should be a clear plan in place ahead of time, detailing what these expenses are projected to be and how these expenses will be covered, including bear trapping and transport costs, bear conflict specialists, conflict response costs, conflict prevention costs, and necessary ongoing monitoring. Funding for those expenses should not come from diverting funds from existing recovery efforts, especially while those populations remain listed.

Throughout the proposed rule, the USFWS alludes to work that has been or is being done to minimize conflict, and based on that, concludes there will be minimal impacts to grizzly bears or people if the reintroduction occurs. While we applaud that “substantial outreach efforts have been put in place by the National Park Service (NPS) and U.S. Forest Service over the last 30 years to reduce unsecured attractants (e.g., garbage, human food) and provide the public with tips on identifying and coexisting with grizzly bears,” (88 FR 67199) we know from experience that much work remains to be done, especially given the proximity of the recovery zone to the large human population in the nearby Puget Sound, and the increasing interest in outdoor recreation. It seems disingenuous to indicate otherwise, given the scale and scope of effort needed to prepare and maintain the landscape for grizzly bear presence, and associated costs. Passing a food storage rule and assuming everyone will follow it is overly optimistic. It should be obvious from experience in the GYE and NCDE that, although needed, this is the minimum effort, and that ongoing education and enforcement is also needed, especially as bears expand into new areas. Montana is hesitant to support removing bears from the NCDE or GYE that will likely come into conflict because of inadequate conflict prevention measures. This is no different than moving wildlife to inadequate habitat or

areas where threats have not been addressed and expecting them to survive.

The Restoration Plan suggests that the source of bears for the reintroduction will likely be the NCDE and possibly the GYE (five to seven bears per year), and that because the populations in those recovery ecosystems are so robust, impact to those populations will be minimal. The Restoration Plan goes on to state the reintroduced population will receive ongoing demographic support (population augmentation) from source populations to replace bears that die or are killed until a population of 25 individuals is achieved. It appears the USFWS is maintaining space to translocate an infinite number of bears without committing the necessary resources to minimize mortalities. While Montana appreciates USFWS' recognition of the NCDE and GYE successes, the restoration plan and need for bears for translocation has not been discussed with the states that functionally manage these populations, despite assertions of "coordination."

Specifically, the restoration plan states:

Under both action alternatives the restoration plan anticipates capturing and releasing 3 to 7 grizzly bears per year for 5 to 10 years to achieve an initial population of 25 bears. The capture and release of grizzly bears would take place between June and September each year. Release site(s) would be selected based on quality of food in the release areas. Grizzly bears that would be considered ideal candidates for capture and release would be typically independent subadults between 2 and 5 years of age that had not yet reproduced and had exhibited no history of human conflict. The target sex ratio for initial releases would be approximately 60% to 80% female and 20% to 40% male. Under both action alternatives once an initial population of up to 25 grizzly bears is achieved, a transition to the adaptive management phase would occur. In this phase, additional grizzly bears could be released to address human-caused sources of mortality, genetic limitations, to improve population distribution and sex ratio, or to mitigate the potential for long-term genetic isolation.

The proposal implies augmentation from the NCDE to the CYE also is expected to continue. Montana, Idaho, and Wyoming have agreed to genetically augment the GYE population with bears from the NCDE as well. The restoration plan fails to acknowledge these competing needs. Additionally, the restoration plan suggests only bears with no history of conflict would be used, and preference would be skewed towards females, which have a lower mortality threshold. A management challenge in the NCDE and GYE is relocation of bears that have been in minor conflict or potential to get into conflict, so we recommend the NPS/USFWS consider taking bears that may have some conflict history - a position that would actually assist the states and increase support for removing bears from the NCDE and GYE populations. Being more flexible in criteria will increase likelihood of success and cooperation from source states.

Montana is also concerned about limiting bears for translocation to those from similar "food economies." This is a requirement that has been in place in the CYE but is not based on any supporting information. The best available science indicates bears are food generalists and can adapt to varying availability of different food types. Continuing this unsupported requirement of having to come from the same "food economy" will significantly reduce the number of bears potentially available for translocation, as well as reduce support for taking them from source areas.

Our experience with the CYE augmentation program is that trapping the ideal bear (sub-adult female, non-conflict, similar food economy, in June-July) is very difficult and time consuming, and generally results in less than one bear moved per year. It is unlikely five to seven bears meeting the proposed restoration plan's criteria could be captured each year, especially if bears are also needed for the CYE and GYE. FWP encourages the USFWS to analyze the resources that have been required for the CYE augmentation program and adjust expectations and resources needed accordingly, to include staff, vehicles, culvert traps, handling supplies, radio collars, etc. The budget for this in Table C2 seems low for the proposed work. The restoration plan preferred alternative includes management zones that encompass most of the State of Washington. These appear to be modeled somewhat after the management zones in the NCDE Conservation Strategy, or the Management Situations in the 1986 Interagency Grizzly Bear Committee guidelines, although they are not defined clearly in the document. We find it ironic that non-federal portions of the North Cascades Recovery Zone are considered Zone 3, as are "inholdings" within Zone 2 areas where bears will not be managed, if we read the zonal descriptions correctly. This implies that recovery and occupancy is expected to only occur on federal lands, and primarily only on federal lands within the recovery zone boundaries. As noted previously, this ignores what has been learned in the NCDE and GYE regarding grizzly bear habitat use and even where bears are showing up in the Bitterroot. They do not honor federal land boundaries. The USFWS should expect and plan for grizzly bears utilizing a diversity of contiguous lands and landownerships or be more explicit in how it will manage for grizzly bears on public lands alone. The Zone 2 designation implies bears are expected in an area much larger than the designated recovery zones, since Zone 2

lands are intended "to accommodate natural movement or dispersal of grizzly bears" (Restoration Plan, page 36). It is unclear how that corresponds with the recovery plan and reinforces the need to plan and budget for management and monitoring at the scale grizzly bears are expected to occur (i.e., all of designated Zones 1 and 2), as well as ensure the resources are available to address management and conflicts in the remaining areas (i.e., Zone 3). The logic of designating a large area of Zone 2 to the east of the recovery zone, separated by Zone 3, is unclear as well, especially since Zone 2 area appears to only be public lands.

To our knowledge, there are no established recovery criteria for grizzly bears in the North Cascades beyond the stated recovery goal in the restoration plan of 200 bears. The restoration plan estimates the North Cascades has capacity for 200-400 bears but cites no supporting information or science supporting the adequacy of this number. There is nothing in the proposed rule that indicates this is adequate for recovery and delisting of this recovery area (a requirement of recovery of the lower 48 listed entity), or if genetic connectivity or genetic augmentation will be required. This is important to understand as it potentially impacts other recovery areas (e.g., Cabinet-Yaak-Selkirks) and/or source populations for augmentation. As stated previously, it is imperative that this proposal not impact recovery and delisting of other recovery area populations.

Finally, the preferred alternative appears to contradict itself as to the importance of the NCE towards grizzly bear recovery. In the background section, it states that recovery of grizzly bears in each of the six recovery zones is necessary for recovery of the species, which means it is no longer threatened with extinction. Yet, the proposal makes the case that the NCE population is not essential, which implies the population in that area is one whose loss would not be likely to appreciably reduce the likelihood of the survival of the species in the wild, and therefore is not necessary for complete recovery in the lower 48.

The North Cascades presents an opportunity to take lessons learned from more than 40 years of grizzly bear recovery work and apply it in a way that provides the best chance for success. Those lessons include recognition that grizzly bears require intensive management, which requires extensive resources. Those needs should be identified, provided for, and committed to long term before any bear is moved. Failure to do so will result in lack of support for recovery efforts in the communities where support is critical for success. Grizzly bears will occupy a diversity of habitats, regardless of landownership or zonal designation. It is naive to think that there will only be bears on public lands, unless the intent is to manage bears to exclude any that wander onto private land. If that is the intent, then many more bears will be required to achieve a desired population. The zone designations are illogical, especially when there are Zone 3 areas between Zone 1 and 2 areas, and within the core recovery zone. Broader consideration of source bears is necessary to ensure adequate numbers can be achieved, and to help address concerns of source areas. Limiting source bears to young, female bears with no history of conflict and from areas with a similar food source will greatly increase the time and cost to capture bears, and likely will not be supported at the proposed levels. The NCE recovery effort cannot come at the expense of current and ongoing recovery efforts, and absolutely must not influence delisting of the GYE and NCDE populations.

Thank you for considering our comments. We welcome any opportunities to discuss them with you further.

Sincerely,


Director

References

"Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Establishment of a Nonessential Experimental Population of Grizzly Bear in the North Cascades Ecosystem, Washington State. (Proposed Rule)." Federal Register 88:188 (September 29, 2023) p. 67193-67222. Available from <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2023/09/29/2023-21418/endangered-and-threatened-wildlife-and-plants-establishment-of-a-nonessential-experimental>; Accessed: 11/13/23.

Correspondence ID:	13967Project:112008Document:132104
Address:	Port Angeles, WA 98362 United States of America
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual
Received:	Nov,13 2023 18:12:45
Correspondence Type:	Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears do not belong in Washington any more than dinosaurs do. Please don't bring them here.

Correspondence ID: 13968Project:112008Document:132104
Address: La Conner, WA 98257
United States of America
Outside Organization: Town Planning Comm. AIRBNB Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:12:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: YES! PLEASE do bring back and Protect Grizzlies in the North Cascades. We humans have stolen "their" ancestral homes, butchered and killed them at times almost to extinction and now they are also being beaten down by (man-made) Climate Change.

BRING THEM BACK!

Correspondence ID: 13969Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Sammamish, WA 98029
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:13:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not support reintroducing Grizzly Bears into the North Cascades of Washington. I have for many years been an outdoor enthusiast and frequently venture into the backcountry ,including trips in the North Cascades National Park. I am not convinced the benefits of returning bears to this part of the country outweigh the potential negative impacts to public safety, live stock, and to the small communities in this area.

Correspondence ID: 13970Project:112008Document:132104
Address: CHIMACUM, WA 98325
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:13:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We must have the Grizzlies back

Their existence is important to being part of the cycle of the animals that live in that area.
To not include these animals in having an incomplete picture.

Correspondence ID: 13972Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Walla Wala, WA 99362
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:15:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I fully support the re-introduction of the grizzly bear restoration plan in the North Cascades. As a biologist, backpacker and grandfather, I want to provide my generation and all future generations with the natural order in our ecosystems.

Correspondence ID: 13974Project:112008Document:132104
Address: RICHLAND, WA 99352
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:15:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzlies belong in the North Cascades. We can all get along as long as people try to rein-in their greed.

Correspondence ID: 13975Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Newport, WA 99156
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 18:16:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not go through with this, we already have enough predators killing off all of our other wildlife such as deer, elk and other game animals if we keep introducing more and more predators with no way of keeping control of them pretty soon there will be no deer or elk as there has already been a huge decrease in those populations...

Correspondence ID: 13976Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98101
United States of America

Outside Organization: National Parks Conservation Association (NPCA) Unaffiliated Individual(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,13 2023 18:17:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: NOTE: PDF of NPCA's comments and relevant attachments have been electronically submitted to: nce_grizzly@nps.gov. Please include these comments in the record.

November 13, 2023

Superintendent Don Striker
North Cascades National Park Complex
810 State Route 20
Sedro-Woolley, WA 98284

Supervisor Brad Thompson
Washington Fish & Wildlife Office
510 Desmond Drive SE
Suite 102
Lacey, WA, 98503

RE: Draft North Cascades Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/ Environmental Impact Statement and Proposed Rule:
Establishment of a Nonessential Experimental Population of Grizzly Bear in the North Cascades Ecosystem

Dear Superintendent Striker and Supervisor Thompson:

The National Parks Conservation Association (NPCA) submits these comments specific to the National Park Service (NPS) Draft North Cascades Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan Environmental Impact Statement (draft EIS) and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) Proposed Rule: Establishment of a Nonessential Experimental Population of Grizzly Bear in the North Cascades Ecosystem (proposed 10(j) rule) to determine how to restore grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE). NPCA urges the implementation of Alternative C: Restoration with Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) Designation, the identified preferred alternative, with some modifications to the proposed 10(j) rule. Alternative C will ensure the restoration of grizzly bears to the NCE, while providing increased management flexibility to support regional communities.

NPCA's mission is to protect and enhance America's National Park System for present and future generations. NPCA represents more than 1.6 million members and supporters with approximately 42,000 located in Washington state. Our organization has a long history of advocating for the restoration of grizzly bears to the NCE.

Restoring grizzly bears to the NCE provides significant ecological benefits that will enhance the overall health of the ecosystem. The restoration would also enhance visitor experience and bring new visitors to the region supporting gateway community economies. There are too few places where we may experience the ancient character of wildlands that include the full complement of species that evolved over thousands of years. Grizzly bears only occupy approximately 2% of their historic range. The NCE is one of the few remaining areas in the continuous U.S where it is still possible to recover and maintain a healthy grizzly bear population.

North Cascades Grizzly Restoration is Widely Supported

Grizzly bear restoration has been consistently popular with Americans. A recent survey commissioned by NPCA, and conducted online by The Harris Poll found that 85% of Americans (83% of Republicans, 89% of Democrats and 85% of Independents) support restoring grizzly bear populations back to their historic habitat in North Cascades National Park in northern Washington state.(i) These poll results track well with a 2016 Tulchin Poll that found 80 percent of registered voters in Washington support efforts to help the declining population of grizzly bears in the North Cascades recover.(ii)

This widespread support for grizzly bear restoration to NCE aligned with the comment breakdown that NPS received during the 2017 grizzly bear restoration comment period. A Freedom of Information Act request sent to NPS revealed that over 126,000 pieces of correspondence were submitted during the public comment period in 2017. Of these, 109,000 correspondences supported grizzly restoration, and only 1,300 were opposed.(iii) Approximately 15%, or about 18,900 of the comments submitted were from Washington state.

The federal agencies released a breakdown of comments received during the scoping phase of the process in 2022. Of those comments, 933 supported grizzly restoration and 285 opposed.(iv) Lastly, NPCA urges the agencies to consider all comments equally. The NPS and FWS manage our lands and natural resources for every single American no matter where they live or how they use federal lands.

Federal Law Requires Bureaus under the Department of Interior to Protect and Recover the North Cascades Grizzly Bear

The NPS and FWS are required to protect and restore grizzly bears under federal law, pursuant to both the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) and National Park Service Organic Act.

Obligations under the Endangered Species Act

As a species designated under the ESA as “threatened” since 1975--in part because the species has been reduced to less than 2% of its former range south of Canada, according to the draft EIS--the FWS is legally obligated to protect and recover grizzly bears. Indeed, the very purpose of the ESA is “to provide a means whereby the ecosystems upon which endangered species and threatened species depend may be conserved [and] to provide a program for the conservation of such endangered species and threatened species,” among other purposes. 16 USC § 1531 et seq.; § 1531(b). Section 7 of the ESA mandates that federal agencies utilize existing legal authority to further the purposes of the ESA to recover listed species. 16 USC § 1536(a). Additionally, as you are also aware, Section 4(f)(1) of the ESA requires the Secretary of the Interior to “develop and implement plans [...] for the conservation and survival of endangered and threatened species [...] unless he finds that such a plan will not promote the conservation of the species.” 16 USC § 1533(f)(1).

As discussed in more length in our 2017 comments, were the FWS to select Alternative A, the “No Action” option, the agency would be neglecting its duty under the ESA to provide a program that is sufficient to allow for the conservation, based on the best available science, of a species recognized as threatened. Such an action would be in direct contravention of the plain language and spirit of the ESA, including, but not limited to, the provisions cited above.

Furthermore, failure to take action (i.e., by selecting the “No Action Alternative”) would not satisfy the purpose and need identified in the draft EIS for this federal action, and would be difficult to square with the recovery objectives articulated by the agencies to date. The purpose and need of the DEIS--avoiding the permanent loss of grizzly bears, contributing to the restoration of biodiversity of the ecosystem, enhancing the probability of long-term survival of grizzly bears, and supporting the recovery of the grizzly bear to the point where it can be removed from the federal list of threatened

species--are the very reasons NPCA and our partner organizations support restoration efforts to ensure the viability of the grizzly bear in the NCE, lands the grizzly bear roamed for over 20,000 years.

Obligations under the National Park Service Organic Act

The NPS, as a co-lead agency of this federal action, is also independently obligated to uphold the mandate of the 1916 National Park Service Organic Act, which sets forth the purpose of the Park Service as "to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 16 U.S.C. § 1. As the record for this action makes clear--and as the expert report of Dr. Gaines (vi) further underscores--taking no additional action (i.e., through the selection of Alternative A) would be insufficient to support grizzly bear recovery in the NCE, in violation of the NPS's obligation to conserve wildlife under the Organic Act. Furthermore, as the agencies themselves recognize in the draft EIS, the NPS is additionally obligated under its Management Policies to comply with and further the purposes of the ESA and to proactively conserve listed species. See, e.g., draft EIS at 45, 244, 280; NPS Management Policies 2006, Ch. 4. In this instance, complying with this charge necessitates NPS take additional affirmative action in order to support grizzly recovery.

Washington State Law Does Not Preclude Federal Recovery Efforts

As the agencies are well aware, Washington state law(vii) does not preclude federal agencies from complying with applicable federal laws (i.e., the ESA and Organic Act). As the FWS and NPS accurately state in the draft EIS, see draft EIS at page 41, there is no conflict between state and federal laws because the Washington State code provision in question, 77.12.035, Protection of grizzly bears, that prohibits the State from transplanting or introducing grizzly bears, only applies to the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), not the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service or the U.S. National Park Service. Moreover, even if there were conflict between state and federal law, federal law would preempt conflicting state law pursuant to the U.S. Constitution's Supremacy Clause. U.S. Constitution, Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2.

Endorsement of Alternative C

If adopted, Alternative C would seek to achieve a grizzly bear restoration population goal of 200 bears within 60 to 100 years. An interagency team including FWS, NPS, and WDFW established this population goal based on the carrying capacity of the NCE. This would be accomplished by annually releasing 3 to 7 grizzly bears into the NCE over the next decade with the goal of establishing an initial population of 25 grizzly bears. Upon securing this initial population, additional bears could be transferred to support the long-term health of the population.

The NCE is already bear country, with many currently taking normal precautions to reduce conflicts with the black bear population. Under this alternative, there would be increased public outreach and education to further prepare those who live, work, and recreate in the area to minimize conflicts. NPCA believes the foundation of a successful restoration program is ongoing and proactive community engagement regarding recreating and living in and around grizzly bear country. That means professional managers on the ground educating and supporting communities, recreation users, livestock producers and other agricultural interests.

Millions currently live, work, and recreate in occupied grizzly bear habitat in Montana, Idaho, Washington, and Wyoming with minimal conflicts. Hundreds of thousands of tourists, hikers, hunters, fishermen and families recreate in the backcountry each year in occupied grizzly bear habitat without ever encountering the widespread populations of grizzly bears. The Glacier, Bob Marshall, and Yellowstone ecosystems combined have more than 2,000 grizzly bears and support more than 5 million visitors each year, yet the average number of injuries and fatalities from grizzly bears is minimal. (viii) In Yellowstone Park, between 1872 and 2018, there have been 8 people killed by bears, which averages out to one human fatality for every 26.2 million visitors. (ix)

Since 1979, there have been 118 million visitors to Yellowstone National Park. During this time, 44 people were injured by grizzly bears in the Park.(x) For all visitors combined, the chance of being injured by a grizzly bear is 1 injury for every 2.7 million visits. Breaking the risk down by the number of injuries related to the type of recreational activity visitors were involved in:

- Visitors who remain in developed areas: 1 injury in every 59.5 million visits
- Visitors who camp in roadside campgrounds: 1 injury in every 26.6 million stays
- Visitors who camp in the backcountry: 1 injury in every 1.7 million stays
- Visitors who hike in the backcountry: 1 injury in every 232,613 person travel days
- All park activities combined: 1 injury in every 2.7 million visits

Though bear attacks are rare, every incident must be taken seriously. Agencies should continue to educate communities on how to reduce human-bear conflict and recreate successfully in grizzly bear country. There are many existing outreach and education programs in Montana, Wyoming, and Idaho that have built partnerships and trust between bear managers, communities, recreationalists, livestock owners and agricultural interests.

We encourage the NPS and FWS to work with Washington state agencies to implement similar programs in the NCE. There are numerous tools, programs, and resources to reduce conflicts and support working lands. Efforts are underway to increase resources and technical support for voluntary landowner conflict prevention practices including electric fencing, livestock carcass removal, range riding, and community sanitation support. Should bears be restored to the NCE these same tools and federal funding could be deployed to minimize grizzly bear/agricultural conflict.

To increase management flexibility, this alternative proposes restoring grizzly bears to the NCE under an Endangered Species Act Section 10(j) designation. NPCA supports the proposed 10(j) population boundary, which includes most of Washington, except a portion in the northeastern corner that encompasses the established Selkirk Ecosystem Grizzly Bear Recovery Zone. The Selkirk Ecosystem Recovery Zone should remain outside of the 10(j) designation due to the current active recovery program occurring in this ecosystem.

The proposed 10(j) rule would tailor management responses in three different zones with increasing active management response when grizzlies move across different land ownership types within the recovery zone. Planning for dispersal is important and will prepare land managers for a successful long-term recovery effort.

While a grizzly bear can always be killed in the defense of human life, under a 4(d) ESA listing the parameters for when a bear can be killed or relocated for other reasons is standard across the landscape. The proposed 10(j) rule would provide more management flexibility and increase the tools the FWS and agency partners can use to address conflicts. NPCA supports designating the grizzly bears restored to the NCE portion of Washington as an experimental population under section 10(j) of the Endangered Species Act to allow both state and federal agencies a certain level of management flexibility. Zone 1 would consist of the core restoration area with the least amount of flexibility in management responses. Zone 2 would have increased flexibility for management of conflicts. Zone 3 is an area where bears would still be tolerated but would have the most responsive management.

Zone 1: The proposed management actions in this zone include: take of a bear in self-defense or defense of another person; exemption of an incidental take resulting from an otherwise lawful activity, though does not include the take of a bear that is wrongfully identified for another species while hunting; intentional non-lethal deterrence of bears to avoid conflict; and lethal removal by FWS or authorized agency partner of a bear that is involved in conflict, if a "conflict bear" determination has been made according to the interagency guidelines and it is determined to not be reasonably feasible to eliminate the threat through non-lethal means.

Zone 2: The proposed management include all the actions for Zone 1, plus the ability for federal, state, or tribal authorities to relocate a bear for a single-conflict and the ability for FWS to issue a lethal take permit to a livestock owner if a depredation has been confirmed.

Zone 3: The proposed management includes all of the actions for Zones 1 and 2, plus the ability of federal, state, or tribal authorities to relocate any bear as a preemptive action to prevent conflict or to issue a lethal take permit to a private landowner to kill a bear presenting an ongoing to human safety, livestock, or other property if there is a demonstrable and ongoing threat and when it is not reasonably possible to eliminate the threat through non-lethal means.

Recommended Modifications to the Proposed 10(j) Designation

NPCA recognizes that restoring some populations under a 10(j) designation, which allows additional management flexibility, can be a valuable tool to build acceptance in local communities to advance species conservation. Additionally, the 10(j) can be a tool to help build acceptance in local communities that may be concerned that the restoration of grizzlies could eliminate existing uses like timber harvest on public lands or access for firewood cutting or berry picking. The use of 10(j) can also enhance the potential for success in outreach and messaging about management flexibility to both assure the success of the reintroduction effort and to build public confidence that management agencies will be responsive to public needs and concerns.

We encourage the FWS to modify some components of the proposed rule to increase the potential of a 10(j) designation to ensure the successful restoration of grizzly bears and reduce unintended consequences.

Wilderness as Zone 1: Although it is unlikely that grizzlies will disperse far from the recovery zone in the near future, all designated wilderness areas that are currently in Zone 2 should be redesignated as Zone 1. The following wilderness areas should be added to Zone 1: Clearwater Wilderness, Mount Rainier Wilderness, Norse Peak Wilderness, William O. Douglas Wilderness, Goat Rocks Wilderness, Glacier View Wilderness, Tatoosh Wilderness, Mount Adams Wilderness, Indian Heaven Wilderness, Trapper Creek Wilderness. Wilderness areas are among the most protected landscapes in America. Wildlife should enjoy maximum protection in wilderness areas, where human activity is more limited. Olympic Peninsula wilderness areas can remain as Zone 3, because they are not considered to be core grizzly bear habitat.

Conditioned Lethal Take After Depredation in Zones 2 and 3: The proposed 10(j) rule includes the option for FWS to authorize a livestock owner to kill a bear that is within 100 yards of legally present livestock after a confirmed livestock depredation for two weeks. While NPCA supports responsive action to a confirmed livestock depredation, we urge the FWS to remove the provision that would issue take permits to private citizens. We also urge FWS to ensure that non-lethal take is prioritized and the lethal take of a bear in conflict occurs after all other measures have been explored. Instead, the FWS, WDFW, or a Tribal Fish and Game agency should be the party responsible for removing bears in this situation whether through lethal or nonlethal take for numerous reasons including:

- The issuance of permits to private individuals to kill conflict grizzly bears is unnecessary and not an effective way to prevent future conflicts as the wrong bear will certainly be killed in many instances. Decades of management experience in areas with grizzly bear populations have shown that agencies are able to effectively remove bears in instances of depredation. The best way to address depredation is for agency bear management professionals to capture and either relocate or remove the offending bear. If depredating bears cannot be captured and depredations continue, agency professionals can kill the bear as a last resort. Agency bear management professionals use the track size at the depredation site and bite mark size to judge if the depredating bear is an adult or a subadult or a female accompanied by young. They can use this information to maximize the probability of assuring that the correct bear is managed in any capture or removal.
- The issuance of permits to private individuals will likely result in bears being wounded as the permittees will be shooting at a bear they see in poor light or even at night with spotlights. Such wounded and dangerous bears will remain on the landscape where they will be a danger to unaware people who may be living, recreating, or working in the area.
- It could lead to the wrong bear being killed including non-conflict bears that are simply in the area. Most people cannot tell one bear from another and bears can move large distances across the landscape in a few days. Issuing a permit to a person to kill a bear that they think was involved in depredations and allowing them 2 weeks to kill any grizzly bear they think was the depredating bear will likely result in the "wrong bear" being killed or wounded. Bears are readily drawn to dead animals, and dead livestock odors or depredation remains in a pasture will draw in any other bears that might be in the area. Anyone with a permit will be likely to shoot such investigating bears even though they were not the depredating bears. The permittee will have no idea what bear committed the depredation. This is an ineffective way to solve depredation problems.
- The proposed 10(j) does not address how females accompanied by young will be treated under this permit system. If a female with cubs needs to be lethally removed following a depredation, the need to determine whether the cubs can be relocated needs to be made by a management professional. Allowing a private citizen to kill a female with cubs could lead to additional conflicts or unnecessary suffering on the part of the cubs.

Bears that depredate on livestock in Zones 2 and 3 need to be managed by either capture and relocation by agency bear

management professionals after the first offense, or removal by agency bear management professionals after the second offence. In the event of any depredations, agencies should also work with the livestock owner to secure livestock and reduce associated attractants, if possible, to reduce the probability of further depredations.

Conditioned Lethal Take Due to Threat in Zone 3: The proposed 10(j) rule includes the option for FWS, or an authorized agency to authorize a landowner or other person to kill a grizzly bear if FWS or an authorized agency determines that grizzly bears present a demonstrable and ongoing threat to human safety or lawfully present livestock, domestic animals, crops, beehives, or other property and that it is not reasonably possible to otherwise eliminate the threat by live-capturing and releasing the grizzly bear unharmed.

NPCA strongly urges the FWS to remove this provision from the proposed 10(j) rule. Along with the concerns raised above, this would allow the issuance of a lethal take permit to a private citizen based on the non-objective and vague possibility of threat. Threat not only to livestock, but also property which is not clearly defined within the proposed 10(j) but could include compost. The FWS, WDFW, or a Tribal Fish and Game agency should be the party responsible for managing bears in this situation for many of the same concerns raised above, as well as additional reasons including:

- There is no objective way to determine if a grizzly bear is “a demonstrable and ongoing threat to human safety or to lawfully present livestock, working dogs, domestic animals, crops, beehives, or other property.” Threat is an undefinable word and a threat to one person is not a threat to another.
- In over 40 years of management of hundreds of grizzly bears in the states of Montana, Idaho, and Wyoming, there has never been a need to issue permits to private individuals to kill grizzly bears like this inside or outside recovery zones. Any grizzly bears requiring a management response have either been captured and relocated or removed or taken by authorized state federal or tribal officials if it was not possible to capture such bears. This provision could create situations where people could request permits to kill bears because they feel threatened due to the species presence in the area.
- The provision also does not require that any non-lethal measures are implemented prior to a take permit being authorized.
- As noted above, most people cannot tell one bear from another and bears can move large distances across the landscape in a few days, so issuing a permit to a person to kill a bear that they think was “threatening” until “...FWS or authorized agency determines the threat is no longer ongoing...” could result in the “wrong bear” being killed or wounded.
- There is not clarity about how females accompanied by young will be treated under this permit system. Can a permittee shoot an entire family group if he/she sees them and thinks they are threatening?
If a bear is posing a threat, it should be managed by authorized agency personnel by capture or removal. We strongly suggest removal of this entire component. Such bears in any management zone should be managed by either capture and relocation by agency bear management professionals as necessary.
Successful grizzly bear restoration relies on ensuring individuals and communities have the education, resources, tools, and technical support they need to thrive alongside grizzly bears. That should include expanded signage and outreach concerning sanitation and garbage storage in all campgrounds and at trailheads into backcountry areas. We recommend prioritizing the completion of efforts to provide prevention supplies and sanitation in United States Forest Service and NPS campgrounds to enhance sanitation with bear-resistant food storage boxes at each site and bear-resistant garbage containers where necessary. Any education and outreach materials, sanitation enhancement and conflict prevention measures will also apply to and benefit resident black bears.

The restoration of grizzly bears to North Cascades National Park and the broader landscape offers a once-in-a-lifetime conservation opportunity to bring back the last major missing mammal of an incredibly wild, robust, and spectacular ecosystem. The effort would represent an enormous victory for our national parks, the people who enjoy them, and future generations that we will pass these lands onto. Agencies have a narrow window to move forward with grizzly restoration and the 10(j). If the 10(j) is adopted, future generations of people around the ecosystem will thank you for your work reintroducing a vital species to the region and giving them a full set of management tools to address, reduce, and prevent human-bear conflict. We urge you to quickly move forward with a final EIS, Record of Decision, and implementation of this important plan. We look forward to assisting you in making grizzly restoration work in the North Cascades.

Works Cited (Citations i - x):

- i National Parks Conservation Association. (2023). NPCA Wildlife Poll Summary, page 2, located at: <https://www.npca.org/resources/3462-national-park-wildlife-poll>
- ii Defenders of Wildlife. (2016). Polling finds Washington voters support grizzly bear recovery in North Cascades. Located at: <https://defenders.org/sites/default/files/publications/polling-finds-washington-voters-support-grizzly-bear-recovery-in-north-cascades.pdf>
- iii National Park Service. (2017, June 7). Briefing Statement. Retrieved from Google Drive: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1m_0eeqO7wBKoZt-YZ1HdZLa3IFfOmBto/view
- iv National Park Service. (2023, March). North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/Environmental Impact Statement Public Scoping Comment Analysis Report. Page 6. Retrieved from the NPS History website: <http://npshistory.com/publications/noca/grizzly-bear/restoration-plan-scoping-2023.pdf>
- v National Park Service. (2023, September). Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/Environmental Impact Statement, North Cascades Ecosystem. Page 18. Retrieved from: <https://parkplanning.nps.gov/document.cfm?parkID=327&projectID=112008&documentID=132104>
- vi William L. Gaines. Grizzly Bear Population Restoration in the North Cascades Ecosystem. (2019). Retrieved from: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/12icUAAy2pf8st6ylAvSLf9e2tZ8ePAIa/view?usp=sharing>
- vii RCW 77.12.035, Protection of grizzly bears--Limitation on transplantation or introduction--Negotiations with federal and state agencies.
- viii Dr. Chris Servheen (2023). Personal Communication.
- ix Gunther, K. A. (2023). Bear-caused human fatalities in YNP - characteristics and trends. Human-Wildlife Interactions. In press.
- x National Park Service (2023). Bear-Inflicted Human Injuries and Fatalities in Yellowstone. Retrieved from NPS website: <https://www.nps.gov/yell/learn/nature/injuries.htm>

Best Regards,

██████████
Northwest Program Manager
National Parks Conservation Association
██████████

██████████
Wildlife Director
National Parks Conservation Association
██████████

Correspondence ID: 13977Project:112008Document:132104

Address: DEER PARK, WA 99006
United States of America

Outside Organization: Canopy Credit Union Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 18:17:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Natural Migration is Already Happening: Grizzly bears are already making their way into Washington. Just last week, a grizzly bear was captured and removed from Stevens County. If they're meant to be in Washington, they'll come on their own.

Safety Concerns for Recreational Users: Hikers, hunters, and outdoor enthusiasts already have to be cautious of black and grizzly bears. Introducing more grizzlies could lead to increased risks, as seen in states like Montana, Idaho, and Wyoming.

Strain on Wildlife Management: The WDFW Commission has not maximized recreational opportunities for sportsmen as

directed in their mandate. With recent decisions on black bear and potential changes to mountain lion hunting, many conservationists fear the commission is failing to manage its wildlife properly. Introducing more grizzlies would exacerbate this issue. To be clear, reintroduction would not mean a grizzly bear hunting season. The point here is that the state is already under strain from mismanagement of its large population of existing predators beside grizzly bear.

Predator Balance is Essential: Washington is already home to a variety of predators including wolves, cougars, black bears, and coyotes. Washinton's ungulate populations, such as elk, deer, moose, mountain goats, and the endangered woodland caribou, are under strain. Introducing more apex predators would further imbalance its delicate ecosystem. Again, much of this is a consequence of decisions made within the state to properly manage existing species.

If Grizzly bears are restored in Washington, the WDFW commission must allow hunters to have a part in managing them through allocation of tags that are based off of science and biology. This also needs to be applied to other species of predators such as black bears and mountain lions(including allowing the use of hounds to hunt and properly manage the mountain lion population).

Correspondence ID: 13978Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Edmonds, WA 98020
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:18:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: No to grizzly bears. Keep the forest pristine; but no to grizzly bears.

Correspondence ID: 13979Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Olympia, WA 98501
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:19:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do all you can to help restore the grizzly population in the North Cascades. Grizzlies are crucial to a healthy ecosystem as well as the maintenance of the biodiversity of our beautiful State. Thank you!

Correspondence ID: 13980Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Port Orchard, WA 98366
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:19:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzlies belong in the North Cascades. They are natural predators, who are an important part of the great circle of life. They need to be there, just like wolves, deer, and all the other creatures who make up the mountain ecosystem. We must learn to leave nature alone to take care of itself. When we try to intervene, we only succeed in mucking things up. The bears and wolves belong. If anything doesn't belong, it's us!

Correspondence ID: 13981Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Edmonds, WA 98020
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:19:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please bring back the grizzly bears to the Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 13982Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Republic, WA 99166
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 18:19:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is not a good idea, I believe this has been proven with the wolf reintroduction. Their has been nothing but problems with ranchers/cattle and had a detrimental effect on prey species. This coupled with removing the hunting of preparatory cats without the aid of well trained dogs has been a very disheartening few decades of largely decreasing deer/elk populations to say the least Additional predators such as grizzlies will only further the process of reducing all prey animals and eventually cause more human/predator conflicts, while inevitably costing the state thousands in revenue due to declined hunting license purchases because of reduced deer/elk populations available to be harvested.

Correspondence ID: 13983Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kenmore, WA 98028
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 18:20:56

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear National Park Service & To whom it may concern,

I support the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades range where they thrived thousands of years before humans decimated them or pushed them out of this territory. They belong in and contributed in many ways to that ecosystem and would do so again. My understanding is that the few grizzly bears brought into the territory would be placed in remote areas not close to human populations, thus should not create unwanted dangers for people.

I am writing to ask that you support the restoration of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem, their historic range for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C but with needed changes to the proposed 10(j) rule. The proposal would bring up to 25 non-conflict grizzly bears - likely from Montana - into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade and manage them as an experimental population.

The proposed 10(j) rule as currently written fails to give grizzlies the best chance to succeed and is too permissible in allowing reintroduced bears to be killed.

Lethal removal of a grizzly bear should only be considered where there is a demonstrable threat to human safety, and, for non-immediate threats to human safety, only after non-lethal management options, including concerted use of conflict prevention methods, have been exhausted.

No grizzly bears should be hazed or relocated as a result of conflict with livestock unless demonstrable, repeated efforts have been made by the livestock producer to prevent such conflicts, using commonly-available techniques.

No grizzly bears should be killed on public lands as a result of livestock depredation.

Landowners/private citizens should not be given a permit, or otherwise authorized, to kill a grizzly bear.

No grizzly bear should be preemptively relocated if the bear is not a threat to human safety, particularly if the bear has not become habituated or food-conditioned, or when nonnatural foods/attractants have not been properly secured and made inaccessible to bears. Doing so acts as a disincentive for communities to employ conflict prevention measures, and increases the risk to the bear of injury or death from capture and relocation.

These changes are crucial in providing adequate protection for grizzly bears.

I also support an education campaign and postings in the appropriate areas so that people are aware of what they should or should not do when out in remote areas. And education, as well should be given to ranchers or farmers that are concerned about livestock. The more people know, the more fears can be dispelled.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in

the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C and with appropriate changes to Section 10(j). Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

Correspondence ID: 13984Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 18:21:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Recommend Alternative 'A' NO-ACTION PLAN.

The EIS is silent on too many facts that dispute the effectiveness of the two Action Plans. Clearly the EIS is highly leveraged by special interests and the use of reports that go back nearly 60 years.

In 2016 the federal government's point man for 35 years on grizzly bear recovery was quoted as saying "there are now about 2,000 grizzlies in the Lower 48 AND "the Yellowstone and Northern Continental Divide Ecosystem populations ARE RECOVERED."

That was back in 2016. So here we are 7 long years later - Montana, Wyoming, Idaho all petitioned for delisting the Grizzly. They were ignored, or their filings were dismissed.

The government talks about restoration of 200 bears - supporting up to 35 grizzlies during first 5 years. Annual grizzly offspring would then likely put the Grizzly population at over 50. Yes, that will take some years. But it takes only ONE Grizzly to ruin your day. And you have to be alert, on guard every day whether you're hiking, biking, working cows, horses, irrigating, walking your pet, any outside activity. You have to be lucky every time. A Grizzly only needs to be lucky ONE TIME.

The Grizzly recovery plans that are currently in force have not been updated or otherwise adjusted to accommodate the changes in bear population, livestock depredation, or the increase in Grizzly attacks on humans. The federal government should not force apex predators into our communities until after they've corrected mistakes of the past, especially those mistakes that have cost human lives.

Correspondence ID: 13985Project:112008Document:132104

Address: YAKIMA, WA 98903
United States of America

Outside Organization: Baird Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 18:21:48

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I DO NOT THINK GRIZZLY BEARS SHOULD BE RE-INTRODUCED TO THE NORTH CASCADES OF WASHINGTON. I LIVE HERE. I HIKE HERE. I DON'T WANT TO BE ATTACKED BY A GRIZZLY BEAR.

In 1995 the Washington State Legislature declared the "grizzly bears shall not be transplanted or introduced into the state";

PLEASE HONOR THE WISHES OF THE PEOPLE OF WASHINGTON AND DO NOT BRING GRIZZLY BEARS BACK TO WASHINGTON.

Correspondence ID: 13986Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ellensburg, WA 98926
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:21:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The Grizzly Bear is needed for the biological equilibrium of the forest region.

Correspondence ID: 13987Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Port Angeles, WA 98362
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:22:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To whom it may concern,

I am writing to support the restoration of grizzly bears to the North Cascades. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C but with needed changes to the proposed 10(j) rule. The proposal would bring up to 25 non-conflict grizzly bears - likely from Montana - into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade and manage them as an experimental population.

The proposed 10(j) rule as currently written fails to give grizzlies the best chance to succeed and is too permissible in allowing reintroduced bears to be killed.

Lethal removal of a grizzly bear should only be considered where there is a demonstrable threat to human safety, and, for non-immediate threats to human safety, only after non-lethal management options, including concerted use of conflict prevention methods, have been exhausted.

No grizzly bears should be hazed or relocated as a result of conflict with livestock unless demonstrable, repeated efforts have been made by the livestock producer to prevent such conflicts, using commonly-available techniques.

No grizzly bears should be killed on public lands as a result of livestock depredation.

Landowners/private citizens should not be given a permit, or otherwise authorized, to kill a grizzly bear.

No grizzly bear should be preemptively relocated if the bear is not a threat to human safety, particularly if the bear has not become habituated or food-conditioned, or when nonnatural foods/attractants have not been properly secured and made inaccessible to bears. Doing so acts as a disincentive for communities to employ conflict prevention measures, and increases the risk to the bear of injury or death from capture and relocation.

These changes are crucial in providing adequate protection for grizzly bears.

Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C and with appropriate changes to Section 10(j). Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Correspondence ID: 13988Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Port Angeles, WA 98362
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:23:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please restore Grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem. They have always been an important player in a balanced ecosystem. Besides, they were here first.

Correspondence ID: 13989Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Shoreline, WA 98133
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:23:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hello, reintroduction of Grizzlies will help restore the natural balance of the park. Protection needed from users of public land gorgeous private gain. Thank you

Correspondence ID: 13990Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Kennewick, WA 99337
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:24:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: No, I don't agree that with the present circumstances, man and grizzly can co exist that close in proximity to one another...one of the few times I agree with my congressman!

Correspondence ID: 13991Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98112
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:25:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am writing to support the restoration of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem, their historic range for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C and with appropriate changes to Section 10(j). Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 13992Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Anacortes, WA 98221
United States of America
Outside Organization: Sierra Club Conservation/Preservation
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:26:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support these changes to the proposed 10(j) rule regarding reintroducing Grizzly Bear into the North Cascades wilderness.

Correspondence ID: 13993Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98124
United States of America
Outside Organization: Skagit Environmental Endowment Commission Conservation/Preservation(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:27:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: November 13, 2023

Office of the Superintendent
North Cascades National Park Complex
Grizzly Restoration EIS
810 State Route 20,
Sedro-Woolley, WA 98284

Dear Superintendent Striker,

RE: Support for grizzly bear recovery in the North Cascades ecosystem

The Skagit Environmental Endowment Commission (SEEC) was established under an agreement between the Province of British Columbia and the City of Seattle as a condition within the Ross Lake/Seven Mile Reservoir Treaty between the United States and Canada signed in 1984 (Appendix D). The treaty and agreement are in effect until 2064.

SEEC's mission is to ensure the preservation and protection of the natural and cultural resources and recreational opportunities of the Upper Skagit Watershed to the highest North American management standards through advocacy, promoting international collaboration and strategic partnerships and investments. As a transboundary entity, SEEC values this opportunity to protect and recover species like the grizzly bear, which still is found in the BC side of this shared ecosystem, and has supported public education and research towards this goal in Canada, as well.

SEEC has supported public education and research on grizzly bear restoration during the initial scoping process in preparation for the draft environmental impact statement (EIS). SEEC committed to providing up to \$250,000 toward the EIS process and approved the use of these funds to support population modeling and public agency involvement.

We have been pleased with the integrity of the science and the extraordinary commitment from the National Park Service and other cooperating agencies, including the Washington Department and Fish and Wildlife, to engage and educate the public around this issue and process.

As an entity with a transboundary focus and mission, SEEC appreciates the international coordination conducted already through the North Cascades Subcommittee of the Interagency Grizzly Bear Committee, and we hope it continues through this analysis to implementation of recovery actions. We also appreciate the actions underway by the NPS to install wildlife-proof food storage containers throughout the Ross Lake National Recreation Area.

SEEC strongly supports action to recover a long-term viable population of grizzly bears in the North Cascades because they are a key component of this ecosystem and cultural landscape.

We also support the designation of this grizzly bear population as an experimental/nonessential population pursuant to Section 10(j) of the Endangered Species Act. We believe this Section 10(j) designation will allow the greatest flexibility in management for grizzlies on the United States side of the North Cascades, and therefore offers the best opportunity for minimizing potential conflicts in the interest of both wildlife and people who visit or live in the region.

These comments will supplement those provided by SEEC in March of 2017 to the Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan Environmental Impact Statement for the North Cascades Ecosystem issued in January, 2017.

Thank you and other state and federal agency partners and cooperators for this opportunity to support the recovery of this keystone species to one of the remaining wild and largely intact ecosystems in the contiguous United States which is shared with Canada.

Sincerely,

██████████
USA Co-chair, SEEC

██████████
Canada Co-chair, SEEC

Correspondence ID: 13994Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Auburn, WA 98092
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:27:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I think it would be wonderful to reintroduce grizzlies. It would help restore the natural balance of nature.

Correspondence ID: 13995Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Renton, WA 98058
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:29:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: After reading up on this issue, I am fully supportive of a careful and science backed approach to reintroducing grizzlies to the North Cascade area. They belong here.

Correspondence ID: 13999Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98133
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:30:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Speaking as someone who recreates in the North Cascades weekly, hiking, climbing, and backcountry skiing, I whole heartedly support efforts to reestablish grizzly bears in the North Cascades. Having spent a fair bit of time in areas with healthy grizzly/brown bear populations (Alaska, Montana, Wyoming, Alaska, BC, Alberta), I am familiar with the extra precautions required and risk incurred, but find that the sense of wonder and joy at having the opportunity to see these magnificent animals in the wild far exceeds the downsides.

From a broader perspective, we are living in a time were it feels as though the biosphere is in a constant state of retreat. Factors including global warming, habitat loss, and over hunting are causing species extinctions and a dramatic decay in biodiversity. In this context, we must make use of all available opportunities to reverse the tide. This is an important chance to restore biodiversity to our region, and I believe it is imperative that we act.

I support either Alternative B or C from the draft EIS. Grizzly bear populations in the North Cascades Ecoregion should be restored.

Correspondence ID: 14001Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98119
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:31:19
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzly bears to their historic range in the North Cascades. Grizzly bears thrived here for thousands of years with access to clean water and bountiful fish and wildlife.

I support Alternative C except changes are needed to the proposed 10(j) rule. The proposal would bring up to 25 non-conflict grizzly bears - likely from Montana - into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade and manage them as an experimental population.

The proposed 10(j) rule as currently written fails to give grizzlies the best chance to succeed and is too permissible in allowing reintroduced bears to be killed.

Lethal removal of a grizzly bear should only be considered where there is a demonstrable threat to human safety, and, for non-immediate threats to human safety, only after non-lethal management options, including concerted use of conflict prevention methods, have been exhausted.

No grizzly bears should be hazed or relocated as a result of conflict with livestock unless demonstrable, repeated efforts have been made by the livestock producer to prevent such conflicts, using commonly-available techniques.

No grizzly bears should be killed on public lands as a result of livestock depredation.

Landowners/private citizens should not be given a permit, or otherwise authorized, to kill a grizzly bear.

No grizzly bear should be preemptively relocated if the bear is not a threat to human safety, particularly if the bear has not become habituated or food-conditioned, or when nonnatural foods/attractants have not been properly secured and made inaccessible to bears. Doing so acts as a disincentive for communities to employ conflict prevention measures, and increases the risk to the bear of injury or death from capture and relocation.

These changes are crucial in providing adequate protection for grizzly bears.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C and with appropriate changes to Section 10(j). Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Correspondence ID: 14003Project:112008Document:132104
Address: West Richland, WA 99353
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:32:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Before introducing grizzly bears to the Cascades which are not that far from a major city, they should be reintroduced to sparsely populated ranges, eg, the Idaho Sawtooth mountains.

Correspondence ID: 14004Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Edmonds, WA 98020
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:33:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Having lived in Alaska for 30 years, I do NOT support bringing grizzly bears back to the North Cascades. With so many people in that area, human-bear contact will be inevitable and the results will not be good.

Correspondence ID: 14005Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:33:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As part of the restoration of the wilderness of the North Cascades, I support the reintroduction of grizzly bears to their natural habitat. While there will inevitably be some conflict, the hype and notoriety of such incidents does not represent the true likelihood of conflict. With respect to ranchers, farmers, and landowners, this conflict is managed in other

states. As a former resident of Montana, I learned to enjoy wilderness areas in the state in the presence of grizzly bears. I have had encounters with grizzly bears while in the backcountry, and all of my experiences have been positive experiences.

Correspondence ID: 14006Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Vashon, WA 98070
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:34:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The future needs top predators like the grizzly and wolves to keep the ecosystem balanced and healthier.

Correspondence ID: 14007Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bothell, WA 98012
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:34:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: (*Not copy/pasted word-for-word!*)
I am writing to support the restoration of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem, their historic range for thousands of years.

I support Alternative C but with needed changes to the proposed 10(j) rule. The proposed 10(j) rule as currently written fails to give grizzlies the best chance to succeed and is too permissible in allowing reintroduced bears to be killed.

Lethal removal of a grizzly bear should only be considered where there is a demonstrable threat to human safety, and, for non-immediate threats to human safety, only after non-lethal management options, including concerted use of conflict prevention methods, have been exhausted.

No grizzly bears should be hazed or relocated as a result of conflict with livestock unless demonstrable, repeated efforts have been made by the livestock producer to prevent such conflicts, using commonly-available techniques.

No grizzly bears should be killed on public lands as a result of livestock depredation.

Landowners/private citizens should not be given a permit, or otherwise authorized, to kill a grizzly bear.

No grizzly bear should be preemptively relocated if the bear is not a threat to human safety, particularly if the bear has not become habituated or food-conditioned, or when nonnatural foods/attractants have not been properly secured and made inaccessible to bears. Doing so acts as a disincentive for communities to employ conflict prevention measures, and increases the risk to the bear of injury or death from capture and relocation.

These changes are crucial in providing adequate protection for grizzly bears.

Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C and with appropriate changes to Section 10(j). Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Thank you!

Correspondence ID: 14008Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:34:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the careful and considerate reintroduction of Grizzlies into the North Cascades Ecosystem. I know me the hardest challenge will be the public perception of Grizzlies as dangerous animals and the possibility of encountering these animals in the wilderness areas that are very popular to human recreation. As an avid trail runner, I know how this will impact my community but I think it provides a valuable lesson if communicated properly about how these places are not just for human consumption and that we need to recognize the benefit of this decision to the vitality of the entire region. Public outreach will be extremely important. Continued funding for professionals who desire to connect people to conservation efforts should be a priority alongside reintroduction programs otherwise such programs will fail. Implementing the latest research on community engagement and allocating the appropriate resources should be at the forefront of everyone's efforts involved.

Correspondence ID: 14009Project:112008Document:132104

Address: EDMONDS, WA 98026
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 18:35:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to support the restoration of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem. What's good for grizzlies is good for people.

I support Alternative C but with needed changes to the proposed 10(j) rule.

The proposed 10(j) rule as currently written fails to give grizzlies the best chance to succeed and is too permissible in allowing reintroduced bears to be killed.

- Lethal removal of a grizzly bear should only be considered where there is a demonstrable threat to human safety, and, for non-immediate threats to human safety, only after non-lethal management options, including concerted use of conflict prevention methods, have been exhausted.
- No grizzly bears should be hazed or relocated as a result of conflict with livestock unless demonstrable, repeated efforts have been made by the livestock producer to prevent such conflicts, using commonly-available techniques.
- No grizzly bears should be killed on public lands as a result of livestock depredation.
- Landowners/private citizens should not be given a permit, or otherwise authorized, to kill a grizzly bear.
- No grizzly bear should be preemptively relocated if the bear is not a threat to human safety, particularly if the bear has not become habituated or food-conditioned, or when nonnatural foods/attractants have not been properly secured and made inaccessible to bears. Doing so acts as a disincentive for communities to employ conflict prevention measures, and increases the risk to the bear of injury or death from capture and relocation.

These changes are crucial in providing adequate protection for grizzly bears.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C and with appropriate changes to Section 10(j). Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Correspondence ID: 14010Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America

Outside Organization: Retired Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 18:36:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: BEARS ARE PART OF OUR PLAN TO FULLY RESTORE WILDERNESS AND WILDNESS!

Correspondence ID: 14011Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Anacortes, WA 98221
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:37:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am now approaching 70 years old, and grew up loving to hike in the Cascades of Western Washington. For the last several years now I do not go much because so many trails are overcrowded, trail entrance areas are overparked and folks are then parking on highway shoulders. In addition, there is far less respect for the wildlife and leaving trash and feces on the trails instead of packing it out. Since my 'growing up years', the development and population of Western Washington has skyrocketed, meaning more and more people out on trails, especially on weekends. In Western Washington, many areas have fairly easy access for 'city folks' on a weekend jaunt. I feel that introducing Grizzlies to this largely human-populated (often ill-behaved humans) is dangerous!!

Having lived 7 years in Montana, with Grizzlies still in residence, it was okay to go hiking with due caution of course. There was less population by humans near the wilderness areas, and the folks there pretty much abided by respect of the bears and consciousness of the dangers of risky behaviors. Even then, there were still occasional deadly attacks!

The population in Western Washington has exploded, and this population would not give due caution and respect to the presence of Grizzly Bears, endangering both bears and humans.

Correspondence ID: 14012Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:37:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzly bears deserve the right to stay in the habitats that they have currently adapted to without being removed. Reintroducing them to a new area is unhealthy for their adjust and will increase violent reactions to the influx of human interactions they will experience. People here are not used to the presence of these animal and a strained relation between them and us will be inevitable. The hiking and recreational lands we have available to us have recently been increasingly inhibited by predatory animal sightings and interactions and this will only increase with the presence of another deadly species. We, Washington state, pride ourselves on providing endless outdoor recreation to the families and communities that make us who we are. We do not want yet another obstacle to interfere with ours desires to do so in a safe and comfortable manner.

Correspondence ID: 14013Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Arlington, WA 98223
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:37:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Typed and emailed for Elaine Engles Sears by Theresa Ferron (Daughter-in-law)

To: Department of Fish and Wildlife
Attn: Brad Thompson, State Supervisor

Dear Mr. Thompson:

My name is Elaine Engles Sears. I am 81 years old and I live at the base of Whitehorse mountain. I am writing to ask you respectfully not to place grizzlies in the North Cascade mountain range. Considering the new population growth and interest in these rural areas and the high volume of hikers in these mountains, I believe that to inject these bears into this area would be a disastrous mistake.

For more than a decade I resided in both Alaska and Montana, so I know more than I would like to about the grizzly -- "ursus arctos horribilis".

I know the grizzly is a major killer. It will and does kill and eat humans, burying anything left uneaten, and returning later to dig up and finish the remains.

I also know the grizzly is not content to wander solely in the highlands. It loves the valleys - the flatlands - and gets to them in a hurry where it then fishes the salmon out of the creeks, gorges on fruit, destroying the trees, kills livestock, snags domestic animals, and easily claws its way into any wood structure about which it is curious. I know you realize all of this,. The truth is any child walking to school or to the school bus in the early morning hours would be in mortal danger from this animal.

At the moment there is a great run -- a race, in fact -- to "save the environment" and "restore the balance of nature". I'm not saying that is wrong. I was raised by a long-time forest ranger who served the Mount Baker Snoqualmie area for 30 years, so I love these hills and the animals who inhabit them; but I also love my family and my neighbors. Common sense must prevail. Wildlife enthusiasts get excited and begin to push personal agendas. There can be a lot of hubris when one believes he/she is saving the world. Please don't allow hubris a seat at the table when the final decision is made.

Thank you --

██████████
██████████
Arlington, WA 98223

"Ursus arctos horribilis - The world's largest terrestrial carnivores - highly incompatible with human civilization."

From Cascade-Olympic Natural History / Author: Daniel Mathews

Correspondence ID: 14014Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Desmoines, WA 98198
United States of America
Outside Organization: None Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:37:52
Correspondence Type:Web Form
Correspondence: No no no no no and Hell No!

Correspondence ID: 14015Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Vancouver, WA 98664
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:38:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I strongly support the return of grizzlies to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 14016Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Snohomish, WA 98296
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:38:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I attended the presentation online last month. I fully support this. I believe restoration of the grizzly bear is an important step in restoring ecosystems in the North Cascades. The research and previous restoration efforts in other regions in Montana, for example, support this step.

Correspondence ID: 14017Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Poulsbo, WA 98370
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:39:18

Correspondence Type:

Web Form

Correspondence: To the Members of the U.S. Department of the Interior, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the National Park Service,

Thank you for accepting comments on this document. There are multiple points I would like to address, the cumulative sum of which directs me to recommend AGAINST the proposed course of action. These points are listed below:

- 1) Disruption to currently established ecosystems which have adjusted to a new equilibrium post-disappearance of grizzly populations, including competition with native black bears
- 2) Conflict between introduced grizzlies and human populations that have become equilibrated to a reality post-disappearance of grizzly populations, including damages to livestock and property
- 3) Unfavorable public opinion of grizzly populations due to the aforementioned conflict, especially in rural communities, resulting in reduced support for conservation efforts
- 4) Undue stress and risk to transplanted grizzlies
- 5) Imminent natural migration of grizzly populations from Canada into the North Cascades
- 6) Allocation of resources that could be directed to protecting and expanding the current populations of grizzlies outside of the Cascades
- 7) Allocation of resources that could be directed to conservation efforts of neglected and at-risk species including fish, amphibians, and microfauna which are critical to ecological health
- 8) Allocation of resources that could be directed to environment restoration projects that are currently yielding successful results, such as the restoration of the Dungeness River Watershed
- 9) Allocation of resources that could be directed to maintenance of national and state parks which are in need of funding, staffing, and refurbishment

I believe that the skills and resources of your departments would serve the wild places of our country in far more impactful ways than by pursuing the proposed grizzly restoration plan. Please continue the powerful work you do in promoting education, conservation, and management of the parks so critical to humans and wildlife alike. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Correspondence ID: 14019Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Marblemount, WA 98267
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 18:40:45

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I agree completely with the North Cascades Conservation Council's comments. They are very well researched, well reasoned, and fair in all aspects. I quote:

"Dear National Park Service and Fish and Wildlife Service:

North Cascades Conservation Council offers these comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem. Our enthusiastic support for the return of grizzly bears to the Ecosystem is tempered by our concerns over the process proposed to reintroduce bears, and the management of bears post-placement.

The first principle for successful reintroduction of grizzlies is to do no harm to existing bear populations or to wilderness, and to safeguard reintroduced bears. The reintroduction plans contemplated in the DEIS Alternative C appears poised to violate this principle. We cannot support any reintroduction plan that involves intensive use of helicopters in wilderness, and the haphazard killing of reintroduced bears under vague pretenses. The way to get grizzlies flourishing in the North Cascades is to protect wilderness, not desecrate it while killing bears. Therefore, we support implementation of Alternative B.

Reintroduction Targets

We are generally supportive of the target of a local population of 200 bears over the long-term. We generally agree with the process of introducing a small group of bears each year over a period of five to ten years. However, we feel that an initial population of 25 bears may be insufficient to obtain the 200 bear objective when considering the limited breeding stock, limited potential for interbreeding with outlying grizzly populations, and the proposal for lethal means of managing bears. We would favor a firm commitment to reintroduce a minimum of five bears per year over an eight-to-ten-year window.

Reintroduction Process

The EIS should include a review of all previous grizzly reintroductions anywhere in North America to determine the level of, and reasons for mortality that occurred both during the transport of bears, and due to the unsuccessful adaptation of bears within the first 3-6 months post-reintroduction. Every effort should be made to avoid repeating past mistakes, and to reduce, if possible, the shock to bears of being drugged, transported, and placed in an unfamiliar location. The EIS should identify whether and to what degree causes of mortality can be avoided, and whether on balance any given reintroduction plan's value outweighs the deaths of bears it will cause.

Sources from which to Glean Grizzlies

While we recognize that travel distance is a factor in ensuring the safe relocation of grizzlies into the North Cascades, we believe bears should only be gleaned from places where the existing population is stable and flourishing, and would be expected to remain intact even after removal of some bears. We are not presently comfortable with removing bears from anywhere in the lower 48 United States.

Furthermore, bears should not be gleaned from populations whose primary food source differs from the available food sources in the North Cascades. For example, it would seem unwise to reintroduce bears that have adapted to coastal food sources.

Public Education Program

A grizzly recovery effort should be accompanied by a more intensive public education campaign than is proposed. It should of course involve both federal and state government, focusing on communities and popular recreation sites surrounding, and within Zones 1 and 2 to minimize potentially dangerous encounters between grizzlies and humans.

An intensive information campaign would involve how to identify grizzly bears; how to avoid areas where grizzlies are likely to be present at specific times of the year; what to do if encountering a grizzly; how to bear-proof campsites and residences; a requirement to carry bear spray in the backcountry; what brands and/or intensities of bear spray to carry and how to use it; the value of noisemaking devices to scare off bears.

The State of Washington should educate hunters (bear hunters or pursuers of other game animals) on how to distinguish a grizzly from a black bear. Killing a grizzly bear for any reason other than justifiable self-defense should be met with legal consequences under the Endangered Species Act to be enforced by the respective federal and state agencies.

10(j) Designation Under the Endangered Species Act

We are including our position on the designation of the North Cascades grizzlies as an experimental population under Section 10(j) of the ESA in these comments, as this issue is directly related to the overall goal of establishing grizzlies in the North Cascades. This is not a separate issue. It isn't clear why two separate sets of comments are required when the 10(j) rule is proposed in one of the action alternatives (C) and not in the other (Alternative B).

If the objective of establishing a breeding population of grizzlies in the North Cascades, and in suitable habitat outside the Ecosystem (outside of Zone 1) is to be realized, half-measures will not suffice. Assessment of whether the existence of grizzlies is compatible with present land uses and activities has already been made with the decision to pursue reintroduction.

Such determination should consider the fact that grizzlies were extirpated from their traditional range in the Ecosystem due to perceived land use conflicts. Humans killed all grizzly bears in the North Cascades rather than adapting land uses to the

ecological necessity of top-tier predators across the landscape. This reverse-logic process should not be repeated.

In consideration of the three management zones, management direction for Zone 2 should not differ from Zone 1. In Zone 3, killing of bears should be limited to cases where a person is in imminent danger of being harmed or killed by a grizzly. It should be an accepted principle that grizzly bears will self-restrict to preferred habitat in wild places where conflicts with humans other than recreation users would be unlikely.

We oppose 10(j) designation for North Cascades grizzlies and instead encourage the implementation of public education measures that reduce human/bear conflicts and preclude the perceived need for lethal means of managing bears, as described further in these comments. Alternative B satisfies most of these concerns. The purpose of reintroduction of grizzlies is to amend the mistakes of the past, so why compromise that principle? The alleged need for a 10(j) designation has been described as a "...larger tool box." When the main tool in the box is a high-powered rifle, the designation is contrary to the purposes of the project.

Human Use Issues

Management of bears that may pose threats to livestock should be more detailed. There should be a distinction between grizzlies threatening livestock on public land open range versus contained livestock on private land. Lethal force should never be used to protect open range livestock: federal land should be considered bear territory. The standard for addressing bear interactions with livestock on private land should stipulate that bears may only be disturbed if they directly threaten livestock (attacking animals) rather than merely their presence in areas where livestock are present.

The first option to address bears that directly threaten contained livestock should be relocation, not killing. The option of supplying ranchers in the wildland urban interface with rifles that discharge tranquilizer darts whereby bears would be disabled to await relocation by federal officials, is preferable to deadly force at the discretion of the livestock operator. In the relocation effort, every bear should be considered an integral part of ecosystem restoration rather than an expendable resource.

We are also concerned that logging operations are listed under direct threats to human uses. We fail to see the need to have any distinction between bears interacting with recreationists in backcountry than with personnel on logging operations. This directive implies that logging companies may arbitrarily kill bears that are in the general vicinity of a logging operation.

Helicopters in Designated Wilderness

We implore the Park Service and FWS to explore and analyze options to the use of helicopters in designated wilderness, and in roadless areas. Based on available information and common sense, we believe the use of helicopters in designated wilderness for reintroduction of grizzlies is not a necessity but an unnecessary convenience in violation of the Wilderness Act. No exceptions to the Wilderness Act should be pursued. There are several locations where bears could be successfully placed with wide geographic coverage using ground-based vehicles on existing, open roads, and/or using helicopters without landing in designated wilderness.

Exceptions to the Wilderness Act should be limited to emergency situations where human life is at stake, not the contradictory objective of facilitating the reintroduction of native species that depend on wilderness for survival.

We have identified several locations outside areas of human presence where reintroduction can occur on existing roads with no helicopter use: Slate Peak near Hart's Pass; roads end on the upper Twisp River Road; the end of Eightmile Creek Road south of the Pasayten Wilderness; the road along the Chiwawa River near Trinity; the end of the road at Cascade Pass, the end of Road 11 above Shannon Lake.

Helicopter reintroductions could occur outside of designated wilderness in, but not limited to, the following locations: Golden Horn in the upper Methow Watershed; Burch Mountain at the headwaters of Eightmile Creek; Foggy Pass on upper Canyon Creek; Lamont Lake at the headwaters of Cedar Creek; Easy Pass; Cub Lake at Prince Creek; Evergreen Mountain near Beckler River; Indigo Lake in the Suiattle River Watershed.

All the above locations would allow a wide distribution of grizzlies throughout Zone 1 without using helicopters in designated wilderness, or at all. However deep into backcountry bears are placed, released bears will presumably remain in backcountry, and migrate to the habitats necessary for their survival.

In addition, for management of bears post-release, access to bears in designated wilderness should be by foot or pack animals only--no continued use of helicopters for ground examination should be permitted. The EIS should state more succinctly what human intervention would be deemed necessary (not just "desirable") for bear survival after bears have been released.

Connecting Island Populations

As you know, the 10(j) rule considers a reintroduced species that is geographically isolated from other occupied habitats as experimental. This begs for a solution to creating populations that will remain isolated. Although it may seem outside the scope of the EIS analysis, we highly recommend there be disclosure in the EIS of measures that can be taken in specific areas to facilitate connectivity between grizzly bear populations in the United States and Canada in the future.

Connectivity is essential to facilitate inter-population migration to diversify the grizzly gene pool. Such analysis would include identification of areas where habitat restoration could occur on public land between the North Cascades and federal land in the Idaho panhandle and northwestern Montana, and populations in south and central British Columbia.

The EIS should disclose what measures would be needed in the respective areas for example, road closures and other means of habitat restoration. This consideration would set the stage for the overarching objective of expanding habitat to restore grizzlies to areas of historical existence outside island populations by creating seamless habitat.

This concludes our comments. It is refreshing to comment on a federal proposal that would restore the natural world. We are grateful for the time and effort the National Park Service and Fish and Wildlife Service have invested in the effort to restore native grizzlies to their former habitats."

Thanks for your careful consideration of this important issue.

Correspondence ID: 14020Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sumner, WA 98390
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:43:49
Correspondence Type:Web Form
Correspondence: I support this decision!

Correspondence ID: 14021Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA, WA 98105
United States of America
Outside Organization: HPR Robotics Business(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:44:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I strongly disagree with reintroducing grizzly bears in the North Cascades. There are too many hikers and campers that utilize that area for recreation. Grizzly bears and humans don't get along particularly well, and there will be encounters between the two, most likely resulting in injuries or death to one or the other. While I certainly do not wish injury to my fellow outdoor enthusiasts, I also do not wish harm to come to these magnificent creatures.

Correspondence ID: 14023Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Federal Way, WA 98023
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received:
Correspondence Type:
Correspondence: November 13, 2023

Nov,13 2023 18:45:34
Web Form

4:42 PM

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to support the restoration of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem, their historic range for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C but with needed changes to the proposed 10(j) rule. The proposal would bring up to 25 non-conflict grizzly bears - likely from Montana - into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade and manage them as an experimental population.

The proposed 10(j) rule as currently written fails to give grizzlies the best chance to succeed and is too permissible in allowing reintroduced bears to be killed.

- Lethal removal of a grizzly bear should only be considered where there is a demonstrable threat to human safety, and, for non-immediate threats to human safety, only after non-lethal management options, including concerted use of conflict prevention methods, have been exhausted.
- No grizzly bears should be hazed or relocated as a result of conflict with livestock unless demonstrable, repeated efforts have been made by the livestock producer to prevent such conflicts, using commonly-available techniques.
- No grizzly bears should be killed on public lands as a result of livestock depredation.
- Landowners/private citizens should not be given a permit, or otherwise authorized, to kill a grizzly bear.
- No grizzly bear should be preemptively relocated if the bear is not a threat to human safety, particularly if the bear has not become habituated or food-conditioned, or when nonnatural foods/attractants have not been properly secured and made inaccessible to bears. Doing so acts as a disincentive for communities to employ conflict prevention measures, and increases the risk to the bear of injury or death from capture and relocation.

These changes are crucial in providing adequate protection for grizzly bears.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C and with appropriate changes to Section 10(j). Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment. I will continue to follow this process and am hopeful of a positive outcome for grizzly bears.

Correspondence ID: 14024Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spokane, WA 99207
United States of America

Outside Organization: Sierra club Conservation/Preservation(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,13 2023 18:46:12

Correspondence Type:Web Form

Correspondence: NATURE BEFORE PROFIT!

Correspondence ID: 14025Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sammamish, WA 98075
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 18:48:15

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a wildlife photographer who frequently encounters grizzly bears in the Yellowstone ecosystem, I have seen first hand the effect that they have on bringing natural balance to their home range. Grizzly bears have historically belonged in the north cascades, and their absence is one of the great ecological tragedies of our time. The threat to recreational use of the park is insignificant compared to the positive effect that bringing these bears back will mean. All citizens of our state should support this plan and help to bring these amazing animals back.

Correspondence ID: 14026Project:112008Document:132104

Address: chicago, IL 60631
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 18:48:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The natural recovery options must be fully developed and studied even if this method takes longer than other options.. All possible measures must be taken to prepare residents for grizzlies. Restoration must occur without violating the Wilderness act. Helicopter landings in Wilderness and the placement and use of telemetry installations need to be avoided.

Correspondence ID: 14027Project:112008Document:132104

Address: tacoma, WA 98417
Austria

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 18:48:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please restore Grizzly bears and other native species to their original homes

Correspondence ID: 14028Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 18:50:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: For the following reasons, I am opposed to reintroducing grizzly bears to the North Cascades. I am a lover of nature and believe in conservation, but reintroducing predatory species that have been absent for some time can have unforeseen negative effects. There will be more competition for resources with the established native species that still exist in the areas, and it is difficult to predict if grizzlies or black bears will be pushed closer to areas highly populated by humans to look for resources. I think our time and resources would be best put to use to conserve our current fauna and flora, and to keep access to our beautiful parks maintained so we can all enjoy and experience our lands as responsible stewards.

Reintroducing a predatory species in our north cascades will likely lead to unfavorable encounters with hikers and those exploring our parks. While many avid adventurers may know how to encounter a bear in the wild, there are many visitors and less experienced people that may not be able to correctly read the body language of a bear or how to act in a potentially dangerous situation. Anyone who has hiked in the North Cascades can probably understand how quickly the wind could render bear spray completely useless if it came to that desperate of a situation.

I understand wanting to restore a species, but we should focus on our current local restorations rather than uprooting these animals from their current home and reintroducing a species that has been absent for many years. Thank you for giving us the opportunity to provide input.

Correspondence ID: 14029Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lacey, WA 98516
United States of America

Outside Organization: Washington Farm Bureau Non-Governmental(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:50:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To: Dir. Martha Williams

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 1849 C Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20240

Date: November 13, 2023

Re: Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Establishment of a Nonessential Experimental Population of Grizzly Bear in the North Cascades Ecosystem, Washington State

Via: Electronic Submission; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Docket No. FWS-R1-ES-2023-0074. Federal Register 9/29/2023

Dear Director Williams et al.

The Washington Farm Bureau (WFB) is the state's largest voluntary grassroots agricultural advocacy organization representing the social and economic interests of farm and ranch families, including private forest landowners, at the local, state, and national levels. We respectfully request consideration of the below recommendations and analysis on behalf of our members.

WFB has significant concerns over the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) released by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) related to the nonessential experimental population (NEP) of the grizzly bear in the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE). Our strong opposition to any introduction of grizzly bears is rooted in the danger grizzlies will pose to our members, their employees and their families in the area. At this time, WFB is supportive of Alternative A as stated in the DEIS for multiple socioeconomic, regulatory and immeasurable reasons; the preference of our members is no introduction of grizzlies. USFWS proposal to introduce a NEP and establish grizzlies in the NCE is not a necessary step for conserving the species. Our members have managed sheep and cattle production for generations across tens of thousands of acres of public and private lands throughout Washington. These producers are the conservationists of these landscapes, having managed lands, waters, wildlife, and adverse conditions with the most accurate record keeping in history to ensure the resources remain healthy and resilient. These producers have always been partners with public landowners and contribute significantly to the wellbeing of federal and state lands. Yet, agencies continue to push interests and farmers continue to present issues on this same topic through three presidential administrations.

Ranchers, who have been in the area for generations, are worried that reintroducing bears will reach the same end as wolves and the lack of management from several agencies will perpetuate predation on cattle throughout the area. The DEIS fails to clearly state how the NEP of grizzlies introduced to the NCE will help to effectively lead to the delisting of the species. Just as the recovery for wolves is a moving goal post of population and nonlethal deterrents, the recovery for bears poses similar threats and tie the hands of the stewards producing food in the area.

As bears seek food and disperse away from Management Zone 1, predations will increase and livestock will respond negatively in several ways. Stress on livestock can greatly impact growth and fertility causing irregularity in a herd and reducing the efficiency of both the animals and manager. One 2014 study focused on wolves but noted the results can be more broadly applicable to other predators: in areas near a confirmed kill livestock weights were down 3.5 percent.¹

Additionally, a different study

¹ "Crying Wolf? A Spatial Analysis of Wolf Location and Depredations on Calf Weight," American Journal of Agricultural Economics. 10/2014.

found 19 percent of ranchers reported reductions in conception rates.

² An external negative impact to a manager's return on investment reflects the industry's viability; especially when livestock producers and farmers are dependent on a commodity market and incapable of setting their own prices.

Not only will the grizzly bear as an apex predator pose a threat to cattle, livestock and local ungulates, but it will significantly impact the families and employees managing land and services in the NCE and private lands most adjacent to the NCE border.³ Regardless of commodity, employers and employees alike are not interested in working in the presence of a grizzly bear. Farmers are obligated to provide a safe work environment for their employees and are continually complying with state and federal safety standards and laws. Unknowingly subjecting employees to a dangerous hazard like a grizzly bear in an orchard block or riparian area while tending cattle will raise questions about the liability of an attack, particularly if an attack happens on private land. This type of threat and continued occupation of grizzlies will lead to unharvested orchard blocks, ungrazed sections of land and reduced wages for employees.

Pollinators will also face pressure when trying to achieve what all farmers, landowners and natural resource managers need in the spring and summer. Without the increased populations of pollinators during the spring and summer from the presence of pollinating businesses and backyard beekeeping, natural landscapes and orchards and other crops will suffer. Every year beekeepers struggle to keep hives confined and well managed surrounding them with electric fence, ribbons and other deterrents, yet bears do not mind and continue to destroy both hives and colonies.

The establishment of grizzly bears in the NCE with the NEP under the 10(j) rule does not provide the flexibility required for an agricultural producer to properly respond and manage their farm and livestock. If lethal take of a bear in Management Zone 2 can only be done after confirmed depredation has already occurred, or if lethal take can only be done in Management Zone 3 after the Service determines that a bear presents a "demonstrable and ongoing threat to human safety or to lawfully present livestock," there will be an inevitable harm to producers.⁴ If the intention of USFWS is to establish grizzly bears and protect agricultural producers, landowners and the greater human population, the tools available must be expanded and require more stringent definitions.

Despite the best of intentions by USFWS or other agency staff, depredation kills can be misidentified and responsiveness to a depredation can lack the urgency the producer needs to stifle the further issues. We request clarification on USFWS reasoning on p.58 of the proposed 10(j) rule, "Once (USFWS) or authorized agency determines the threat is no longer ongoing, the authorizing agency will notify the person, terminating the authorization." Producers need a clear, consistent threshold of what constitutes a no-longer ongoing threat. The process to request and receive written authorization to engage in lethal take must be a streamlined process and Farm Bureau is ready to foster the relationships required to assist both USFWS and producers in resolving potential grizzly bear conflicts. Many producers already experience lengthy bureaucratic delays to everything from review of minor range improvements to

2 "Modeling Large Carnivore and Ranch Attribute Effects on Livestock Predation and Nonlethal Losses," Rangeland and Ecology Management. 6/2018.

3 Proposed Rule, Docket No. FWS-R1-ES-2023-0074. Federal Register 9/29/2023.

4 Proposed Rule, Docket No. FWS-R1-ES-2023-0074. Federal Register 9/29/2023.

renewal of grazing permits. Time is of the essence when responding to depredation threats; the authorization of producers to lethally take a grizzly bear is especially crucial to prevent the next attack.

Agricultural producers also deserve transparency and timeliness of information within the NCE and Management Zones 2 and 3. To keep producers and the public safe, notifying people in the area of a grizzly bear especially in a situation where human life may be jeopardized is crucial. Collaring every bear upon capture and relocation would provide the tools to USFWS staff and the public to help prevent further depredations or threat to public safety. Collaring bears and having an active tracking system would give producers the ability to safely send employees into orchards and grazing areas and a tracking system would give peace of mind to those who want to utilize federal lands for recreating. Notification on release sites and dates, and updates on the movement of collared bears, must be shared with producers. After a lethal take incident, the circle of information sharing must go beyond the recovery coordinator and Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife; it must also include the USFS staff located in the NCE area.

The proposed reintroduction of grizzly bears will negatively impact livestock and tree fruit producers while simultaneously forcing families to move and shift communities away from agriculture-based economies in rural areas. Our members in Washington continually provide safe and abundant food to communities while also maintaining soil health, diverse habitat and fire suppression through grazing. Introducing grizzlies to Washington, a state already saturated with apex predators, will increase the stress on employers and employees, threatening the viability of agriculture and disproportionately affecting farmers and ranchers. We urge you to put this rule down and not introduce grizzlies to the NCE or the state of Washington. Thank you in advance for your consideration of our comments.

Sincerely,

/s/


Governmental Affairs Coordinator
Washington Farm Bureau

Correspondence ID: 14030Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 18:51:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to support the restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades, their home for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C: Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation. The proposal would bring up to 25 non-problem grizzly bears into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade and manage them as an experimental population.

Alternative C is the best choice for bears and the people who live and visit the North Cascades Ecosystem. The 10(j) rule will give people more management tools to reduce, prevent, and sometimes respond to human-bear conflict. I believe that the 10(j) rule, if properly implemented, will help increase human acceptance of grizzly bears as they return to the landscape.

Grizzly bears are ecologically and culturally significant and are vital to the overall health of the North Cascades ecosystem and its biodiversity. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Correspondence ID: 14031Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Auburn, WA 98002
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:52:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please give the grizzlies the right of way to come back to the north cascades. I'm a hiker and backpacker and know we can get a long.

Correspondence ID: 14033Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:54:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: YES!

Correspondence ID: 14034Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Missoula, MT 59807
United States of America
Outside Organization: Western Watersheds Project Conservation/Preservation(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,13 2023 18:54:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: November 10, 2023

Office of the Superintendent
810 State Route 20
Sedro-Woolley, WA 98284

Submitted via National Park Service PEPC Portal

Re: 2023 North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly Bear Reintroduction Plan Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Superintendent Striker,

Thank you for the opportunity to submit scoping comments on the North Cascades Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). Please accept these comments on behalf of Western Watersheds Project (WWP) and Erik Molvar.

WWP works to protect and conserve the public lands, wildlife, and natural resources of the American West through education, public policy initiatives, and litigation. WWP staff and members use and enjoy the public lands in Washington, and its wildlife, cultural, and natural resources for

health, recreational, scientific, spiritual, educational, aesthetic, and other purposes. This includes those public lands in the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE) where the proposed grizzly bear reintroduction project will take place.

We are pleased to see that with the release of the DEIS the National Park Service (NPS) and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) have taken another important step in a process that will ensure grizzly bear reintroduction in the NCE. Despite having some significant concerns with major components of the DEIS analysis and proposed plan (comments below), WWP is generally heartened to see such a meaningful step being taken after many years of delays and false starts.

1). Livestock Grazing:

In previous scoping comments submitted jointly in December 2022 by WWP and WildEarth Guardians (WEG)¹, several concerns related to livestock grazing, including impacts to grizzly bears and the need for robust interagency coordination were raised. Suggestions were made to address these concerns through further analysis and proactive planning that involved other federal agencies (esp. the USFS). Unfortunately, it appears that NPS either chose to disregard these suggestions, or did not adequately address them in the DEIS.

Impacts of Livestock Grazing on Grizzly Bears:

Despite previous comments highlighting the need for NPS to analyze the impacts on grizzly bears resulting from livestock grazing on federal grazing allotments within and adjacent to the NCE, there was little to no substantive attempt in the DEIS to do so. This is despite there being clear evidence in other grizzly bear recovery areas of how the presence of livestock within and adjacent to recovery zones can negatively impact mortality rates.

Footnote 1: WWP and WEG's previous scoping comments on this project are hereby incorporated in their entirety into the comments offered here, as they are still relevant and apply fully to the issue at hand.

In 2020, the Yellowstone Ecosystem Subcommittee's Technical Team produced a report detailing the leading causes of mortality for grizzly bears within the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem (GYE).² This report found that "outside the Recovery Zone (RZ) but within the Demographic Monitoring Area (DMA), mortalities from livestock conflicts and self-defense kills are the primary sources of documented mortalities. Outside the DMA, livestock and site conflicts are the primary sources of mortalities." From 1999-2008, there was an average of one grizzly bear killed per year due to livestock depredations outside the RZ and inside the DMA, with 0.3 grizzlies killed per year outside of the DMA following conflicts with livestock. This increased significantly and between 2009-2018, there was an average of 5.4 grizzly bears killed per year due to livestock depredations outside of the RZ and inside of the DMA with 3.1 per year outside of the DMA. These mortality levels are significant and clearly show that livestock presence in or near recovery areas have the potential to negatively impact grizzly bears.

Additionally, in its notice in the Federal Register for promulgation of the 10(j) rule associated with this project, USFWS specifies the following requirement for grizzly bears: "Grizzly bears also need large, intact blocks of land with limited human influence and thus low potential for displacement and human-bear or livestock-bear interactions that could result in human-caused mortality. [emphasis added] (USFWS, 67197). Given that USFWS itself, working on this very same project, singles out low potential for livestock-bear interactions as important for avoiding human-caused mortality, the presence of livestock on grazing allotments in or adjacent to the NCE needs to be taken seriously and impacts to grizzlies must be analyzed accordingly.

Despite the known impacts of adjacent active livestock allotments on grizzly bears, like those observed in the GYE, and those noted by USFWS, the grizzly bear subsection of Chapter 3 analyzing the projected impacts to the species barely mentions livestock grazing. Throughout the 9

pages of text and maps devoted to analyzing the impacts of reintroduction on grizzly bears, the term 'livestock' appears all of three times, and the phrase 'cattle and sheep grazing' is used twice, with not a single section heading devoted to this issue. Most concerning, when it comes to the specific impacts of nearby USFS grazing allotments, the 'analysis' comprises all of one sentence: 'Cattle and sheep grazing on USFS lands could have adverse impacts on grizzly bears if conflicts with grizzly bears occur.'(DEIS, 62).³

Despite NPS knowing the precise location of each USFS allotment, the type of livestock grazed on each, along with their stocking rates, there was no further attempt to analyze the impacts to grizzly bears⁴. Foregoing this meaningful analysis ignores the major role that the presence of livestock plays in grizzly bear mortality. With this grazing permit information, outdated as it is, NPS possesses actionable, quantifiable, non-hypothetical knowledge that an activity with direct, often negative impacts on grizzly bears is almost 100% certain to occur within and adjacent to the NCE and the project area. This simply defies reason and does not meet the level of robust analysis required under NEPA for an EIS.

Footnote 2: Pils, A., Becker, S., Frey, K. Gunther, K. Hnilicka, P., Nicholson, J., Thompson, D., Tyers, D.(2020). Recommendations for reducing bear-human conflicts and grizzly bear mortalities in the Yellowstone Ecosystem: a report to the Yellowstone Ecosystem Subcommittee.

Footnote 3: Conversely, at least three entire pages of analysis were devoted exclusively to the impacts that grizzly reintroduction would have on livestock producers (DEIS, 143-146).

Footnote 4: Regarding this allotment information, it is concerning that NPS cites figures from 2015 (see DEIS, 138), information which will likely be a decade old by the time grizzlies are actually placed on the landscape. Acquiring current information on the Okanogan-Wenatchee NF grazing program would not only contribute to a more accurate analysis, it would simply be a matter of asking OWNF for it (a basic component of interagency coordination that was not followed here).

Interagency Planning & Coordination on Federally Permitted Livestock Grazing:

Our previous comments highlighted the particular importance of working directly with the USFS on the issue of active and/or vacant livestock grazing allotments within and adjacent to the NCE. This especially applies to the Okanogan-Wenatchee NF (OWNF), given that this federally managed Forest contains all of the active and/or vacant grazing allotments within and adjacent to the NCE (DEIS, 138).

Throughout the DEIS there are repeated vague and rather brief references to interagency planning and cooperation playing a role in preparing for grizzly reintroduction in the NCE.⁵ While this may have been true when collaborating with USFWS, the apparent lack of meaningful agency-to-agency planning when it comes to the USFS is very concerning. This is especially the case when it came to working with the Okanogan-Wenatchee NF(OWNF) and its multiple active and vacant grazing allotments.

In our previous comments we offered detailed suggestions and examples of preemptive measures that could be taken now to avoid the need to hastily react later. These suggestions included incorporation of non-lethal conflict deterrence measures into grazing permits and/or Forest Plans. Citing the Flathead NF in Montana as an example, we provided clear language already used by another National Forest to proactively address the potential for bear-livestock conflict. The referenced Flathead NF standard included this language: 'new or reauthorized livestock grazing permits and annual operating plans shall incorporate requirements to reduce the risk of grizzly bear-human conflicts [and] include a clause providing for modification, cancellation, suspension, or temporary cessation of activities, if needed, to resolve a grizzly bear-human conflict situation.' We also suggested that these additional measures be incorporated into USFS grazing permits:

- Immediately removing and composting livestock carcasses found on the allotments;
- Removing sick or injured livestock from the allotments, so they are not targeted;
- Delaying turnout until after mid-June, so that native ungulate young can provide a food

source;

- In the event of depredation, if future depredations are feared or anticipated, livestock should be moved to private pastures;
- Keeping livestock in open, defensible spaces to reduce opportunities for ambush predation;
- Prohibit the turnout of young calves and lambs under 200 pounds in weight to reduce depredation potential, and protect calving and lambing areas with deterrents such as electric fencing;
- Require human presence by using range riders and guard animals and frequently checking livestock.

Footnote 5: Beyond the sharing of disconcertingly outdated figures on the OWNF grazing program, the extent of interagency collaboration in the DEIS appears to consist of a mere two sentences: “The USFS has participated in internal planning meetings, including the internal scoping and alternatives development meetings. The USFS has also contributed to the development of this plan/EIS in describing the affected environment and addressing potential impacts that could result from actions in the Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie and Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forests.”(DEIS, 155). This vague statement is never elaborated on and there is no indication that NPS even broached the idea of grazing permit modifications, the incorporation of non-lethal deterrence measures, or the possibility of voluntary permit retirement.

Bringing about these necessary changes in grazing management would require meaningful interagency collaboration and consultation with OWNF and would need to be included and analyzed in the DEIS. There is no evidence in the DEIS that this occurred.

Additionally, in previous comments we suggested collaboration with the OWNF on the possibility of voluntary permit buyout and permanent retirement of grazing on these allotments, something that would definitively remove the risk of bear-livestock conflict in these key areas while justly compensating affected permittees. This win-win option does not appear to have even been discussed with the OWNF and was never entertained in the DEIS.

Given that the multiple active and vacant grazing allotments on the OWNF represent the closest known grazing operations to the NCE, it is doubly concerning that none of the above options were broached with the Forest Service or otherwise analyzed in the DEIS. The NPS itself has this to say regarding proximity to livestock and the risk of depredation: “The extent of depredation would be most influenced by the extent that livestock overlap with grizzly bears, the size of the grazing operation, and the presence of attractants.”(DEIS, 144). Without a doubt, given their proximity to the project area, the grazing allotments on the OWNF are most at risk of overlapping with grizzly bears, with several of these allotments actually contained within or bordering Management Zone 1 (the core Zone that contains all release and staging areas for reintroduction). These are the only locations within this area where it is known for a fact that livestock will be present. It is a reasonable assumption, given the proximity of these allotments that when (not if) there are bear-livestock conflicts, they will likely occur here (especially as populations grow and expand their range). It defies reason for NPS not to address this inevitability now, rather than hastily and on the fly at a later time.

Regarding release and staging areas, the DEIS has this to say about the impacts these will have on livestock in these allotments:“...these impacts are somewhat less likely to occur given that no staging or release areas would overlap active grazing allotments. Figure 17 shows current, active grazing leases in the NCE closest to the potential release areas.”(DEIS, 144). Upon examining the map referenced here as “Figure 17”, it is concerning to notice that staging area F appears to be touching the border of an active grazing allotment, and that the nearby release area appears to be between 10 or 15 miles from this same active grazing allotment (DEIS, 145). The DEIS has this to say about grizzly movement after translocation: “After recovering from capture and translocation events, grizzly bears entering novel environments tend to have higher movement rates, greater displacement, and spend more time in poor-quality habitats and habitats with higher mortality risk compared to resident bears (Stenhouse et al. 2022).” Placing bears with potentially “higher movement rates” so near an active grazing allotment - an allotment where no effort has been made to implement non-lethal conflict deterrence measures - defies reason and appears designed to not

only ensure conflict, but also to ensure that any measures taken will be hasty and purely reactive (increasing the likelihood of lethal removal).

Finally, the lack of any attempt to propose, analyze, and subsequently collaborate with a partner federal agency on preemptive measures like non-lethal conflict deterrence, vacant allotment closure, permit modification, and permit buyouts is even more concerning when Alternative C and its associated 10(j) rule has been chosen as the NPS preferred alternative. This concern arises from the fact that, per the DEIS, a 10(j) rule will preclude the possibility of consultation under section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act for any federally permitted actions. The DEIS outlines what consultation would require of USFS permitted livestock grazing, were it to apply: "agriculture and livestock grazing operations on USFS lands would also be subject to ESA consultation requirements under section 7(a)(2), which requires the USFS to avoid jeopardizing the continued existence of a listed species like the grizzly bear. As a result of the consultation process, efforts to minimize or avoid those adverse effects may be required. These efforts, such as requiring removal of cow carcasses quickly to avoid attracting grizzly bears, could adversely affect grazing and agriculture activities seasonally. Additionally, adhering to no net loss of core bear habitat has the potential to affect use of motorized activities to manage cattle, such as restricting road development." (DEIS, 146).

In choosing to eliminate the above consultation requirement through adoption of a 10(j) rule, and by refusing to coordinate meaningfully with USFS to adjust or modify grazing permits, the NPS will be reintroducing grizzly bears into an environment where capture and/or lethal removal appears to be the only plan. The inadequacy of this plan is shockingly apparent in the meager one sentence statement offered in the DEIS that addresses conflict on these allotments: "If a bear frequents an allotment area, the FWS and WDFW would work with the USFS and livestock owners to determine the best course of action to minimize bear-livestock interactions." (DEIS, 146).⁶ This is essentially a "plan to develop a plan" and is the epitome of kicking the can down the road while enshrining a purely reactive management program, all while refusing to meaningfully address a conflict-prone, federally permitted activity taking place on the doorstep of the reintroduction area. NPS is choosing to silo itself off from a supposed partner federal agency and, in so doing, abdicating its responsibility to conduct the rigorous, thorough analysis required in an EIS. Though it may not have direct authority to dictate USFS actions and policies, it can at the very least cooperate in a meaningful way and develop a plan that is comprehensive and holistic. This includes working with the USFS to incorporate the various measures and preemptive planning outlined above. Grizzly bears do not recognize artificial agency boundaries imposed on a landscape, nor do they recognize differing agency mission statements. Any plan that aims to establish a thriving grizzly population in the North Cascades would do well to recognize this fact.

2). Alternative B:

For many of the above mentioned reasons, among the alternatives offered, WWP supports Alternative B. As the DEIS itself has clearly demonstrated, there appears to be neither the desire nor the will on the part of NPS to foster interagency planning to meaningfully address federally permitted livestock grazing on the OWNF. Alternative B puts more of the onus on agencies and federal permittees to adapt non-lethal, coexistence, and/or deterrence measures via the consultation requirement. Meanwhile, Alt C appears to simply remove any obligation to be proactive on the part of USFS and its permittees. They are given wide discretion to capture and/or kill a bear without requiring much of any prior effort to avoid conflict. Absent any stipulations, regulations, or other requirements, consultation under section 7(a)(2) is the only way to ensure that USFS will be impelled to adjust its grazing administration on those allotments where it is clearly needed. Whether through the modification of permits or AOIs, or whenever a permit is renewed or reissued, the protections afforded under Alternative B will make sure federal agencies do not authorize livestock grazing that results in unacceptable impacts to grizzly bears without first analyzing those actions and ensuring that jeopardy does not occur. If NPS refuses to take preventative, proactive steps regarding USFS grazing permits, as has been the case so far, then consultation is the only way to protect grizzly bears

Footnote 6: It is worth noting that this language found in the current DEIS appeared, verbatim, in the previous DEIS and its inadequacy was highlighted in our previous scoping comments. It also undermines the NPS claim that the current DEIS is “new”. When it comes to livestock grazing, there appears to have been very little change from the previous DEIS.

from lethal take as a result of inevitable depredations on federal grazing allotments (with some active allotments being less than 20 miles from proposed release areas)

3). Canadian Reintroduction Plans:

Regarding the potential for reintroduction of grizzly bears into the NCE immediately across the border in Canada, the DEIS states the following: “Should reintroduction efforts occur in British Columbia, it is likely that some grizzly bears reintroduced into the Canadian portion of the ecosystem may move into the US portion of the NCE, either as a transient and return to Canada or may ultimately remain in the US.” (DEIS, 62). This statement is no longer applicable and now requires revision in order to reflect current reality, in addition to an analysis of what the impacts of Canadian reintroduction will be on the NPS plan. This is due the fact that the Okanagan Nation Alliance, with the help of the BC Ministry of Water, Land, and Resource Stewardship, has announced definitive, concrete plans to reintroduce grizzly bears just across the border from North Cascades National Park in Canada. This reintroduction has now moved from a hypothetical scenario to a definitive plan, complete with a timeline. This was announced to the Interagency Grizzly Bear Committee at a meeting held on October 10, 2023. During this meeting, Dr. McKenzie Clarke, a wildlife biologist with the Okanagan Nation, declared the intent of the tribe to finalize a restoration plan by the winter of 2023, followed by actual relocation in the summer of 2024. A staff member representing WWP at that meeting asked Dr. Clarke a follow up question regarding the specific areas slated for reintroduction. Dr. Clarke stated that the focus will be in “priority units” that are south of Canadian highway 3.7 This would place reintroduced Canadian grizzly bears immediately across the border from North Cascades National Park within less than a year, all but guaranteeing emigration of these bears south into equally suitable habitat in the American NCE.

Though this information regarding Canadian reintroduction plans was revealed after the completion of the DEIS, it is absolutely crucial that the Final EIS incorporate this new development and analyze its overall impacts to the NPS plan. With relocated Canadian bears likely to already be on the ground before NPS finalizes its EIS and issues a Record of Decision, it is imperative that NPS update its planning and analysis to account for the impacts of additional bears coming down from Canada, as well as take into account the management plan adopted by the Okanagan Nation and the BC government. It is also imperative that meaningful consultation with the Okanagan Nation take place, especially regarding the liberal lethal take measures that will apply under a 10(j) rule to any Canadian bear that wanders south across the border.

Conclusion:

As stated the outset, WWP is heartened to see the grizzly reintroduction process move forward in earnest, after years of delay. Placing these important predators back in the NCE goes some way in righting the ecological harms inflicted in the past. However, as also noted above, the DEIS appears to lack any substantive interagency cooperation, analysis, and proactive planning when it comes to livestock grazing permitted on federal lands, especially by the USFS. There is still time to add these crucial components into a Final EIS and work closely with the OOWNF to modify and prepare their permittees and their grazing program for the presence of grizzly bears. We hope NPS takes this opportunity to do so. Thank you for your time and for the opportunity to provide these comments.

Sincerely,

Montana & Washington Director
Western Watersheds Project

Missoula, MT 59807

Author, "Hiking the North Cascades";

Laramie, WY 82070

Footnote 7 A recording of this meeting, along with Dr. Clarke's presentation slides are available at:
<https://igbconline.org/committees/north-cascades/>

Correspondence ID: 14035Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Cle Elum, WA 98922
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 18:55:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I also own a home in Wilson Wyoming (near Jackson). My home is about 4 miles from Grand Teton National Park (GTNP), where grizzly bears are also found. I have been visiting the Jackson, Wyoming area for about 15 years before buying my home, which I have had for 10 years now. In all this time, I have never heard of a human-grizzly bear interaction in GTNP or Jackson or Wilson where there's been an injury or death. Indeed, I don't recall any cattle-grizzly interaction where there's been a death or injury to the cattle. However, there are occasional maulings and sometimes deaths from grizzly human interactions; these generally occur during hunting season or outside Yellowstone National Park.

It is possible for grizzly bears and humans to co exist without interaction.

The presence of the grizzly bear is a great tourist attraction for both Yellowstone NP and GT National Parks and enhances the park tourist visitations.

I think these bears can be managed quite well as the experiences in Yellowstone and Grand Teton show.

On the rare occasion, that the grizzly bear roams through Wilson or Jackson, there has not been any adverse interaction with humans.

I favor the re-introduction of the grizzly bear to the north Cascades of Washington State.

Cle Elum WA

Correspondence ID: 14036Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Newport, WA 99156
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 18:55:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not support grizzly bears being restored into Washington State.

Correspondence ID: 14037Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Newport, WA 99156
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 18:56:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I don't want grizzlies reintroduced in my county!! There's too many predators as is.

Correspondence ID: 14038Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98119
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 18:57:02

Correspondence Type:Web Form

Correspondence: Please bring back the grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 14039Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Renton, WA 98057
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 18:57:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We have robbed the lands of so very many critters. They were all here first. We need to protect their lands and allow them to be at home again.

Correspondence ID: 14041Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 18:59:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I completely support Grizzly Bear introduction and EDUCATION of the public about living and recreating in Grizzly country.

Correspondence ID: 14043Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Clear Lake, WA 98235
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 19:02:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to express my support for the reintroduction of grizzlies in the North Cascades.

Here are some of the reasons:

Where grizzlies thrive, ecosystems thrive. These bears regulate populations of the animals they prey on and keep forests healthy by dispersing seeds and berries.

Additionally, the population of bears on the Canadian side of the North Cascades ecosystem is considered critically endangered, and wildlife biologists do not believe a natural recovery is possible. Reintroducing bears on the U.S. side will complement significant efforts led by First Nations in Canada to bring back this sacred cultural species.

Restoring grizzly bears would benefit North Cascades National Park and the people who enjoy it. A restored population will boost the park's appeal and attract nature enthusiasts, scientists, and tourists from around the world. This would provide economic benefits to local communities and support the park's mission to protect park resources.

Alternative C, with the 10(j) rule, provides managers flexibility to address community concerns while protecting the grizzly

population. It ensures coexistence between humans and bears.

Please consider the positive ecological and economic benefits and support Alternative C. Restoring grizzly bears will secure the park's natural heritage and conserve an iconic species for current and future generations.

Thank you very much!

Sincerely,

■

Correspondence ID: 14044Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Enumclaw, WA 98022
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 19:03:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Introducing more Grizzly Bears anywhere in Washington is a horrible idea. It would be bad for already dwindling number of big game populations. It would also be bad and most likely deadly for the residents and tourists who enjoy the outdoors in Washington state. There are already Grizzlies in Washington State it's time to stop playing with predator populations as it has already been a disaster with the Wolves.

Correspondence ID: 14045Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sierra Madre, CA 91024
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 19:03:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do NOT support reintroducing grizzlies in the northern Cascades even if it's a slow roll out. I'll be long gone and so will current decision makers. The consequences of intentionally reintroducing grizzlies will negatively impact people not yet born. I do not believe the benefit of reintroduction outweighs the potential risk of lives lost.

The Upper Skagit Tribal representative, Scott Schuyler, states "the Upper Skagit successfully coexisted with grizzly bears for thousands of years, and we should once more." We live in a different time with a 21st century population. The mountain ranges in the west are enjoyed by millions of people. The way the land is used and shared by people and animals has changed. This is not the 17th century. And the statement that grizzlies are now needed for the ecosystem in northern WA is false. The ecosystem has adjusted over the years without the presence of these bears.

THE OPTION TO TAKE NO ACTION AND RELY ON "NATURAL RECOVERY" IS THE APPROPRIATE DECISION. Currently bears are free to roam where they want. So if grizzlies make their way to the northern Cascades, so be it. But if grizzlies are intentionally reintroduced in the northern Cascades, then they are also free to roam into Oregon and northern California. And then into the Sierra Nevada. That will be a game changer.

Correspondence ID: 14046Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Cusick, WA 99119
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 19:04:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not want grizzly bears reintroduced into the state of Washington.

Correspondence ID: 14047Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Battle Groundf, WA 98604
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 19:05:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I don't recall any information presented showing proof of grizzlies being native to the North Cascades. Idaho in the Sawtooths a Montana into Yellowstone is the closest I know of so how does that justify stating you're "returning" them to the North Cascades?

Correspondence ID: 14048Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Fircrest, WA 98466-6810
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 19:06:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am a hesitant proponent in re-introduction of grizzly bears in the North Cascades as long as the intention is to correctly manage their populations with the traditional model of hunting in North America. Re-introducing grizzlies will be a great thing for the landscape BUT if there are protections in play in WA State to limit or ban predator hunting, this species along with others will damage the deer and elk populations and result in human bear interactions and predations. We see this with cougars and black bears, and may be on the cusp with wolves. Bears, like wolves, will impact the game populations negatively and lessen tag revenue and overall opportunities for those who enjoy the outdoors in such a way. Not to mention that fact that they go for easy prey and do not understand lines on a map.

It must be documented that state fish and game biologists will have the final say in how this and all species are managed, not special interest groups or people voting on emotions or "social reasons". Bears are dangerous, exceptional predators, smart, and amazing animals. Lets not re-introduce something and create a ripple affect of problems that seemingly dont have solutions.

Lastly, are there grizzly bears already there?

Correspondence ID: 14050Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Cashmere, WA 98815
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 19:08:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please bring the grizzly back to its natural habitat, where they belong. They have been poisoned and shot almost to extinction.

Correspondence ID: 14051Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Camas, WA 98607
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 19:11:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please allow the bears to be returned to the north cascade mountains

Correspondence ID: 14052Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mazama, WA 98833
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 19:13:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly support restoration of grizzly bears to the North Cascades ecosystem as proposed in the Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan EIS. I respect the perspectives and concerns of all who have a stake in this region. But it is imperative to allow science and fact, not fear and misinformation, to guide decisions - and to acknowledge that it is not just humans who have a stake in this region. By restoring grizzly bears to the North Cascades, we create opportunity for hope, sustainability, awe and inspiration.

The footprints of humanity now impact even the last slivers of open space on earth. Our future, and the future of all life depends on the presence of healthy, functioning ecosystems. Grizzly bears are an integral and irreplaceable part of the North Cascades ecosystem.

Thank you for your consideration.

Correspondence ID: 14054Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Lynden, WA 98226
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 19:16:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: NO to reintroduction of grizzlies to North Cascades. We oppose to this proposal.

Correspondence ID: 14057Project:112008Document:132104
Address: North Bend, WA 98045
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 19:19:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do not feel that it would be appropriate to reintroduce Grizzly bears to the North Cascade region because the area has already been having problems with large predators. The black bears are causing problems getting into garbage, cougars have attacked and killed people and wolves have been seen in the North Bend/Snoqualmie valley. We do not need another apex predator causing additional problems.

Correspondence ID: 14058Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Anacortes, WA 98221
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 19:20:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please restore our beautiful northwest forests. Please reintroduce our grizzly bears back into our forests.

Correspondence ID: 14059Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Stanwrod, WA 98292
United States of America
Outside Organization: Cosmic Cogs Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 19:21:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a back country user and a high country user , I'm not a fan of reintroducing grizzly bears. The back country and high country have been places that I've shared with my young children. While those wild places are absolutely NOT without hazard, at least being eaten is not generally one of the dangers.

I would not really consider visiting the Yellowstone Backcountry as a backpacker for the same reasons. Rather than managing the forest and Backcountry for preservation and public use you'd be managing it for some long gone mythical ideal of the way things used to be. You might as well reintroduce them to downtown Seattle 'because thie bears _used_ to live

there . The logic is exactly the same, and equally poor.

Pardon me for typos, this from my phone.

Sincerely [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 14060Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Vancouver, WA 98664
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 19:22:04

Correspondence Type:Web Form

Correspondence: Give the Grizzly bears their home back!

Correspondence ID: 14062Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 19:25:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Reintroducing grizzlies west of the crest of the Cascade Mountains would be a mistake. There is not much in the way of food sources in the dense fir and hemlock forests on the west side. The primary places for many foods, including berries, field mice, moles, and conies, are not in those forests, but either in the comparatively small alpine and subalpine meadows just below the rocks and snowfields, and in the now fairly densely populated river valleys that are at surprisingly low elevations on the West side of the range. Global warming may well lead to such moderate winter temperatures on the West side, especially at the lower elevations, that the both black and grizzly bears might undergo a greatly reduced or even a zero period of hibernation. That would doubtless lead to unfavorable interactions with humans even during the winters. The east side of the cascades is rather different, exhibiting much more open pine forests and larger alpine and subalpine meadows over a much larger range of altitudes, and the river valleys are less densely populated than on the west side. The eastern slopes are typically much colder in winter, so the bears there are more likely to hibernate during winters on that side.

In 2015 discussion with a wrangler in the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area (BMWA), just south of Glacier National Park, I was informed that "problem" grizzlies in Glacier Park are trapped and transported to the BMWA, where they are released, and "we take care of them." By we, he was referring to himself and other wranglers in the BMWA. What will you do with the problem bears in the North Cascades National Park, and where to you propose to release those "problem bears", which surely will appear at some point?

Please give these problems careful thought before going through with this plan. Cheers! [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 14063Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 19:25:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Sierra Club logo on top of a photo of an orca jumping out of the water.

The National Park Service is accepting public comments on grizzly bear restoration in the North Cascades. Deadline for comments is 10:59pm, tonight, Monday, Nov. 13th.

Join Sierra Club in supporting grizzly bears' restoration to their ancestral homelands. Help grizzlies make a comeback and enhance the vibrant biodiversity and the wild character of the North Cascade ecosystem. See below for sample text!

Comment before midnight!

Dear John,

Get ready to roar for a cause that truly matters. Grizzly bears once roamed Washington's Northern Cascade Mountains for thousands of years - but have since been hunted, trapped, poisoned to death, and exterminated from the wildest parts of our state.

Since 2015, the Sierra Club has supported restoring grizzly bears to their ancestral homelands in the North Cascades. Right now, the National Park Service is accepting public comments on their draft grizzly bear restoration plan through November 13th, 2023.

Grizzly bears are a keystone species whose presence contributes to the health of our wildlands. Their presence is a sign of a fully wild and intact landscape that supports all life.

We know from successful efforts in the Northern Rockies that it is absolutely possible to live, work and recreate with grizzly bears on the landscape. Conflicts can be prevented through proven, effective measures.

Help grizzlies make a comeback in Washington and contribute to the vibrant North Cascades ecosystem. Help protect and enhance biodiversity and the wild character of the North Cascades.

Before 11pm tonight (November 13th), please take a moment to:

Copy the advocacy text located below the grizzly bear graphic.

Click on one of the comment buttons or graphics itself.

Fill out your contact information and paste the advocacy text from step 1.

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to support the restoration of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem, their historic range for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C but with needed changes to the proposed 10(j) rule. The proposal would bring up to 25 non-conflict grizzly bears - likely from Montana - into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade and manage them as an experimental population.

The proposed 10(j) rule as currently written fails to give grizzlies the best chance to succeed and is too permissive in allowing reintroduced bears to be killed.

Lethal removal of a grizzly bear should only be considered where there is a demonstrable threat to human safety, and, for non-immediate threats to human safety, only after non-lethal management options, including concerted use of conflict prevention methods, have been exhausted.

No grizzly bears should be hazed or relocated as a result of conflict with livestock unless demonstrable, repeated efforts have been made by the livestock producer to prevent such conflicts, using commonly-available techniques.

No grizzly bears should be killed on public lands as a result of livestock depredation.

Landowners/private citizens should not be given a permit, or otherwise authorized, to kill a grizzly bear.

No grizzly bear should be preemptively relocated if the bear is not a threat to human safety, particularly if the bear has not become habituated or food-conditioned, or when nonnatural foods/attractants have not been properly secured and made inaccessible to bears. Doing so acts as a disincentive for communities to employ conflict prevention measures, and increases the risk to the bear of injury or death from capture and relocation.

These changes are crucial in providing adequate protection for grizzly bears.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C and with appropriate changes to Section 10(j). Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Correspondence ID: 14065Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 19:26:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please move forward with the plan to bring Grizzly Bears back to Washington State. They are an important part of the ecosystem.

Additionally, the NPS should prioritize protections for grizzly bears over livestock grazing. It is unnecessary and counter-productive to focus on "management" of grizzly bears for the benefit of the livestock industry.

Grizzly bears should have the same protection under the Endangered Species Act that all populations have. The USFWS should not have a special rule for the grizzly populations that will be in Washington State.

The final restoration plan should account for human behavior in the effort to minimize human-grizzly interactions, because let's be honest, it's usually the humans at fault when there is a negative human-grizzly interactions. Don't make the grizzle bears pay for human stupidity.

Correspondence ID: 14066Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Omak, WA 98841
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 19:27:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No Grizzly in the Cascades, Please

It is my understanding that the Cascade Mountains are already at capacity for Grizzly Bears. There is neither food resources nor space for an increased grizzly population.

Thirty years of observation, which included mountain climbing, have shown me that the Cascades are drying out and warming up.

There are many glaciers and "permanent snowfields" that have been erased from the mountains in the past few decades.

Lack of precipitation coupled with deglaciation and forest fires have reduced habitat for ALL creatures in the Cascades.

The grizzly bears that wander into the Cascades already do a thorough job of consuming the limited resources available.

No longer are there salmon jumping out of the rivers in the North Cascades, the seasonal berries are not as abundant as in the past, and every square mile of habitat seems to be under constant threat from wildfire.

Alternative "A" (no action) is the only way I see forward in the next decade. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14070Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 19:29:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I honestly don't understand the need to re-populate the Grizzly bears in our area. Why would you want to do that? No matter what you might say, or think, there will be human loss. Bear spray is ineffective, and I have heard many people in our area say that they are going to carry a gun, while hiking, if this becomes a reality. And we all know that more people with guns in the forest isn't good for anyone. Please do not bring Grizzlies here.

Sincerely,

Correspondence ID: 14071Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America
Outside Organization: University of British Columbia University/Professional Society
Received: Nov,13 2023 19:29:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Thank you to the agencies and individuals who prepared and reviewed the DEIS document, who have solicited and considered public comments, and who continue the difficult process of grizzly bear recovery in the North Cascades.

I am writing to enthusiastically support Alternative C and implementation of the 10(j) rule in the North Cascades. I think it is the balanced, conservative approach we need to re-learn how to coexist with grizzly bears in the North Cascades.

I am a PhD candidate in [REDACTED] interdisciplinary Institute for Resources, Environment, and Sustainability. My background is in environmental psychology and sociology. I currently serve on the [REDACTED] Grizzly Bear Stewardship Steering Committee and have conducted research about the social dimensions of grizzly bear recovery in the North Cascades as my dissertation research in collaboration with that group, as well as in collaboration with the US NPS and USFWS. The opinions and feedback I express here are my own and do not represent the [REDACTED].

I will share a few substantive, (hopefully) constructive comments regarding details in the DEIS document and will share preliminary findings from my research about perceptions of grizzly bear recovery among Manning Park residents and interviews I have conducted with large carnivore recovery experts around the world.

Comments regarding the DEIS:

(1) The DEIS's "Socioeconomic" impacts sections engage almost exclusively with concepts of value that are economic in nature. It says, "The analysis of socioeconomic impacts considers potential effects on employment, population, and revenue from natural resource-related activities and revenue from park and national forest visitation that may result from grizzly bear restoration under each alternative."

There is extensive evidence demonstrating that values that are non-economic in nature have important positive and negative consequences in peoples' lives, and I do not see other kinds of socioeconomic value addressed in the DEIS. For example, the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) is the global body charged with strengthening the science-policy interface for conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, human well-being and sustainable development. They recognize that people have broad values (guiding principles and life goals) and specific values, which are judgements about the importance of nature in particular situations. This latter category can be further split into three categories: instrumental (nature as a resource and asset, usefulness), intrinsic (agency of other-than-humans, inherent worth of biodiversity), and relational (importance of desirable, meaningful, and often reciprocal human relationships) (see the IPBES report, p. xxiii, for a nice summary graphic <https://zenodo.org/records/6522393#.YswYWOzMK3J>). A key message from this global document is that "Achieving sustainable and just futures requires institutions that enable a recognition and integration of the diverse values of nature and nature's contributions to people" (p. xvii). I believe that socioeconomic considerations from a proposal like grizzly bear recovery, can and should address ideas related to multiple values, ranging from health benefits, ideas about rights and responsibilities to others, cultural meaning, sense of place, prosperity, ways of life, etc.

I also believe, after studying this issue, that the economic concerns expressed by interest groups are rooted in deeper concerns about ways of life, power dynamics, cultural preservation/loss, social norms and group dynamics that are better understood through non-economic valuation processes. I believe that reducing the "Socioeconomic" analysis to jobs and economic activity is an oversight that should be addressed in the FEIS and implementation process.

(2) Relatedly, while I see that there are plans for monitoring the ecological outcomes of this project, and some intentions to monitor conflicts and economic outcomes, I do not see evidence in the DEIS for monitoring other social outcomes. One of the rationales for grizzly bear recovery mentioned in the DEIS's "Need for Action" statement is to "Contribute to the restoration of biodiversity of the ecosystem to build ecological resilience and for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations of people." (p.3). How do you plan to monitor the ideas of benefit and enjoyment? What expertise do you need to bring on to set up a monitoring plan to understand whether or not this project is meeting this objective?

(3) Relatedly, I am concerned about the lack of social scientists on your team of expert preparers and reviewers. It appears that technical expertise supporting this effort includes almost exclusively people with ecology/wildlife biology backgrounds, and a few individuals with cultural resource/anthropology expertise. I am concerned about the capacity of this team to adequately address the above sociological and psychological dimensions of recovery planning. I encourage the agency to consider including scientific expertise from the fields of psychology, sociology, marketing and communications, risk perceptions, behavioral economics, and other social science disciplines. Often one "social scientist" is brought onto a team to address all of the social dimensions. I suggest that you include multiple social scientists with diverse disciplinary expertise.

(4) Throughout the DEIS, the impacts on "visitors" are considered. People who do not set foot in the recovery area may also be significantly impacted by the decision to recover or not recover grizzly bears in this area. The concept of "existence value" (e.g., Krutilla 1967, Conservation Reconsidered) is widely accepted across the environmental values literature. This concept reflects that people derive benefit (often manifesting as a sense of well-being) by simply knowing that elements of biodiversity exist, even if they never utilize or personally experience it. I think that existence value (or "non-use value") is an extremely important concept for understanding how grizzly bear recovery efforts affect peoples' well-being that does not seem to be accounted for in the DEIS.

(5) Throughout the DEIS, there is a consistent message that "Alternative A: No Action" would not have impacts. Please consider that building up expectations/anticipation for GB recovery and then not following through on that action may have significant psycho-social impacts on visitors (and others). Please consider reviewing the "ecological grief" literature (e.g., DOI 10.5040/9781350233164.ch-5)

(6) As I understand, there is new guidance from the White House that states that, "Indigenous Knowledge is a valid form of evidence for inclusion in Federal policy, research and decision making." (<https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/OSTP-CEQ-IK-Guidance.pdf>). This directive seems relevant to North Cascades grizzly bear recovery, and I do not see it reflected in the DEIS.

(7) On page 17 the DEIS states that "The joint US/British Columbia commitment to recover grizzly bears in the North Cascades is stated through a Memorandum of Understanding between the provincial government and the IGBC (North Cascades Grizzly Bear Recovery Team 2004)." As I understand, the Province of BC has not committed to supporting/issued a mandate to support grizzly bear recovery in the North Cascades at this time. I wonder if this policy position is up-to-date.

(8) I also think that policy directives from Indigenous governments should be included part of the relevant policy framework, especially given our federal government's commitment to Nation-to-Nation relations.

(9) p.31 - The DEIS has very vague plans about public education and outreach. There is substantial evidence that "knowledge deficits" are often not the main problem for changing behavior, and that efforts to change cultural understandings/meanings, incentives, habits/behavioral nudges, power dynamics, norms, etc., are more effective. I am concerned that the education/outreach planned may not be adequate to protect the safety of people and recovering bears. I think it is important to draw from social science theory and concepts and have social scientists review education and outreach planning in order to integrate best available science about behavior change, developing multidimensional trust between managers and communities (e.g., Stern and Coleman 2015), understanding how people assess risk and hazardousness, develop habits, make quick judgements, and more.

(10) Many of the safety precautions mentioned in the DEIS rely on collaring bears and monitoring their movements. However, many collars fail and any cubs born will not have collars. Do you anticipate re-collaring bears who lose collars, or collaring bears that are born into the system? Do you anticipate any resistance to the process of collaring bears (as has occurred in some areas of BC)?

(11) p. 68 "Bear captures in source areas would be done in coordination with British Columbia wildlife managers and with appropriate permits or approvals in place." I suggest that this should also include coordination with First Nations, including appropriate ceremonies and cultural protocols, not just British Columbia representatives.

(12) I am an avid backcountry recreationist in the North Cascades and have travelled extensively throughout all of the proposed release areas and recovery zones. I am concerned about the lack of bear-resistant food storage and sanitation facilities throughout some of these areas, especially in popular cross-country zones and USFS/State lands. I am especially concerned about bear encounters in cross-country zones because mountaineering parties may be less likely to comply with requirements to carry heavy bear deterrents and cannisters (because they are already carrying heavy equipment deep into the backcountry) and may be less likely to comply with the requirement to obtain permits (where they may get bear safety information). I am also concerned about the lack of bear-safe infrastructure at USFS and WA DNR sites because I believe encounters will be more likely at these sites given the relatively easy access to/lax management of attractants, and people recreating at these sites will also be more likely to have guns that they may use to kill the reintroduced bears.

(13) Potential typo (?) on p.119. The third issue statement doesn't make sense to me. It reads, "Depending on the type and location of visitors' attitudes and preferences, ..." Should it say visitor activities?

In addition to these comments on the DEIS, I will share a few observations from a study in Manning Park conducted in 2023. We randomly selected 113 visitors and conducted 30-60 minute, face-to-face surveys with them, in which we discussed their values about bears, opinions on grizzly bear recovery, knowledge/behaviors with regard to bear-safe behaviors, and more. I think the following findings are relevant to the US process:

- There was very little awareness of grizzly bear population declines in Manning Park. The vast majority of Park visitors thought there was still an active population of grizzly bears in the Park.
- There was little awareness of grizzly bear recovery efforts. Only 8% said they were "somewhat" or "very" aware of the proposed efforts.
- There was very high in-principle support for grizzly bear recovery among the Manning park visitors we surveyed. Only 7% said they were slightly to very unlikely to oppose recovery.
- There was mixed knowledge & uptake of bear-safe behaviors. In particular, visitors stated that they had and/or would have left out many bear attractants, especially BBQs, insect repellants, dish soap, empty food and beverage containers, empty coolers, toothbrush/toothpaste, etc.
- Their stated willingness to accept a variety of personal and management changes for bear coexistence was very high.

I will be happy to discuss the findings of this survey with the agencies if you would like to know more. I expect to submit the results for publication within the next year.

I have also conducted a set of interviews with large carnivore recovery experts from around the world about the outreach and engagement efforts they used in their efforts. I would also be happy to discuss these findings with the agencies. I also expect to submit the results from those interview for publication within the next six months.

Thank you for your consideration,

██████████
████████████████████

Correspondence ID:	14073Project:112008Document:132104
Address:	Seattle, WA 98117 United States of America
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual
Received:	Nov,13 2023 19:35:04
Correspondence Type:	Web Form

Correspondence: 1. With climate change affecting the timing and quantity of food availability for Grizzly bears, past data of bear encounters must be viewed skeptically. The bears' typical locations and behavior may change significantly. Earlier in 2023, in Banff National Park, Canada, two experienced hikers did everything right, but were still killed by a Grizzly. One theory about this encounter is that the Bear was desperate for food because the plant foods that are typically available at that time of year were not present due to drought and/or temperature anomalies.

2. Evidently the National Park Service has "no plans to install bear wires for hanging food or to make any changes to existing frontcountry or backcountry campsites" as reported in the Seattle Times. I wonder if it will take fatal attacks for the Park Service to decide to install electric fences around front country campgrounds such as those that have been installed around certain campgrounds in Banff National Park. Staying in a campground surrounded by an electric fence will probably protect the campers from bears, but it ruins the wilderness experience in my opinion.

3. I am not aware of any peer-reviewed science that provides evidence that Grizzly Bears are "keystone species." The absence of wolves from Yellowstone clearly created a cascade of undesirable ecological changes in the Park, so it is clear that wolves in that ecosystem are a keystone species. I've seen nothing like that ecological cascade of changes in the North Cascades related to the absence of Grizzly bears.

4. I oppose the Park Service's proposal to reintroduce Grizzly Bears into the North Cascades. For the person who wants to hike in the backcountry, it will be like deciding to play Russian Roulette.

Correspondence ID: 14075Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Cashmere, WA 98915
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 19:37:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: If grizzlies are reintroduced in the North Cascades, they must be federally protected. They cannot be killed for killing a domestic animal. WA Fish and Game cannot harm the Grizzlies or kill them because they have been in contact with humans.

Bringing Grizzlies only to kill them is out of the question.

Again the Grizzly needs to be completely protected under federal and state protection.

Thanks

██████████

Correspondence ID: 14076Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98126
United States of America

Outside Organization: Defenders of Wildlife Unaffiliated Individual(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,13 2023 19:37:37

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Striker and Supervisor Thompson,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/Environmental Impact Statement: North Cascades Ecosystem (Draft Plan/EIS) and Proposed Rule regarding Establishment of a Nonessential Experimental Population of Grizzly Bear in the North Cascades Ecosystem, Washington State (Proposed 10(j) Rule or Rule).

These comments are submitted on behalf of Defenders of Wildlife (Defenders), a national non-profit organization founded in 1947 dedicated to conserving and restoring native species and the habitat upon which they depend. Defenders has over 2 million members and supporters nationally, 70,000 of whom reside in Washington State. Defenders has a long history of supporting agency-led grizzly bear recovery efforts by minimizing bear-human conflict, improving tolerance, and providing bear-aware outreach materials and programs to the public. Since 1997, Defenders has invested over \$1.3 million on grizzly

bear coexistence projects.

We are excited that, after considerable public consultation, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) and the National Park Service (NPS) are nearing completion of a final plan to recover grizzly bears in the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE). Defenders appreciates the extensive research that has gone into studying and understanding the NCE grizzly bear population and potential opportunities to restore it through translocation. Grizzly bears are one of the most beloved animals in the West, and the vast majority of Washingtonians support actions that would restore this Pacific Northwest icon. They are also the last native mammal currently missing from the NCE. Restoring them to their former range would bring the NCE to a state of wildness seldom seen in the U.S. today.

Consistent with our comments on the previous Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Environmental Impact Statement: North Cascades Ecosystem and Proposed 10(j) Rule in 2018, Defenders supports the use of a 10(j) rule as part of the restoration effort to the extent it promotes the recovery of the population, ensures management is humane and prioritizes non-lethal alternatives, and enables humans and grizzly bears to coexist. While we support the overall goals and approach outlined in Alternative C, we recommend several revisions to clarify and strengthen the Draft Plan/EIS and Proposed Rule to ensure they provide adequate safeguards to promote grizzly bear recovery consistent with the best available science. Given that grizzly bears are slow reproducers and dispersers, the Rule would be in effect for quite some time, and it is vital to ensure that it is as protective as possible to foster conservation of the species.

When FWS authorizes the release of a listed species under section 10(j), the accompanying rule must provide for conservation --i.e., recovery--of that species.[1] Specifically, through a 10(j) rule, FWS must ensure that the grizzly bear reintroduction will "further the conservation of the species." [2] Further, each member of an experimental population generally "shall be treated as a threatened species," [3] which makes them subject to "such regulations as [FWS] deems necessary and advisable to provide for the conservation of such species." [4] Similarly, any section 10(a)(1)(A) permit issued by FWS for an otherwise prohibited taking of a grizzly bear must be consistent with the ESA's recovery mandate. [5] Moreover, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires the agencies to prepare an EIS in which they "take a 'hard look' at the environmental consequences" of the Proposed 10(j) Rule and "explain their decisions to the public." [6]

Defenders is pleased to note that the current Draft Plan/EIS incorporates much of the feedback we submitted during the previous 2018 Draft Plan/EIS public comment period and the more recent 2022 scoping period. We appreciate inclusion of adaptive management, monitoring tools, implementation costs, and assessment of potential socioeconomic and environmental benefits from the return of grizzlies to the NCE. The following comments and recommendations build on our previous remarks and are intended to strengthen the Proposed 10(j) Rule and Draft Plan/EIS, as well as aid the NEPA process in providing clarity, transparency, and accountability in management practices. Since Alternative C of the Draft Plan/EIS is inextricably linked to the Proposed 10(j) Rule, we have opted to submit comprehensive comments through both agency portals. Minor recommendations specific to either document are captured in Sections VI and VII below.

Our primary concern is to limit population loss in the nonessential experimental population (NEP) by (I) securing sufficient grizzly bear habitat, including through an updated roads and trails inventory and strengthening the definition and implementation of the "no-net-loss-of-core" approach; (II) providing additional measures to avoid human-bear conflict through securing attractants; (III) prioritizing non-lethal deterrence in any conditional take authorization and allowing only authorized agencies (not private individuals) to conduct lethal take; (IV) setting specific population goals, including mortality thresholds, for the NEP; and (V) establishing a robust, specific, and long term monitoring and evaluation plan.

I. Strengthen public land habitat protections and Proposed 10(j) Rule language to more adequately secure grizzly bear habitat.

Defenders is concerned that current habitat protections in the NCE, especially on U.S. Forest Service land, may be insufficient to support long-term population growth of the NEP. The Proposed 10(j) Rule allows incidental take of grizzly bears on National Forest System lands, but it conditions that allowance in part on the Forest Service's maintenance of "its 'no-net-loss-of-core' approach for grizzly bear habitat maintenance agreed upon between the NPS and the Forest Service in 1997. This approach has some limitations, however (see I-B below), and threats underlying its creation persist (see I-A). To the extent possible, NPS and FWS should address these threats within the Draft Plan/EIS and Rule. Beyond that, the agencies should work closely with the Forest Service to take additional actions ensuring habitat threats are

addressed before grizzlies are on the ground. Defenders recommends the following actions:

I-A. Update road and trail inventories in the NCE to give effect to the “no-net-loss-of-core” approach and monitor for rises in trail use since the COVID-19 pandemic.

As noted in the Proposed 10(j) Rule, “road access to grizzly bear habitat likely poses the most imminent current threat to grizzly bears by reducing the availability of [habitat]...and increasing mortality of individual bears through vehicle strikes or other activities associated with human-caused mortality.”[7] Indeed, the term “core area” was defined based on “research showing that bears, notably females, avoid proximity to roads when and where possible, and therefore the presence, use and density of roads is a critical issue for management agencies to address.”[8] The 1997 North Cascades Ecosystem Recovery Plan Chapter also highlights a need to “reduce road densities throughout the recovery zone.”[9]

Despite the generally accepted understanding of the importance of limiting road and trail density in core grizzly bear habitat, no comprehensive analysis of current roads and trails in Management Zone 1 appears to have been performed since 1994. Defenders has repeatedly advocated to the Interagency Grizzly Bear Committee (IGBC) technical working group for the completion of such a study in recent years. It falls under agencies' responsibilities within the “no-net-loss-of-core” approach regardless of whether grizzly bears are present on the landscape.

Now that grizzlies could potentially occupy the NCE within a year or two, an updated roads and trails analysis across state and federal land in the NCE should urgently be conducted to ensure the population's survival. This should include an updated survey of roads and high-use trails, an assessment of the level of threat to grizzlies and/or their core habitat, and identification of priority areas for improvement. Ideally, the analysis would incorporate any relevant data collected by other agencies.

Crucially, this analysis should also include data on high-use non-motorized trails. There is not enough current understanding about how a rise in non-motorized recreation, such as we have seen since the COVID-19 pandemic, may impact grizzly bear recovery. We again invite agencies to make use of Defenders' 2020 North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly Bear Coexistence and Core Habitat GIS Analyses to supplement the analysis.[10]

I-B. Work with the U.S. Forest Service to strengthen the no-net-loss-of-core approach and ensure that national forests within the NEP Zone formally adopt habitat security standards that will ensure the long-term occupancy of grizzly bears.

As noted in the Proposed 10(j) Rule, the “no-net-loss-of-core” approach was intended to “protect and secure grizzly bear habitat in the U.S. portion of the NCE.” [11] While it is a good start, this approach remains an interim standard between the Supervisors of three National Forests. [12] Apart from maintaining “no-net-loss-of-core” as a condition of allowing incidental take on Forest Service lands, per the Proposed 10(j) Rule, it is entirely incumbent on national forests to uphold this standard, and it is only established “until superseded by a Forest Plan amendment or revision.” While the Rule indicates an intent to memorialize the “no-net-loss of core” in an updated MOU, [13] Defenders is concerned that this approach will be insufficiently protective and unenforceable.

As a starting point, “no-net-loss-of-core” should be formally adopted into the plans, rather than remaining a temporary agreement. This would include the plans for Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest (MBSNF), Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest (OWNF), Colville National Forest, Gifford-Pinchot National Forest, and Mt. Rainier National Park. Additionally, collaborate with the Forest Service in setting habitat management thresholds for each Bear Management Unit (BMU) and work to restore habitat to meet them. Accordingly, we urge FWS to incorporate those standards into the Proposed 10(j) rule as a precondition allowing incidental take of grizzly bears.

Strengthening the “no-net-loss-of-core” standard is also vital, as the current approach has limitations that could prove detrimental to the NEP in the long term. For example, the baseline for “no-net-loss” is unclear. Some bear management units (BMUs) in the NCE likely approach 100% secure core because they overlap with Wilderness areas. BMUs on the periphery of the NCE, however, likely have little core habitat and large areas of high road density. This is particularly concerning over the long-term because these peripheral BMUs will be the “launching off” point for dispersing bears.

It is also important to note that baseline conditions, particularly in connectivity areas, may not be sufficient as an indicator of the NEP's ability to grow. This fundamental assumption may be wrong and must be verified; the lack of substantive analysis of actual effects puts a premium on such assumptions being valid. A primary reason that managing for the status quo would be inadequate is that the environment in which grizzly bears live is destined to change resulting in declines in security. We urge FWS and NPS to take this into account when evaluating the success of the NEP.

I-C. Amend the Proposed 10(j) Rule to require that state and private land inside the NCE should be managed as Management Zone 1.

In the Proposed 10(j) Rule, all state and private land inside the NCE will be managed as Management Zone 3 (as opposed to Management Zone 1). While we understand the agencies' desire to grant more flexibility on non-federal lands to deal with conflict bears, defining zones with allowances for mortality based solely on land ownership has the potential to create ecological sinks. If limits on take are loose and resulting mortality is high on state and private lands, these parcels interspersed throughout the NCE have the potential to limit and counteract recovery efforts in the rest of the NCE, especially given that unsecured attractants are more likely on private land.

State and private lands in other grizzly bear recovery ecosystems are not differentiated in this manner. In the Northern Continental Divide Ecosystem (NCDE), the conservation strategy defines zones as contiguous areas and buffers based on the bear population and habitat, not landownership. This means that private lands within the NCDE are still considered part of the Primary Conservation Area and Management Zone 1, subjecting them to mortality thresholds (see Section IV below). While mortality thresholds are in place and take is limited on these private lands, FWS and conservation groups like Defenders have worked proactively in these ecologically critical areas to ensure that private landowners have the tools and flexibility needed to address conflict. State and private lands inside the NCE are part of that ecosystem, and grizzly bear occupancy should be allowed on those lands.

We recommend that state and private lands within the NCE be considered part of Management Zone 1. Should the FWS decide to keep these lands as part of Management Zone 3 (or change it to Management Zone 2), we are extremely concerned that this would exacerbate the problem of private lands within the NCE becoming ecological sinks. This would make grizzlies more vulnerable to take and removal before they are securely established in the ecosystem. Also, the regulatory differences between Zone 1 and Zone 3 are significant, and regulating those discrepancies on state and private land in the NCE may prove difficult to enforce.

II. Take additional measures to secure attractants within the NEP Management Zones.

Attractants are one of the primary sources of human-bear conflicts. The Northern Continental Divide Ecosystem (NCDE) Conservation Strategy states that, "securing potential attractants is the single most effective way to prevent grizzly bears from becoming food conditioned and displaying subsequent unacceptable aggressive behavior. It is effective in limiting human-caused grizzly bear mortality, human-grizzly bear encounters, and other human-grizzly bear conflicts."¹⁴ Ideally, bear resistant food storage should be available and/or mandated on all public lands within the NEP Management Zones. Short of that, Defenders recommends the following actions:

II-A. Amend the Proposed 10(j) Rule to require that allowance of incidental take on Forest Service lands is conditioned on implementation of food storage restrictions in Zone 2 as well as Zone 1.

The Proposed 10(j) Rule conditions incidental take on Forest Service lands on implementation of food storage restrictions throughout Management Zone 1. Given the effectiveness of such measures, we urge the FWS to provide in the final Rule that allowance of incidental take of grizzly bears in a National Forest in Management Zone 2 is conditioned on the Forest Service's implementation of food storage restrictions throughout the Forest in which the take occurred.

Of the two national forests in the NCE, OWNF does not currently have a food storage order. This is a major concern for grizzly bears. A lack of food storage orders on public lands that reintroduced bears are likely to utilize poses a risk of human-bear conflict. The final Restoration Plan/EIS should call for OWNF, as soon as reasonably possible, to formally adopt a food storage order that mirrors the order in place at North Cascades National Park. Outside of the NCE, in Management Zone 2, only the Colville National Forest has a food storage order. The Gifford-Pinchot National Forest and Mt. Rainier National Park should also proactively work to adopt similar food storage orders rather than wait until grizzly bears arrive. Food storage orders can also provide benefits beyond grizzly bears by reducing human-wildlife conflicts with multiple species.

Defenders partnered with Colville National Forest, the Yellowstone to Yukon Conservation Initiative (Y2Y), the Interagency Grizzly Bear Committee and Scenic Canyons Recreation Services to fund the installation of 20 food storage lockers in 2021. We are prepared to assist with similar efforts in future.[15]

II-B. Budget and provide support for measures to secure attractants in gateway communities adjacent to Management Zones 1 and 2.

Most gateway communities listed in the Draft Plan/EIS, those cities and towns that are geographically close to the NCE, do not currently have the means to install bear resistant infrastructure for securing attractants, such as bear resistant garbage containers. This concern was raised by a member of the public during the Virtual Public Meeting on the Draft Plan/EIS and Proposed 10(j) Rule hosted by the agencies on October 17, 2023.[16] Agency representatives responded that this was not currently part of the plan, but numerous non-profits exist who are doing good work on this. While this is true, and such partnerships are very beneficial, this responsibility should not fall entirely on the public or non-profits to undertake. Additional funding sources, such as state and/or federal budgets, should be considered. Defenders stands ready to support efforts to secure such funding and to help inform best practices for such programs. As part of our bear coexistence programs in Washington, we have supported the installation of bear resistant garbage containers in the Methow Valley and with the Sauk-Suiattle Tribe. Recently, Defenders piloted an approach to make the city of Leavenworth a bear-resistant community, in partnership with the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) and city officials.[17]

III. Clarify, monitor, and limit the conditions of preauthorized lethal take of grizzly bears.

As the Proposed 10(j) Rule recognizes, “excessive human-caused mortality is still currently the primary factor affecting grizzly bears at both the individual and ecosystem levels.”[18] Given this, it is important to ensure that the final Rule and Plan/EIS sufficiently limit mortality through unambiguous provisions that leave no room for misinterpretation. Accordingly, Defenders urges the agencies to clarify and strengthen the Proposed 10(j) Rule in the manners described below to limit the circumstances under which lethal take may be authorized.

III-A. Only authorized agencies, not private individuals, should be responsible for conducting lethal take in the NEP area, and FWS should maintain a careful oversight role.

Human lethal removal of bears is a procedure that should only be undertaken by trained professionals, except in emergency situations such as defense of life. Defenders appreciates that it is difficult for FWS to implement actions directly over a wide area; however, having untrained individuals kill grizzly bears could lead to dangerous interactions between people and wounded bears or cause accidents to others nearby. We therefore strongly advise against allowing private individuals to perform authorized lethal take in any NEP Management Zone.

Additionally, according to the Draft Plan/EIS, “the WDFW would manage grizzly bears outside the park, in cooperation with FWS.”[19] We understand this to mean that WDFW could be the authorized agency in deterring or removing bears that come into conflict with humans outside of national parks and Indian trust lands. Defenders has worked closely with WDFW on bear safety and coexistence initiatives in Washington for several years, and we have the utmost respect for the integrity and expertise of the staff we have worked with. It is worth noting, however, that WDFW's current leadership has engendered some public distrust in recent years over its handling of wolf and cougar conflicts in Washington state.[20] Wolves remain federally endangered across much of Washington state; any lack of proper due diligence in this area therefore does not bode well for grizzly bears. If WDFW is to be involved in grizzly bear management, we ask that FWS retain oversight of WDFW's decision-making processes as part of authorization provisions to ensure that all proper steps have been taken and non-lethal measures are not possible before lethal removal of a grizzly bear is considered.

III-B. Clarify that lethal take of a “grizzly bear involved in human conflict” cannot be based upon a grizzly bear's defensive behaviors.

The current definition of the term “grizzly bear involved in human conflict” in the Proposed Rule lacks the “(not defensive)” parenthetical qualifier, which should be added to the definition to clarify that it does not include defensive grizzly bear behaviors and ensure the definition is not misread. [21] Elsewhere in the Rule text, as well as in the Draft Plan/EIS, the term “aggressive” is consistently qualified with the parenthetical “(not

defensive)."

III-C. Eliminate potential ambiguities in the Proposed 10(j) Rule provisions regarding pre-authorization of lethal take in Management Zone 3.

Defenders is concerned with two areas in the Proposed 10(j) Rule in which the pre-authorization for lethal take in Management Zone 3 could be more clearly described. First, there is an inconsistency between the description of authorization for lethal take specific to Management Zone 3 in the preamble to the Rule and the Rule itself. The Rule allows FWS or an authorized agency to pre-authorize lethal take of any "grizzly bear that presents a demonstrable and ongoing threat to human safety or to lawfully present livestock, domestic animals, crops, beehives, or other property" if "it is not reasonably possible to otherwise eliminate the threat by live-capturing and releasing the grizzly bear unharmed."[22] By contrast, the preamble states that the agency could authorize lethal take only "when it is not reasonably possible to eliminate the threat through nonlethal means."[23]

The preamble's use of the term "nonlethal means" suggests that FWS intended to condition lethal take authorization in Management Zone 3 on an inability to resolve the threat via nonlethal deterrence, which is broader than relocation and includes other means of eliminating the threat.[24] Indeed, the proposed rule recognizes as much in describing conditions for pre-authorization of lethal take in Management Zones 1 and 2.[25] Given the importance of take limitations to recovery, we believe it is important to ensure lethal take is authorized only as a last resort. This is particularly true given the Proposed Rule's inclusion of private property within the NCE immediately adjacent to Management Zone 1 within Management Zone 3.

Second, the Proposed Rule's use of the undefined term "threat" regarding lethal take in Management Zone 3 introduces unnecessary ambiguity and could result in an expansion of the circumstances under which lethal take is authorized. FWS should set clear parameters for what constitutes a "threat," include the definition in the Rule, and ensure the parameters are understood by every authorized agency.

III-D. Clarify potentially confusing language concerning lethal take in Management Zone 2 in the preamble of the Proposed 10(j) Rule.

The preamble's shorthand description of conditioned lethal take related to livestock depredation is potentially confusing. It states that in Management Zone 2, the Service has the ability "to issue written time-limited conditioned lethal take authorization to a livestock owner if a depredation of livestock has been confirmed."[26] The Rule itself makes clear that additional constraints apply. Specifically, livestock owners may receive authorization to lethally take a grizzly bear following a confirmed depredation only if, within two weeks of the depredation, the bear is "within 100 yards (91 m) of legally present livestock" and "it is not reasonably possible to otherwise eliminate the threat by nonlethal deterrence or live capturing and releasing the grizzly bear unharmed in a remote area."[27] As noted above, Defenders maintains that only trained professionals should be engaged in lethal take of a grizzly bear. However, to the extent the final Rule allows livestock operators to engage in lethal take, and although the language of the Rule would control and eliminates any doubt, FWS should clarify this point in the preamble.

IV. Identify more specific demographic goals and set mortality limits for the NEP in the Draft Plan/EIS and the Proposed 10(j) Rule to ensure sustainable recovery for grizzly bears in the NCE.

Apart from a target population number (200) and age and sex criteria for bears selected for translocation, neither the Draft Plan/EIS nor the Rule currently state demographic goals for recovery. Per the 1997 North Cascades Grizzly Bear Recovery Chapter, the agencies must "determine population conditions at which the species is viable and self-sustaining [and] re-evaluate and refine population criteria as new information becomes available."[28]

For example, recovery criteria in the Cabinet-Yaak Ecosystem (CYE) described in the 1993 recovery plan stipulate that there should be 6 females with cubs over a running 6-year average inside the recovery zone or within 10 miles of its boundaries, excluding Canada, and that 18 of 22 BMUs are occupied by females with young from a running 6-year sum of verified sightings and evidence.[29] We recommend that the agencies develop similar recovery criteria for the North Cascades population based on the best available science.

The Draft Plan/EIS and the Rule should also include mortality thresholds for the NEP. While the Draft Plan/EIS estimates

that “approximately 2% of the grizzly bear population in the NCE would be lost to human-caused mortality each year, including mortalities associated with restoration activities,”[30] the Proposed 10(j) Rule does not contain any mortality thresholds to guide management decisions in the Management Zones. The 2% estimate is also nearly 20 years old. Because grizzlies are an extremely slow-to-reproduce species, most other grizzly bear ecosystems have mortality thresholds or goals that they work toward to ensure recovery. Again, the CYE recovery plan states that known human-caused mortality is not to exceed 4% of the population estimate based on the most recent 3-year sum of females with cubs and that human-caused mortality of females should not exceed 1.2% of the population estimate for a given year. These mortality limits cannot be exceeded during any 2 consecutive years for recovery to be achieved.[31]

While the Proposed 10(j) Rule allows the Service to translocate additional bears to achieve a founding population of 25 bears, the strategy of constantly augmenting new bears into the ecosystem is unsustainable, costly, and does not address on-the-ground threats. To achieve long-term recovery, FWS should commit to limiting mortality by defining thresholds in each NEP Management Zone. Permitted take should not exceed mortality limits. Should mortality thresholds be exceeded, FWS should reassess and further limit take allowances.

We recommend that FWS set a 0% target mortality threshold for the initial small population of 25 bears within Management Zone 1. Once the population grows, this can be reassessed. It is important to note that there is no evidence to suggest that a founding population of 25 bears will be large enough to lead to self-sustaining population growth. This concern is exacerbated by the exemption of take, which could significantly skew the population's demographic. Take of reproductive age females could severely restrict the population's ability to recover and even result in population decline. Without limiting mortality, FWS will likely need to translocate more than the 36 bears estimated in the Rule.[32] FWS has also not defined parameters for the population to be considered “established.”[33] Mortality thresholds in Management Zones 2 and 3 should be set as needed based on the biological needs of the species. If mortality is too high the population will not be able to establish itself, grow, expand, and ultimately, recover.

V. Develop a more detailed and comprehensive monitoring and evaluation plan with a specific timeline.

Per section NC4 of the North Cascades Ecosystem Recovery Plan Chapter (“Monitor population and habitat”), we recommend that the agencies expand the information contained in the Monitoring section on page 30 of the Draft Plan/EIS to include all likely population and habitat parameters that will be measured under the action alternatives, how each will be measured, and the timeline of these activities. The Plan/EIS and Rule should also include any monitoring obligations that FWS knows will be measured, how each will be measured, and the timeline of these activities.

The Draft Plan/EIS (appropriately) addresses how bears will be monitored during and immediately after initial translocations via GPS tracking collars and camera stations with hair snagging, but it contains less detail about long-term monitoring. This information is somewhat limited and spread throughout the document. The Monitoring and Evaluation section of the Proposed 10(j) Rule also offers information that could be incorporated into the Draft Plan/EIS, specifically the following paragraph:

“The FWS will monitor the status of grizzly bears in the NEP annually and will evaluate the status of grizzly bears in the NEP in conjunction with our species status assessments and status reviews of the grizzly bear. Evaluations in our status reviews will include, but not be limited to: a review of management issues; grizzly bear movements; demographic rates; causes of mortality; project costs; and progress toward establishing a self-sustaining population.”[34]

We understand that should either of the action alternatives move forward, monitoring and evaluation will be included in a follow-up implementation plan. Given that the implementation plan is unlikely to be open to public comment, however, we urge the agencies to include as much detail as is possible and allowable in the final EIS and final 10(j) Rule.

VI. Minor comments on the Draft Plan/EIS.

The following are minor suggestions and corrections we recommend to improve the clarity and quality of the Draft Plan/EIS.

VI-A. The paragraph beginning “In summary, grizzly bears released into the NCE are expected to have an opportunistic feeding strategy” on page 83 appears to be accidentally duplicated on page 84.

VI-B. The Proposed 10(j) Rule proposes to “use geographic location to identify members of the NEP. As such, any grizzly bear within the NEP area, regardless of origin, will be treated as part of the experimental population. Individual

grizzly bears dispersing into or out of the experimental population area will assume the status of grizzly bears within the geographic area in which they are found."[35] This is a helpful clarification that we recommend duplicating in the Draft Plan/EIS as well. This question has come up in public meetings, and members of the public are less likely to review the 10(j) rule than the Draft Plan/EIS.

VI-C. Accurate information about human-bear conflicts and living with bears is vital to promoting human acceptance of grizzlies in Washington, particularly given the safety concerns expressed by some residents in gateway communities. The Draft Plan/EIS makes a good start on communicating such information by including human bear conflict statistics from the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem (GYE) on page 130. We recommend that more information of this kind be included in the final EIS and final 10(j) Rule as appropriate, and that a summarized version of it should be included in the Executive Summary section of the final EIS, where more members of the public are more likely to view it.

VI-D. The glossary of the Draft Plan/EIS includes a definition of "conditioned" that relates to the behavior of certain grizzly bears. However, the document contains numerous references to the term "conditioned lethal take" for which this definition is not applicable. The agencies may want to define this particular term in the glossary as well to reduce potential confusion.

VII. Minor comments on the Proposed 10(j) Rule

The Proposed 10(j) Rule fails to propose to amend 50 CFR § 17.84(l)(2)(iv), which provides that "a grizzly bear that is outside the [Bitterroot] Grizzly Bear Experimental Population Area identified in paragraph (l)(1) of this section will be considered as threatened." The Rule should amend this provision to include a reference to the North Cascades Grizzly Bear Experimental Population Area to avoid any potential confusion regarding the status of that population.

VIII. Conclusion

Nearly 30 years have elapsed since the publication of the NCE supplement to the Grizzly Bear Recovery plan. It is long past time for this iconic species to return to its full historic range in Washington State. Defenders remains committed to supporting FWS and NPS in making grizzly bear recovery in the NCE a reality with the implementation of the 10(j) Rule and Restoration Plan, incorporating the changes noted above. Defenders will continue our ongoing coexistence work to educate and provide tools to Washington's residents to live side by side with grizzly bears once more.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at [REDACTED]
Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
Northwest Representative
Defenders of Wildlife

References:

[1] See *Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. Jewell*, 2018 WL1586651, at *5 (D. Ariz. March 31, 2018) ("As with the other provisions of the ESA, conservation and recovery are at the heart of Section 10(j)."). Similarly, any section 10(a)(1)(A) permit issued by FWS for an otherwise prohibited taking of a grizzly bear must be consistent with the ESA's recovery mandate. 16 U.S.C. § 1533(d).

[2] 16 U.S.C. § 1539(j)(2)(A)

[3] *id.* § 1539(j)(2)(C)

[4] *id.* § 1533(d)

[5] 16 U.S.C. § 1539(d) (permits may only be issued if the Service finds that they "will be consistent with the purposes and policy set forth in section [ESA] section 1531," which requires "conservation" of listed species). *Ctr. for Biological Diversity*, 2018 WL 1586651, at *6.

[6] *Env't Def. Ctr. v. Bureau of Ocean Energy Mgmt.*, 36 F.4th 850, 872 (9th Cir. 2022) (quoting *Kern v. U.S. Bureau of Land Mgmt.*, 284 F.3d 1062, 1066 (9th Cir. 2002). The agencies' analysis of alternatives is the heart of the EIS. *Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. Bernhardt*, 982 F.3d 723, 731 (9th Cir. 2020)

- [7] Proposed 10(j) Rule, p. 67198. Emphasis added.
- [8] Draft Plan/EIS, p. 22.
- [9] FWS. 1997. Grizzly Bear Recovery Plan Supplement: North Cascades Ecosystem Recovery Plan Chapter, p. 17.
- [10] Belmar, Melissa. 2020. North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly Bear Coexistence and Core Habitat GIS Analyses. Collective Ecological Consulting, Denver, Colorado. Prepared for Defenders of Wildlife.
- [11] Proposed 10(j) Rule, p. 67199.
- [12] See Draft Plan/EIS, Appendix B, p. B-8 "In 1997 the Forest Supervisors of these 3 National Forests agreed to and established an 'interim standard' until superseded by a Forest Plan amendment or revision.";
- [13] Proposed 10(j) Rule, p. 67209.
- [14] NCDE Subcommittee. 2021. Conservation strategy for the Grizzly Bear in the Northern Continental Divide Ecosystem, p. 104. Available at https://igbconline.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/NCDE_GrizzlyBearConservationStrategy_8.18.21_WithSignaturesAndEditSummary-2.pdf
- [15] See: Defenders of Wildlife. "New Food Storage Lockers Improve Safety, Visitor Experience in Grizzly Country." (June 15, 2021) Available at <https://defenders.org/newsroom/new-food-storage-lockers-improve-safety-visitor-experience-grizzly-country>
- [16] Virtual Public Meeting on Draft EIS and Proposed 10(j) Rule (October 17, 2023). Available at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=G4HLYmX_xU0
- [17] See: Safford, Kasey. "Leavenworth becomes Washington's first official bear-resistant community." NCW Life (September 1, 2023).
- [18] Proposed 10(j) Rule, p. 67197.
- [19] Draft Plan/EIS, p. 53.
- [20] See: Solomon, Christopher. "Who's afraid of the Big Bad Wolf Scientist?" New York Times (July 5, 2018) Available at <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/07/05/magazine/whos-afraid-of-the-big-bad-wolf-scientist.html>. See also: Jenkins, Don. "WDFW director: When in doubt, remove the cougar" Capital Press (April 5, 2019) Available at https://www.capitalpress.com/ag_sectors/livestock/wdfw-director-when-in-doubt-remove-the-cougar/article_d718cee0-57cd-11e9-9ff6-7b48a2be2ffe.html
- [21] Proposed 10(j) Rule, p. 67219.
- [22] Id., p. 67221.
- [23] Id., p. 67210
- [24] Id., p. 67219 defining "deterrence" for purposes of the Proposed Rule.
- [25] Id., p. 67221.
- [26] Id., p. 67209 and 67216, preamble language with partial description of "conditional lethal take."
- [27] Id., p. 67221. This accords with descriptions of the Proposed (10j) Rule in the Draft Plan/EIS, p. 39 and 44.
- [28] FWS (1997), p. 6
- [29] FWS. 1993. Grizzly Bear Recovery Plan, p. 83.
- [30] Draft Plan/EIS, p. v.
- [31] FWS (1993), p. 85.
- [32] Proposed 10(j) Rule, p. 67203. "Population modeling indicates the need for release of 36 bears into the NEP to obtain an initial population of 25 individuals in approximately 8-9 years (NPS and FWS 2023, p. 33)."
- [33] See Proposed 10(j) Rule, p. 67204 ("We must consider if the reintroduced population will become established and survive in the foreseeable future".) and p. 67206 ("Based on these considerations, we anticipate that the reintroduced population of grizzly bears is likely to become established and persist in the proposed NEP.".)
- [34] Draft Plan/EIS, p. 67210.
- [35] Proposed 10(j) Rule, p. 67207.

Correspondence ID: 14077Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Surrey, UN V4N6N8
Canada

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 19:39:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To whom it may concern,

I am writing as a concerned citizen, to support the restoration of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem, their historic range for thousands of years!! Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations. They are keystone species responsible for the health of the ecosystem services we all rely on. Bears are the gardeners of the forest in more ways than one!

I support Alternative C but with needed changes to the proposed 10(j) rule. The proposal would bring up to 25 non-conflict grizzly bears - likely from Montana - into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade and manage them as an experimental population.

The proposed 10(j) rule as currently written fails to give grizzlies the best chance to succeed and is too permissible in allowing reintroduced bears to be killed??! This is the opposite of conservation!

Lethal removal of a grizzly bear should only be considered where there is a demonstrable threat to human safety, and, for non-immediate threats to human safety, only after non-lethal management options, including concerted use of conflict prevention methods, have been exhausted.

No grizzly bears should be hazed or relocated as a result of conflict with livestock unless demonstrable, repeated efforts have been made by the livestock producer to prevent such conflicts, using commonly-available techniques. No grizzly bears should be killed on public lands as a result of livestock depredation.

Landowners/private citizens should not be given a permit, or otherwise authorized, to kill a grizzly bear.

They are animals that share this earth with us, providing for the same nature that sustains us, we cannot fault or harm them for them simply following their nature, we have to be smarter.

No grizzly bear should be preemptively relocated if the bear is not a threat to human safety, particularly if the bear has not become habituated or food-conditioned, or when nonnatural foods/attractants have not been properly secured and made inaccessible to bears. Doing so acts as a disincentive for communities to employ conflict prevention measures, and increases the risk to the bear of injury or death from capture and relocation.

These changes are crucial in providing adequate protection for grizzly bears.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C and with appropriate changes to Section 10(j). Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Correspondence ID: 14078Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Redmond, WA 98052
United States of America
Outside Organization: Retired Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 19:40:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am very much in favor of restoring grizzly bears to the north Cascades ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 14080Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Sedro Woolley, WA 98284
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 19:44:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am writing to express my support for the National Park Service's decision to restore a grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem in Washington State, including to introduce additional bears to augment the small existing population. I support Alternative C in the EIS, with the accompanying 10j designation and rule as a good compromise that addresses public concerns.

I have lived in Skagit County for forty-five years and have camped and hiked all over the backcountry of the North Cascades. I have also had the privilege of hiking and camping in the interior west, and in Canada and Alaska, where grizzly bears still roam. I am not in the least bit concerned about sharing the North Cascade backcountry with grizzly bears. In fact, I consider it our responsibility to do everything we can to restore these magnificent animals to their rightful place in the wilderness within their historic range.

Thank you for your time and consideration, and for the opportunity to comment.

Correspondence ID: 14081Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Oak harbor, WA 98277
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 19:44:41

Correspondence Type:Web Form

Correspondence: I fully support this

Correspondence ID: 14082Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 19:44:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Recommend Alternative 'A' (No Action Plan)

Question: How does the National Park Service justify placing Grizzly bears onto public lands, next to communities, when their management policy states, "The safety and health of employees, contractors, volunteers, and the public are core Service values" ?

Question: How does the National Park Service justify placing Grizzly bears onto public lands, next to communities, when their management policy states, "Above all, keep in mind that the safeguarding of human life must not be compromised." ?

FACT: Grizzly bears will not remain in the National Park. They will expand their home range to include our communities.

FACT: The EIS fails to address the consequences resulting from Grizzly-to-human conflicts - human deaths and injuries.

FACT: In similar recovery zones THE MAJORITY of Grizzly-to-human conflicts (deaths & injuries) occur on private lands.

FACT: Previous Director of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services stated before Congress that the Grizzly is biologically recovered.

FACT: Empty bear spray canisters have been found next to the dead bodies of those killed by Grizzlies.

FACT: Neither the Federal Government nor WDFW have an exit plan to withdraw the insertion of Grizzly bears into our communities once the Action Plan is executed.

FACT: National Park Service written policy states, "The safety and health of employees, contractors, volunteers, and the public are core Service values. Above all, keep in mind that the safeguarding of human life must not be compromised."

The decision being made to put Grizzly bears into our communities should be based on the merit of the facts. Unfortunately very few facts in the EIS have survived the "smell test" regarding their veracity. Instead, relevant information has been hidden from the EIS. The proponent agencies, NPS and FWS, have predisposed the narrative in the EIS to support their preferred action plan. In doing so the agencies have each committed violations under NEPA as well as under the CFR. This

will clearly be a political decision by those who are insulating themselves from the tragic deaths and injuries that will result from their decision - they have no conscience whatsoever.

Consequences of Grizzly bear attacks occurring just this year within a short 4-month period are listed below, followed by additional attacks in prior years. Our higher population centers bordering the NCE statistically will mean higher incidence of conflict especially as Grizzlies expand their range which is the proven case in Montana, Wyoming, Idaho.

*** 2023 GRIZZLY / HUMAN CONFLICTS ***

OCTOBER 01, 2023 BEAR COMES OUT OF BRUSH AND ATTACKS 73-YEAR-OLD

SEPTEMBER 13, 2023 GRIZZLY CHARGES HUNTER UNTIL HE SHOOTS IT

SEPTEMBER 24, 2023 PERSISTENT GRIZZLY AND HER CUB EUTHANIZED AFTER BREAK-INS

SEPTEMBER 11, 2023 DEER HUNTER SHOOTS AT ATTACKING GRIZZLY

SEPTEMBER 02, 2023 GRIZZLY KILLED HIKER NEAR YELLOWSTONE

SEPTEMBER 06, 2023 GRIZZLY CHARGES AT HUNTERS IN THICK BRUSH, SHOT DEAD

AUGUST 30, 2023 SPOOKED GRIZZLY CHARGES ANGLERS IN MONTANA WILDERNESS

SEPTEMBER 07, 2023 GRIZZLY KILLED WOMAN, EUTHANIZED AFTER BREAKING INTO HOME

SEPTEMBER 12, 2023 NAVY VETERAN, JAW TORN OFF IN HORRIFYING GRIZZLY ATTACK (AMBUSHED)

SEPTEMBER 10, 2023 GRIZZLY BEAR MAULS HUNTER IN CUSTER GALLATIN NATIONAL FOREST

AUGUST 30 2023 MONTANA MEN SURPRISE MOMMA BEAR WITH CUB

JULY 24, 2023 WOMAN FOUND DEAD IN MONTANA FOLLOWING GRIZZLY BEAR ENCOUNTER

*** ADDITIONAL GRIZZLY ATTACKS, PRIOR YEARS ***

SHED HUNTER KILLED BY GRIZZLY IN FIRST ATTACK OF 2022

Oct 21, 2022 GRIZZLY ATTACK ON 2 BOYS

WOMAN KILLED BY GRIZZLY IN CITY LIMITS, ripped from her tent, killed by a grizzly bear while camping

IN MONTANA, DEPT OF INTERIOR SECRETARY HEARS CONCERNS OVER GRIZZLY BEARS (OCT 7, 2019)

FIVE GRIZZLY DEATHS LAST WEEK ALL INVOLVED BEARS THAT WERE FEEDING ON CATTLE (OCT 14, 2019)

GRIZZLY ON ROCKY MOUNTAIN FRONT EUTHANIZED (OCT 11, 2019)

GRIZZLY BEAR EUTHANIZED AFTER GUNSHOT WOUND (OCT 8, 2019)

A FOURTH HUNTER IS ATTACKED BY A GRIZZLY BEAR WITHIN DAYS IN MONTANA (September 26, 2019)

GRIZZLY BEAR ATTACK IN WESTERN GRAVELLY MOUNTAINS (SEP 25, 2019)

SEARCH ENDS FOLLOWING BACK-TO-BACK GRIZZLY ATTACKS (SEP 20, 2019)

GRIZZLY BEAR ACTIVITY CLOSES GLACIER PARK CAMPGROUNDS, TRAILS (AUG 20, 2019)

OFFICIALS RELEASE DETAILS ON CABINET MOUNTAINS BEAR ATTACK (JUN 21, 2018)

INVESTIGATORS RECOUNT NOVEMBER GRIZZLY BEAR ATTACK (FEB 17, 2019)

14 GRIZZLIES EUTHANIZED THIS YEAR, DOUBLE THE 10-YEAR AVERAGE. (SEPT 11, 2019)

Correspondence ID: 14084Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 19:47:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I would like to see the grizzlies restored back to the Cascades. I also want our future generations to know we did everything in our power to restore a species we almost drove to extinction. I believe that with the current plan to reintroduce 3-7 bears within a 5-7 yr period would not prove to be a to rapid reintroduction rate. The Cascade mountain range is quite vast and there is plenty of high country for the bear to habitate. I think we have lived with the black and brown bear long enough to show they have not been to destructive to livestock and I believe the grizzlies would be about the same. They don't want to be around cities or a bunch of people anymore than the people want to be around them. As long as they are tagged and kept an eye on, I think it is beneficial to the environment.

Correspondence ID: 14085Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sedro-Woolley, WA 98284
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 19:48:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Greetings from a long time backpacker. I have been camping/ hiking/backpacking since the mid 1960's. Normally I would have a resounding "Yes" for reintroducing an endangered animal, but not now and not for grizzlies. I think it would be a no win situation. These are my reasons. I have seen more and more people going out into the "wilderness, and not being educated in their contact with wildlife and or with the outdoors in general. So I see more possible confrontations between humans and grizzlies. Which could very well mean the loss of life for the human, but just as bad in my mind, is then that grizzly would have to be hunted down and killed. Not a good ending. Please do not reintroduce grizzlies to the North Cascades. Thank you

Correspondence ID: 14086Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98127
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 19:49:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: November 13, 2023

Don Striker
Superintendent
North Cascades National Park Service Complex
810 State Route 20
Sedro Woolley, WA 98284

RE: Restoration of Grizzly Bears to North Cascades Ecosystem- Draft EIS

Dear Mr. Striker:

I strenuously object to the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem complex (NCE) of WA. I have in the past had some experiences with grizzly bears - not all of them positive. For the reasons stated below, I recommend Agency adoption of ALTERNATIVE A -NO ACTION. Let me make one more candid comment - reintroduction is an incredibly stupid idea.

I hold a Masters Degree in Natural Resources and a Juris Doctorate in Law from very good natural resource and environmental law schools. I am a former employee of the US Fish and Wildlife Service (GS-11) out of Fort Collins, CO in the 1980's. I currently live in Washington and have spent considerable time in the North Cascades all the way south to I-90 on both the West and East sides, including segments of the Pacific Crest Trail. I have backpacked and hunted big game in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem, and the Northern Continental Divide Ecosystem over the last 30 years, often with friends or my family. I have also backpacked and fished on the Kenai Peninsula and mainland of Alaska. We have had numerous encounters with black bears and a few with grizzlies during this time, including one in Northern Yukon Territory, Canada, which was life threatening.

1. Human Population Growth in Study Area - Conflict Potential Greater Over Time.

Washington is one of the fastest growing states in the US. Many people use the mountainous areas of the NCE for outdoor recreation including hiking, backpacking and hunting. This includes people from out of state (often urban areas) who come to WA for the first time to hike and backpack our many trails, including the Pacific Crest Trail. This recreational usage has been increasing, and will assuredly increase over time. The NCE is not the vast area of the GYE, BE or the NCDE.

For roughly 6-8 months out of the year there are chances of encounters between humans and grizzly bears. I would suggest these possibilities of encounters would be on average greater than what might be experienced in many areas of the GYE. With more people and more bears there will be more conflicts, usually bad for the bears (we have already seen this happen with 10(j) wolf reintroduction in ID, MT and WY).

2. Grizzlies are not in danger of Extinction in the Continental US or AK. No more are needed to ensure species survival under the ESA. This is an attempt to shoehorn a new population into an area which has little to do with species survival. The 10(j) is just another ill advised legal excuse to put more bears in more areas with greater risk for human conflict.

3. Grizzlies will displace black bears already established in the NCE. This will likely reduce opportunities for recreationists to see black bears as the grizzly range and population grow, and will also reduce bear hunter opportunities, which likely Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife will not appreciate. Of course, black bears are easier for private parties to manage problem individuals - safely and within the bounds of the law.

4. Presence of an expanding population of grizzlies will reduce hunter opportunity of prey species. Grizzlies eat a lot. It must be anticipated they will take many young of the year ungulates. More prey individuals will be taken as more grizzlies are added thru natural reproduction or translocation. This adversely affects recruitment, and thus hunter opportunities to take mature deer and elk outside NCNP. Consider the wolf range and population is also increasing and competition will continue reduce hunter opportunity.

5. These grizzlies won't remain in the North Cascade remote areas. They will seek the lowland diverse ecosystems where seasonal prey are likely to be. Coincidentally these are the lands occupied by people. There will be conflicts, likely more than your EIS suggests. Then what? Expect to see them around Stehekin, Leavenworth, Mazama and other East side communities. This area will not respond like the GYE, and I seriously doubt agency scientists accounted for reduced suitable acreage for grizzlies in their carrying capacity modeling. If those areas occupied by humans and their road infrastructure (or anticipated to be occupied), areas of glaciated peaks, old growth timber and other habitat not suitable for prey species the area suitable for grizzlies is much reduced.

6. Once reintroduction starts it is likely more people will bring firearms to the area. Whether bears are broadly present in the North Cascades National Park, adjacent federal and state forest lands, the numbers of people with firearms will increase

substantially, outside normal big game hunting seasons. Human nature being what it is, this may also increase opportunities for these firearms to be discharged for recreation purposes during more months of the year, decreasing silence and solitude of the wilderness that many people seek to experience.

7. Many who support grizzly reintroduction have no experience with grizzlies. There are some/many who support reintroduction Alternatives have no experience in the wild, do not know of the potential impacts or dangers. Urbanites love their wilderness but many rarely go, so why should they weigh heavily in the reintroduction issue? This advocacy should be discounted in favor of people who live, work or try to make a living in and adjacent to areas the grizzlies are expected to occupy.

8. Grizzlies Often Get Into Trouble Requiring Lethal Removal. It is my understanding from authoritative sources that the GYE population of grizzlies which approaches 1,000 individuals, that roughly 5-10 percent of these bears, depending on the year, are involved in encounters of various types which result in mortality of the bears, and sometimes mortality and/or severe injury of humans, or destruction of property. Grizzlies will not stay in wilderness areas, they are opportunists and will seek out lowlands to find easy prey, often domestic stock or human food stores like chicken coops, livestock on the range or in enclosures, and graneries, damaging valuable private property. Livestock loss programs are an expensive joke in their daily administration - and a continuing frustration for those who attempt to make claims under these programs. One need only look at what has happened in ID, MT and WY already with the wolf programs. And USFWS has thus far balked at letting these states manage grizzly problems by maintaining ESA listing status. Even if the agency wanted to assist, advocates will endlessly sue to stop them. We have watched this bureaucratic disaster play out for over 30 years in the 10(j) wolf reintroduction to the GYE. WA should not have the same fate! Expect nuisance grizzlies to be killed illegally, and who can blame those who do it? Will railroad companies also be asked for money compensation for grizzlies killed by locomotives - ask BNSF or other railroad companies in the GYE if they like want more grizzlies in more places?

9. National Park Service and US Fish & Wildlife Service are Bullies

I deplore the advocacy by the US Fish and Wildlife Service, using the weight and influence of these agencies to aggressively push for this reintroduction. This strikes me more as internal agency bureaucratic advocacy than a demand by the public. JUST STOP!

My apologies for the brevity and incomplete nature of these comments, as I only learned of the expiration of the draft EIS comment period a day ago. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this important proposal.

Sincerely,

██████████
MS, JD,
Attorney at Law licensed in WA and CO
██████████
Seattle, WA 98127

*Footnote: Apparently my Word formatting and bold text did not carry over to this document. Apologies for that, but I think you get my points, nonetheless.

Correspondence ID:	14087Project:112008Document:132104
Address:	Darrington, WA 98241-1096 United States of America
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual
Received:	Nov,13 2023 19:50:22
Correspondence Type:	Web Form

Correspondence: Superintendent Don Striker 11/13/2023
North Cascades National Park Service Complex
810 State Route 20
Sedro-Woolley, WA 98284

Hi again. I am a local resident who has lived, worked, and recreated within the Recovery Area for over 50 years. Let me start off by saying that I strongly support Alternative A, but with the 10(j) rule attached for the time when bears do make their way into the North Cascades.

My primary concern is with the ability of the land management agencies to implement this recovery plan. While funding may be in place to capture and relocate bears into the NCE - what then?

My concerns, dating back to 2017, has been the lack of engagement of the US Forest Service in this process. With the NPS as a lead agency, and ¾ of the recovery area being on National Forests, it is still a case of the tail wagging the dog. The lack of coordination is striking. This was very apparent at the recent public meeting I attended in Darrington. While I appreciated that the National Park Service Superintendent, Mr. Striker, attended the meeting along with Fish and Wildlife Service officials, there was not a single uniformed Forest Service employee to be found. Similarly, the current DEIS has a list of 26 people involved in its preparation and does not include a single Forest Service employee. During the prior DEIS process there were two. I have spoken with district level staff who have extensive knowledge of their districts, and all have verified they were not asked for input on this process. As a result, The DEIS is deficient on activities related to recreation, timber, and other uses on the National Forests. For example, stock and equestrian use is barely mentioned and the fact that there are hundreds of miles of motorized and mountain bike trails on the National Forests and adjacent DNR lands. There are individual trails on public lands within the NCE outside of the North Cascades National Park where use is greater than that in the entire Park backcountry.

Due to current staff shortages, and possibly other issues, coordination between the two National Forests is also lacking. For example, Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie issued a temporary Forest Order earlier this year related to food storage. The Order was apparently done as an "Emergency Order" which will expire in 2025. The Okanogan-Wenatchee has not issued a companion order which will lead to public confusion particularly on trails such as the PCT which crisscross the border between the two Forests. Past orders were coordinated and signed by both Forest Supervisors. Public scoping prior to this regulation becoming permanent is required for the long term. There is no budget line in the DEIS that addresses this likely expensive item.

Future regulations that would require separation of camping, cooking, and food storage sites at backcountry camps - which currently number in the thousands - on the two national forests may have to expand to allow for these additional developments. Likely this would invoke NEPA and be further costs not accounted for. While this may not involve every campsite, there are still hundreds of heavily used camps that may need food storage infrastructure. With this level of development and de-facto campsite designation, the agency may be required to take further management actions such as identifying and removal of hazard trees. Again, more future costs.

The Forests currently have only a handful of employees who are able to enforce even the basic food storage regulation that the MBS has put in place. There are two officers for an area of 1.1 million acres on the Mt. Baker and Darrington Ranger Districts for example. They are only able to spend a very small percentage of their time on any trail, let alone deep in the backcountry. Education is a far more likely goal, though, you are more likely to run into a volunteer ranger in the backcountry than an actual employee - who would not have enforcement ability anyway. The budget should reflect a recurring need for at least seasonal backcountry rangers who, at a minimum, could educate visitors to be bear safe. These people would then be available to implement area/trail closures as needed. One seasonal for each 100,000 acres or so would be a start. About 20 annually for the National Forests.

The DEIS has a map displayed on several pages that outlines possible Grizzly Bear release areas. Two of these, the Pasayten and northern Glacier Peak sites, are not addressed in the DEIS. The Forest Service has not completed, or even started, a minimum requirements analysis to authorize motorized transport. More public scoping will be needed for this effort. The EIS should show these areas outside the National Park in some sort of provisional status. Staging areas D-G should be shown in a similar manner. This is another expensive project that is not accounted for in the DEIS.

Despite comments about the proposed flexibility of the 10(j) Rule, eventually there will be situations that result in closures of roads and trails of great value to recreation and other users. Projects may be shut down altogether. There have already been at least two trail reconstruction projects (Ridley and Swift Cr) dropped due to Grizzly Bear core habitat concerns on National Forest lands. Similarly, economic activities, such as timber harvest, may be impacted due to bears moving into, or near, a sale area for example.

The DEIS discusses plans the Canadians, along with the First Nations, are conducting to translocate bears into the Canadian portion of the NCE. Apparently, this plan is being developed in coordination with the F&WS. While I am in support of Alternative A, I do not have an issue with bears working their way south into the US portion of the recovery area. Another benefit of allowing this course of action to proceed is that in-migration of bears would not violate current Washington State law. These bears should be treated under the 10(j) rule.

In closing, I am supporting Alternative A with 10(j) for the following reasons:

- Lack of Forest Service leadership in this process
- Lack of funding for unidentified future costs
- Lack of addressing the diverse array of recreation activities, particularly impacts to equestrians and motor/mechanized use in the NRE.
- Lack of outlining the impact of future regulations
- Lack of an MRE on Forest Service land
- No demonstrated need on why this effort has to begin now.

Thank you once again for considering these comments.

Sincerely,

Correspondence ID: 14088Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Stehekin, WA 98852
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 19:50:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am requesting an extension to the comment period. If that is not honored, I request no action be taken.

Correspondence ID: 14089Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Duvall, WA 98019
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 19:52:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am a wholehearted supporter of restoring grizzly bears to their native range in the North Cascades. This keystone species will affect the environment in positive ways we can only dream about. Let's right a wrong and get grizzlies back where they belong, in the North Cascades ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 14091Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Chehalis, WA 98532
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 19:54:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm typing this on my phone, so please excuse the inevitable typos. I studied conifer encroachment on subalpine meadows around Mt. Baker as part of my master's thesis. It's easy to see that it is absolutely prime bear habitat up there. They should be playing the role they've evolved to fill in that ecosystem. I know that as a hiker and climber, I will have to take more precautions when I visit the area in the future. I'm fine with that. It's not like it hasn't stopped me from visiting areas with grizzlies before. I'm really pleased that efforts to bring them back to the area are going forward. People can adapt to the inconvenience.

Correspondence ID: 14093Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 19:55:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: [In short, I wholeheartedly support steps being taken by the Federal Government to fully restore the North Cascades grizzly bear population using the 10J approach, and I believe that local public engagement needs to be geared up and ongoing in the way Wayne Kasworm did in the Cabinet Yaak ecosystem where he turned minds and hearts in favor of resoration by simply communicating often and honestly with locals.]

Thank you to the US Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Park Service, the USDA Forest Service, and the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife for initiating this important process.

I emigrated to the USA in 1997. Part of the appeal of this amazing country is something that many people here take for granted - it's WILDNESS. When I hike the mountains of my native home in the UK, there is something missing. Grizzly bears have not walked those hills for one thousand years. And with them went all sense of wildness. The window of opportunity to restore some of our wild planet has long been closed in most parts of the world. But it is different in Washington State. Here, the window is still open, and it is a moment in time we should grasp with pride and excitement. The grizzly bear will sit atop a suite of majestic carnivores that STILL call this home - wolves, lynx, mountain lions, black bears, wolverine....

But it's clear that the tiny number of grizzly bears thought to exist in the North Cascades can't recover without active help in the form of augmentation. The history of this most successful and historically widespread of the bear species shows that with a little support, recovery should be not only possible, but widely beneficial in so many ways. Their ecological and cultural roles are clear, but their economic, and spiritual roles should also be considered. Our future depends upon the types of wild places that grizzly bears represent.

I've been fortunate enough to work on bear research, education, and conservation projects all over the world for the last 25 years. In 1994 and 1995 I captured, radio-collared and tracked grizzly bears by foot for 2000 miles over 2 seasons in the Canadian Rockies, learning from them as I went. I only saw a handful. Since then I've spent thousands of hours among grizzly bears in Alaska, and I've been lucky enough to escort some wonderful people to enjoy them first hand.

But my proudest work was here with the creation of the Grizzly Bear Outreach Project (now Western Wildlife Outreach). I co-founded GBOP in 2001 to bring an accurate understanding about grizzly bears and recovery to local communities of the North Cascades - in close partnership with state and federal agencies, and with the IGBC. But most importantly, with local community members. And wherever we go we find a very high level of support for grizzly bear recovery. Our rigorous polls tell us that local people think bears are an essential component of the North Cascades ecosystem (81% agree), that they were here before humans and have an inherent right to live here (76% agree), that they should be preserved for future generations (86% agree). 79% said they support recovery. The vast majority STRONGLY agreed with these statements.

It's unfortunate that the vocal minority opposed to grizzly bear recovery muddies the water with inaccuracies and myth - something that the grizzly bear has faced since the days of Lewis and Clark. The economics also speak for themselves. Studies in Yellowstone have shown that people flock to the place to see grizzly bears - they are THE prime reward. The presence of grizzly bears there results in 155 local jobs and \$10M per year injected into local communities. Research shows that people would pay even MORE than they already do to enter the park if they were guaranteed to see a griz.

My work as a TV host for PBS, BBC, National Geographic allows me the privilege of sharing the wonders of the wild with people, and the grizzly bear holds a special place in viewers' minds. Our films about them have held audiences of many millions captive all over the world. For good reason it seems. People find them irresistible and fascinating. In fact, it is VERY difficult for a reasonable person to argue that grizzly bears are a bad thing. The facts speak for themselves. But grizzly bears are wild animals, and CAN be dangerous - many people fear them for this reason. We should not shy from the truth, but merely place it in context, and treat people's opinions with respect and consideration.

I'm clearly an advocate for the wild, and for me the grizzly bear is the clearest manifestation of wilderness alive in the world today. But I'm also pragmatic and fair. Steps towards recovery have to be open, transparent, communicated well, inclusive, and with consideration for those who might be at first deny the benefits of bear recovery. Social science has proven that effective programs are based on fairness, familiarity, and control - when stakeholders feel that they are being treated fairly, have access to knowledge to increase familiarity, AND feel that they have a sense of control in matters, then much can be accomplished. Education and outreach should be given the highest possible priority as a result. Not just teaching passive audiences, but engaging active communities in the process - buy-in will be key, and will result in true benefits for all. Outreach can help stakeholders and communities move with the recovery process, checking off practical and emotional needs along the way like the need for information on safety and sanitation, ecology and behavior, and the recovery process itself. Time is on our side to do this right, and open communication is key.

But beyond the practical considerations, grizzly bears keep a part of us close to nature. They represent the things we all need - clean air, fresh water, intact natural resources. Like us, they are demanding - but they are also our best ally on a rapidly developing planet. The restoration of this unique grizzly bear population represents a golden opportunity for bears, for conservation, for our world. Let's show the rest of the world that this corner of the United States is ready to do something special, and huge for the natural world that we owe so much.

Whether we are ever lucky enough to see one or not, just knowing they are out there is a powerful tonic in a world that needs a little more nature. They teach us about ourselves, keep us humble, and are a part of our wild west heritage - perhaps THE most vivid part imaginable. If you don't believe me, just take a hike in the Scottish Highlands.

██████████, MS Ecology
Ecologist, Conservationist, bear specialist
TV Host/Film & Podcast Producer

Correspondence ID: 14094Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Walla Walla, WA 99362
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 19:56:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm not super educated on this topic but I do believe that it is the right thing to reintroduce grizzlies into the area. With that being said, it's equally important to educate the public on how to handle a potential encounter with grizzly bears. I also think it's important to understand to impact this could have on people living in the area from a structural perspective. Tons of construction would have to be done on things from trashcans to kitchens to ensure that they are "grizzly-proof";.

Correspondence ID: 14095Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lakewood, WA 98499
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 19:57:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To whom it may concern,

I am writing in support of the restoration of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem, their historic range for thousands

of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations. I have lived in Washington State since 1972, when I was a small child, and I would like Washington's wildlife and environment that I love so much to be afforded maximum protection in this age of the Sixth Extinction and global warming. The restoration of grizzlies to the North Cascades should clearly be part of these efforts.

I support Alternative C but with needed changes to the proposed 10(j) rule. The proposal would bring up to 25 non-conflict grizzly bears - likely from Montana - into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade and manage them as an experimental population.

The proposed 10(j) rule as currently written fails to give grizzlies the best chance to succeed and is too permissible in allowing reintroduced bears to be killed.

Lethal removal of a grizzly bear should only be considered where there is a demonstrable threat to human safety, and, for non-immediate threats to human safety, only after non-lethal management options, including concerted use of conflict prevention methods, have been exhausted.

No grizzly bears should be hazed or relocated as a result of conflict with livestock unless demonstrable, repeated efforts have been made by the livestock producer to prevent such conflicts, using commonly-available techniques.

No grizzly bears should be killed on public lands as a result of livestock depredation.

Landowners/private citizens should not be given a permit, or otherwise authorized, to kill a grizzly bear.

No grizzly bear should be preemptively relocated if the bear is not a threat to human safety, particularly if the bear has not become habituated or food-conditioned, or when nonnatural foods/attractants have not been properly secured and made inaccessible to bears. Doing so acts as a disincentive for communities to employ conflict prevention measures, and increases the risk to the bear of injury or death from capture and relocation.

These changes are crucial in providing adequate protection for grizzly bears.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C and with appropriate changes to Section 10(j). Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Correspondence ID: 14096Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ione, WA 99139
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 19:57:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am against the relocation of grizzly bear in our area which is north Pend Oreille county .Having lived her for 64 years and my ancestors living here well for over 100 years. Making there living working in the timber industry, ranching and farming and never had to worry about Grizzlies actually never even seen them as well as wolfs which have also been relocated here. We now have to continually worry about our safety and the safety of our livestock. I have always felt safe when out in the woods, but the past month my son has had a grizzly on his game cameras which makes us fear for the safety of our grandchildren. As we all know grizzly bear attacks are becoming more frequent. In Canada a couple that was very experienced were killed by a grizzly. I do not want it to happen here. Relocate in the wilderness areas where there are is enough habitat that they do not need to mix with humans, and livestock. I hope you will take it in consideration that we tax paying citizens should have say in the safety of our families as well as livestock. [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 14097Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Everett, WA 98208
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 19:58:08

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support reintroducing wildlife that were extirpated in their native range. I support the agencies efforts, and think there are enough sideboards and options to manage individual bears if they should they become a problem. As a former wildlife viewing/flyfishing guide with firsthand experience in brown bear country, I know that most bears want very little to do with people. Most people recreating in the wilderness will not even come close to crossing paths with grizzlies, as most visitors to national parks hardly even leave the parking lot. There is a lot of fear mongering and inflated sense of risk with predators. I urge the agency to not cater to that false narrative, and stay true to your mission by doing what is best for the ecosystems in the north cascades. Thank you!

Correspondence ID: 14099Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America

Outside Organization: I Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 19:58:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Sending this in support of Grizzly bear reintroduction. The biggest argument against seems to be fear, however Grizzlies have been here for the majority of time this area has been settled, without a single fatality. I hike regularly in the cascades, and have done multiple backpacking trips in the cascades. Bears attacks are way down the list of dangers, and hazards to prepare for. I am a forth generation whatcom county resident. Thank you, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 14101Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Walla walla, WA 99362
United States of America

Outside Organization: Myself Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 19:59:48

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do not reintroduce the grizzly bear to new areas. Being from the s.e. Washington area I have followed the release of wolves , the success of the packs to watching news accounts of wolves being hunted and killed for live stock deaths. Our human expansion has destroyed what would be a natural habitat for the wolves and bears. Please don't bring them back to be hunted for their natural behaviors. Way to many people for the bears to thrive.. don't do it

Correspondence ID: 14103Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Burlington, WA 98233
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 20:01:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support bringing the grizzly back to the North Cascades. I have been a resident at the edge of the North Cascades and a frequent hiker in this National Park. Grizzly bears are part of our natural ecosystem, and the North Cascades is one of the few areas that has the habitat the grizzly needs to survive. Bringing the bears back will help complete this park in ways that will be beneficial to the environment, to other species, to the culture of the First People, and even to the tourist economy. National Parks are the place where wild species should be able to thrive. Please bring the grizzly back to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 14104Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Redmond, WA 19402
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 20:03:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The grizzly bears deserve to have their home back. Period.

Correspondence ID: 14105Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98105
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 20:03:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Reintroducing grizzly bears that were native to the Cascades is part of a desperately needed move to restore and rebuild the area back to a healthy ecosystem. I would hope that technology, monitoring and other strategies can be used to protect the bears and humans and livestock from each other so that this can be successful and rewarding for us, the bears and the planet.

Correspondence ID: 14107Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Clearlake, WA 98235-0337
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 20:05:48

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to express my strong support for grizzly bear restoration in the North Cascades. Grizzly bears once thrived in the North Cascades and are vital to maintaining a complete, ecologically-functional ecosystem. Grizzly bears enhance the backcountry experience and are an important part of our Northwest natural heritage, one that's on the brink of disappearing.

Specifically, I support Alternative C: Incremental Restoration. Alternative C strikes a sound balance to meet the mutual goals of grizzly bear restoration and the needs of people. I believe grizzly bears will benefit our region's ecosystems and economies alike, and preserve true wildness for future generations to cherish and enjoy.

Grizzly bear range in the contiguous U.S. has been reduced by 98 percent. Restoring grizzly bears to the Cascades will help to maintain the animal's distribution on the West Coast (the only Grizzly Bear Recovery Zone outside of the Rocky Mountains). We also know that people and grizzly bears coexist in other areas where the bears are much more abundant, and local economies are supported by tourism, backcountry recreation and ranching to name a few.

Grizzly bears won't recover on their own because the North Cascades is isolated from larger, more well-connected grizzly bear populations in the U.S. and Canada. In the decades since the grizzly was protected by the Endangered Species Act, grizzlies have not recovered in the North Cascades. Thus, the "No Action" alternative in the DEIS will not suffice to achieve grizzly bear recovery in the Cascades nor will it satisfy the objectives of the EIS process, the responsibilities of federal agencies under the ESA or the national strategy for recovering grizzly bears in the identified Grizzly Bear Recovery Zones.

During your scoping period, the 2017 DEIS comment period, and in recent public polling, broad support has been documented for grizzly bear restoration. Please do the right thing and bring back this native species through the strategy laid out in Alternative C. Alternative C strikes an acceptable balance between the biological and the social sciences. Grizzly bear restoration through Alternative C will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture and natural heritage.

Thank you,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 14108Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Covington, WA 98042
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 20:08:37

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Reintroducing grizzly bears into the Cascade mountains is a good idea only if you don't mind people being killed by grizzly bears.

<https://www.npr.org/2023/10/06/1203928437/couple-grizzly-bear-attack-banff-sent-message>

Correspondence ID: 14109Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Newport, WA 99156
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 20:09:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: This will kill everything off the wolves are already bad with the cougars and black bears please do not reintroduce these grizzlies

Correspondence ID: 14110Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Fox Island, WA 98333-9725
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 20:10:19
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To whom it may concern,

I am writing to support the restoration of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem, their historic range for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C but with needed changes to the proposed 10(j) rule. The proposal would bring up to 25 non-conflict grizzly bears - likely from Montana - into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade and manage them as an experimental population.

The proposed 10(j) rule as currently written fails to give grizzlies the best chance to succeed and is too permissible in allowing reintroduced bears to be killed.

Lethal removal of a grizzly bear should only be considered where there is a demonstrable threat to human safety, and, for non-immediate threats to human safety, only after non-lethal management options, including concerted use of conflict prevention methods, have been exhausted.

No grizzly bears should be hazed or relocated as a result of conflict with livestock unless demonstrable, repeated efforts have been made by the livestock producer to prevent such conflicts, using commonly-available techniques.

No grizzly bears should be killed on public lands as a result of livestock depredation.

Landowners/private citizens should not be given a permit, or otherwise authorized, to kill a grizzly bear.

No grizzly bear should be preemptively relocated if the bear is not a threat to human safety, particularly if the bear has not become habituated or food-conditioned, or when nonnatural foods/attractants have not been properly secured and made inaccessible to bears. Doing so acts as a disincentive for communities to employ conflict prevention measures, and increases the risk to the bear of injury or death from capture and relocation.

These changes are crucial in providing adequate protection for grizzly bears.

Correspondence ID: 14111Project:112008Document:132104
Address: BELLEVUE, WA 98006
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 20:10:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the restoration of grizzly to the No Cascades. The pros are species preservation and environment rebalancing and restoration by restoring apex species. I don't think the plan significantly impacts people, towns, agriculture or ranchers.

Correspondence ID: 14113Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Everett, WA 98208
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 20:12:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Bring back the bears. I've lived and worked in bear country most of my life. I've had encounters from Alaska to California. They walk through my yard in New Mexico and ate my apples. They ran by my tent nightly in BC. I stumbled on them catching fish in Alaska, crossed paths with them working in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho. Bears aren't the problem. It's people's who don't understand nature that are the real issue.

Correspondence ID: 14115Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98122
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 20:16:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: IDraft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Environmental Impact Statement, North Cascades Ecosystem

I support your plans to introduce Grizzly bears into wild areas including in the North Cascades in Washington state. I would like you to know that I hiked the entire Pacific Crest Trail in the summer of 2002. On that trek I carried a bear canister going through the bear areas approaching Yosemite National Park (from the south). I have also spend a total of over 16 months trekking to visit high Himalayan peaks.

Thank you,
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 14116Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mazama, WA 98833
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 20:16:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am commenting in support of the plan to reintroduce grizzly bears in the North Cascades. I believe that it is critical that we support the preservation of this species by establishing a population as proposed by the park service in the North Cascades. This is an area that has been demonstrated to offer habitat and food sources that will support a population of grizzlies. As a frequent backpacker, I am confident that I, and others using the backcountry, can take reasonable precautions to ensure our safety (should I ever be so lucky as to even see a grizzly bear). I am also someone who lives in a rural area where there theoretically could be encounters with a grizzly bear if they are reintroduced to this region. We already live in "bear country" and take reasonable precautions to avoid unduly attracting black bears so that they do not become problem bears -- precautions such as keeping poultry safe in a sturdy coop, refraining from putting up bird feeders, keeping garbage protected, etc. I do not expect we will need to take any additional precautions as a result of the introduction of the grizzly bears, but if there are additional steps we should take we view that as a small step that we would very willingly do in order to promote the health and well being of the grizzly bear population. I also specifically support the use of section 10(j) of the Endangered Species Act in order to provide local communities more flexibility to manage the grizzly bear population with additional wildlife management tools.

Correspondence ID: 14118Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98109
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 20:18:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Just commenting to I'm an avid hiker/skier/biker in the region and support the re-introduction of Grizzly bears into the North Cascades. The danger posed by these bears to any humans is very minimal and I think work to support their restoration into the Cascades is a clearly beneficial change.

Correspondence ID: 14120Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Creston, WA 99147
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 20:18:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We already have a big enough problem with predators in this state. There is already grizzlies in certain parts of this state. We certainly don't need more

Correspondence ID: 14121Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Usk, WA 99180
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 20:19:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I strongly oppose introducing anymore predators into this state until we can manage the ones we have our ungulate population is almost nonexistent and getting worse

Correspondence ID: 14122Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 20:19:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am writing to support the restoration of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem, their historic range for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations. I'm saddened by the hate for wolf animals across the mountain west and hope you and your science community recognize the waste the cattle industry has brought to our public lands. Brown bears have an historic place here not cattle.

I support Alternative C but with needed changes to the proposed 10(j) rule. The proposal would bring up to 25 non-conflict grizzly bears - likely from Montana - into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade and manage them as an experimental population.

The proposed 10(j) rule as currently written fails to give grizzlies the best chance to succeed and is too permissible in allowing reintroduced bears to be killed.

Lethal removal of a grizzly bear should only be considered where there is a demonstrable threat to human safety, and, for non-immediate threats to human safety, only after non-lethal management options, including concerted use of conflict prevention methods, have been exhausted.

No grizzly bears should be hazed or relocated as a result of conflict with livestock unless demonstrable, repeated efforts have been made by the livestock producer to prevent such conflicts, using commonly-available techniques.

No grizzly bears should be killed on public lands as a result of livestock depredation.

Landowners/private citizens should not be given a permit, or otherwise authorized, to kill a grizzly bear.

No grizzly bear should be preemptively relocated if the bear is not a threat to human safety, particularly if the bear has not

become habituated or food-conditioned, or when nonnatural foods/attractants have not been properly secured and made inaccessible to bears. Doing so acts as a disincentive for communities to employ conflict prevention measures, and increases the risk to the bear of injury or death from capture and relocation. These changes are crucial in providing adequate protection for grizzly bears.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C and with appropriate changes to Section 10(j). Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Correspondence ID: 14123Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 20:20:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Alternative C does seem like the best option for establishing and maintaining a population in the North Casades. Restoring a population of grizzly bears in the North Casades is a fantastic step to re-establishing the ecosystem to its natural balance and continuing the conservation mandate of the National Parks.

Correspondence ID: 14124Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Usk, WA 99180
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 20:20:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Do not reintroduce the National park grizzly bears into our general population! We have enough predator problems as it is. This will have an alarming impact on our wildlife numbers. They are already too low as it is.

Correspondence ID: 14125Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Olympia, WA 98502
United States of America
Outside Organization: None Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 20:21:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do not support the reintroduction of grizzly bears into the North Cascades. My husband and daughter are both avid hikers with a lot of experience with destinations like the Boundary Trail, Harts Pass, Golden Lakes Loop, etc. None of these hikes would be as appealing to me or my family if grizzlies were present. Safety of hikers is my priority, not only my family members but the countless through-hikers on the Crest Trail.

Correspondence ID: 14126Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Friday Harbor, WA 98250-8247
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 20:21:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To whom it may concern,

I am writing to support the restoration of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem, their historic range for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C but with needed changes to the proposed 10(j) rule. The proposal would bring up to 25 non-conflict

grizzly bears - likely from Montana - into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade and manage them as an experimental population.

There is plenty of evidence that livestock can be protected from "predators" and coexist. See https://www.aphis.usda.gov/aphis/ourfocus/wildlifedamage/operational-activities/sa_livestock/ct_protecting_livestock_predators for more information

The proposed 10(j) rule as currently written fails to give grizzlies the best chance to succeed and is too permissible in allowing reintroduced bears to be killed.

Lethal removal of a grizzly bear should only be considered where there is a demonstrable threat to human safety, and, for non-immediate threats to human safety, only after non-lethal management options, including concerted use of conflict prevention methods, have been exhausted.

No grizzly bears should be hazed or relocated as a result of conflict with livestock unless demonstrable, repeated efforts have been made by the livestock producer to prevent such conflicts, using commonly-available techniques.

No grizzly bears should be killed on public lands as a result of livestock depredation.

Landowners/private citizens should not be given a permit, or otherwise authorized, to kill a grizzly bear.

No grizzly bear should be preemptively relocated if the bear is not a threat to human safety, particularly if the bear has not become habituated or food-conditioned, or when nonnatural foods/attractants have not been properly secured and made inaccessible to bears. Doing so acts as a disincentive for communities to employ conflict prevention measures, and increases the risk to the bear of injury or death from capture and relocation.

These changes are crucial in providing adequate protection for grizzly bears.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C and with appropriate changes to Section 10(j). Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Correspondence ID: 14127Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Usk, WA 99180
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 20:25:02

Correspondence Type:Web Form

Correspondence: This should not happen

Correspondence ID: 14128Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Newport, WA 99156
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 20:25:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We already have a predator problem in eastern washington we don't need more. I don't want to see Grizzlies adding to the problem.

Correspondence ID: 14129Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 20:26:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Thanks for asking for public input.

One of the most amazing experiences of my life was my visit in 2019 to Brooks Falls and the opportunities to see these magnificent animals in person. We were coached in how to behave to avoid unsafe encounters and there were no problems. Unfortunately, the trip to Brooks Falls is expensive and out of reach for many people.

We humans need to understand that everything is connected, as John Muir noticed. When you remove one species, the natural balance is out of whack and unimagined problems occur as a result. Please return the grizzlies. As we have seen in many areas with wolves returning, over time the natural balance of the area is restored.

Correspondence ID: 14130Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 20:26:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am in favor of the trial reintroduction of Grizzly bears to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 14132Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 20:28:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please strongly consider restoring the Grizzly to its range in the North Cascades!

Correspondence ID: 14133Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America
Outside Organization: Salutation* Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 20:29:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I DEMAND YOU, the National Park Service, PROTECT the grizzly bears from extinction, NOW!!!

Correspondence ID: 14134Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Winthrop,Wa., WA 98862
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 20:29:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am not in favor of restoration of grizzly bears into NCES. I question the adequacy of the analysis of the information in the draft EIS & the proposed 10(j) rule. Since the last grizzly restoration attempt six years ago the main change in the area is that considerably more people live in this area specifically out further from the town's & cities. This makes human encounters with grizzly bears far more likely. National Park Service written policy states, "The safety & health of employees, contractors, volunteers, and the public are core Service values. Above all, keep in mind that the safeguarding of human life must not be compromised". Therefore my vote is option "A", no action on grizzly restoration in NCES at this time.

Correspondence ID: 14135Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Cathlamet, WA 98612
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 20:29:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to support the restoration of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem, their historic range for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support the option that says this will NOT be an "experimental population";.

This option would bring up to 25 non-conflict grizzly bears into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade and manage them as a non-experimental population.

The proposed 10(j) rule as currently written fails to give grizzlies the best chance to succeed and is too permissible in allowing reintroduced bears to be killed.

Lethal removal of a grizzly bear should only be considered where there is a demonstrable threat to human safety, and, for non-immediate threats to human safety, only after non-lethal management options, including concerted use of conflict prevention methods, have been exhausted.

No grizzly bears should be hazed or relocated as a result of conflict with livestock.

No grizzly bears should be killed or removed on public lands as a result of livestock depredation.

No landowners/private citizens should be given a permit, or otherwise authorized, to kill a grizzly bear.

No grizzly bear should be preemptively relocated if the bear is not a threat to human safety. Doing so acts as a disincentive for communities to employ conflict prevention measures, and increases the risk to the bear of injury or death from capture and relocation.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to my state. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Correspondence ID: 14136Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 20:30:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am fiercely against reintroduction of grizzlies into the north cascades. They are a threat to hikers and nearby residents. They are no longer "part of the ecosystem," an ecosystem which had adjusted to their disappearance. The North Cascades is touted as a unique recreational opportunity,,and the reintroduction would severely limit those opportunities and endanger multitudes of hikers, backpackers, fishers, and residents. Please don't don't do this.

Correspondence ID: 14137Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Auburn, WA 98001
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 20:30:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To whom it may concern,

I am writing to support the restoration of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem, their historic range for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C but with needed changes to the proposed 10(j) rule. The proposal would bring up to 25 non-conflict grizzly bears - likely from Montana - into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade and manage them as an experimental population.

The proposed 10(j) rule as currently written fails to give grizzlies the best chance to succeed and is too permissible in allowing reintroduced bears to be killed.

Lethal removal of a grizzly bear should only be considered where there is a demonstrable threat to human safety, and, for non-immediate threats to human safety, only after non-lethal management options, including concerted use of conflict prevention methods, have been exhausted.

No grizzly bears should be hazed or relocated as a result of conflict with livestock unless demonstrable, repeated efforts have been made by the livestock producer to prevent such conflicts, using commonly-available techniques.

No grizzly bears should be killed on public lands as a result of livestock depredation.

Landowners/private citizens should not be given a permit, or otherwise authorized, to kill a grizzly bear.

No grizzly bear should be preemptively relocated if the bear is not a threat to human safety, particularly if the bear has not become habituated or food-conditioned, or when nonnatural foods/attractants have not been properly secured and made inaccessible to bears. Doing so acts as a disincentive for communities to employ conflict prevention measures, and increases the risk to the bear of injury or death from capture and relocation.

Correspondence ID: 14139Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Usk, WA 99180
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 20:30:52

Correspondence Type:Web Form

Correspondence: We do not want grizzlies here !

Correspondence ID: 14140Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Freeland, WA 98249
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 20:31:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have been exploring and recreating in the Washington State backcountry for over three decades: hiking, backpacking, climbing, wildlife tracking and more. I am an environmentalist and a longtime financial supporter of Conservation Northwest. Nevertheless, I am strongly opposed to both Action Plans B and C to reintroduce grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE).

The designation of introduced grizzlies as a Nonessential Experimental Population (NEP) acknowledges that they are not necessary to the survival of the species. So, then, the questions of their value to the ecosystem and to humans are paramount, i.e. "the restoration of biodiversity of the ecosystem to build ecological resilience and for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations of people" (second Purpose and Need bullet point).

The current EIS fails to present a convincing cost/benefit analysis that favors human intervention in the reintroduction of grizzlies. Specifically, I believe the EIS:

1. Grossly underestimates the potential for human/bear conflicts
2. Either discounts or ignores the adverse impact on backcountry users resulting from the presence of grizzly bears
3. Fails to fully consider possible changes in NCE visitor behavior, including increased user pressure on 'safe' areas and the proliferation of firearms in the backcountry
4. Fails to address compensation in cases of human injury or death

Detailed comments regarding each of these items follow.

1. Potential for Adverse Human/Bear Conflicts

There have been several grizzly bear attacks on people in recent years in both the United States and Canada, including multiple camper fatalities. The analysis of NCE visitation presented in the EIS and the potential for conflicts is woefully inadequate. Following are salient portions of the EIS (in quotes) and my comments:

"The park complex attracts more than 900,000 visitors per year, the majority of whom visit Ross Lake National Recreation Area (920,526 in 2020, 855,926 in 2021, and 998,019 in 2022)."

"For relative comparison purposes, Yellowstone National Park receives approximately 4 million visitors annually, while the North Cascades National Park Service Complex receives less than 1 million visitors annually, the majority of whom remain within the State Highway 20 corridor. However, only approximately 50,000 visitors used backcountry areas within the park complex. Given this level of visitation and the lower population density of grizzly bears, potential injuries and fatalities within the NCE are expected to be far lower than those presented for Yellowstone National Park during both the primary and adaptive management phases, all resulting in a decreased potential for grizzly bear and visitor interactions."

"In the event of a conflict between a member of the public and a grizzly bear resulting in human injury or fatality, adverse impacts on public safety would be substantial, and the impacts to the individual and their friends and family would be catastrophic. However, given the population size (ranging from 25 to 200) that would be present on the landscape, the availability of grizzly bear habitat, and the proactive measures and human-grizzly bear conflict response actions discussed above, the probability of such impacts occurring is considered minimal."

If 998,000 people visited the Ross Lake NRA in 2022, how can it be that fewer than 1 million visited the North Cascades National Park Service Complex? Due to the lack of park entrance gates, and limited visitor compliance with self-service registration, the actual number of visitors is likely much higher.

The comparison with Yellowstone fails to account for potentially significant differences in patterns of frontcountry vs. backcountry use. Yellowstone likely has a much higher proportion of frontcountry usage due to its national and worldwide popularity among visitors inexperienced in backcountry travel, while the NCE likely has a much higher proportion of highly-engaged backcountry users hailing from nearby coastal metro areas. As a longtime member of The Mountaineers and a regular backcountry visitor, I can attest to the popularity of many backcountry areas in the NCE. Despite the assertions in the EIS, it can be hard to find an 'untrammelled' place.

"According to the NPS, backcountry visitation in the park complex has fluctuated depending on the year; however, from 2021 to 2022, the park complex saw a 29% increase in backcountry campers" (p.111). The EIS also refers to "...pressures related to the region's rapidly growing human population". It doesn't address how these changes might affect future visitation patterns or adverse human/bear interactions.

The Pacific Crest Trail (PCT) and other popular destinations in the proposed Recovery Area 1 such as Maple Pass, Blue Lake, Harts Pass, Wolf Creek, and those around Stehikin, Marblemount, etc. often see very large numbers of visitors during the time when bears would be active and rearing their young.

The growth of communities in the urban/wildland interface near towns such as Mazama, Winthrop, Twisp, Chelan and Leavenworth will also increase the likelihood of adverse human/bear interactions. Human/bear conflicts are bad for humans and for bears. "As human population density increases, the frequency of encounters between humans and grizzly bears also increases, resulting in more human-caused grizzly bear mortalities because of a perceived or real threat to human life or property." (p. 5)

2. Adverse Impacts on Backcountry Users due to the Presence of Grizzly Bears

There is an underlying assumption in the EIS that the presence of grizzly bears in the NCE will "improve overall wilderness character quality over the long term" (p. 110). However, the potential degradation of human backcountry users' experience due to the presence of grizzlies is either discounted or ignored.

On p. 119, two studies from Glacier and Yellowstone N.P. are cited, ostensibly providing evidence that visitors want to see grizzly bears. What is not addressed is how many of these visitors would want to see grizzlies in their backcountry campsite or on a wilderness trail vs. from a safe vantage point. The EIS concedes that, "Impacts could be adverse for those visitors who do not wish to encounter grizzly bears, such as hunters processing a deer or elk carcass." (p. 119) This is a gross oversimplification that ignores the wider potential threat of bears attacking hikers or campers without such obvious attractants, which has occurred on multiple occasions in the U.S. and Canada in recent years.

I've had the privilege of backpacking in remote areas of Jasper and Yoho National Parks in British Columbia, Canada. While I relished the wilderness experience, I was unsettled by the thought of possibly encountering a grizzly bear. I had bear bells on my backpack and bear spray at the ready, but still felt woefully unprepared if I were to encounter a grizzly. I'm glad they exist and will continue to support their survival, but will probably avoid areas with significant grizzly populations in the future. To each their own space.

3. Possible Adverse Changes in NCE Visitor Opportunities & Behavior

This topic was very lightly touched upon in the EIC. There is no discussion of the potential for increased pressure and impacts on areas deemed 'bear safe', and very little on limited access to areas where grizzlies are present. The EIS presumes that there are extensive areas of undisturbed habitat where grizzly/human interactions will be very limited. My own experience of the NCE tells me that this is an unrealistic expectation.

Wild places that are already under pressure due to human visitation could be further degraded due their designation as 'bear safe' areas.

There is no discussion of how backcountry visitors might adapt to the presence of grizzlies, beyond waste management and learning aversion techniques. The reality in places where grizzlies are prevalent (e.g., SE Alaska), is that people must significantly curtail their backcountry travel and/or learn to use and carry firearms to protect themselves in case of attack. These possibilities are conveniently ignored in the EIS, but could become the norm in 60-100 years if a significant population of grizzlies is restored.

4. Cost vs. Benefit in Case of Human Injury or Death

While the EIS discusses potential compensation to livestock owners, it fails to straightforwardly address compensation in cases of human injury or death, and it completely avoids discussion of how much human loss would be worth restoring grizzly bears to the NCE. One human life in 25 years? Two maimed humans in 15 years? How much property loss?

CONCLUSION

The current EIS does not support either action Alternative B or C to restore grizzly bears in the NCE. Until the significant potential impacts I have raised are addressed, I support Alternative A - no action.

Correspondence ID: 14141Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Otis Orchsrd, WA 99027
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 20:31:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do NOT wish for grizzly bears to be introduced to Washington state, it's one thing if they are naturally migrating but there is no need to introduce them like they did with the wolfs, look at the problems that caused.

Correspondence ID: 14142Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Pasco, WA 99301
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 20:32:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We already have a massive predator problem and we don't need any more of the damn things

Correspondence ID: 14143Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Normandy Park, WA 98166
United States of America
Outside Organization: Concerned citizen Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 20:32:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzlies in the North Cascades: Can the environment support them and what is the true danger to the surrounding population?

The government has a duty and responsibility to ensure the safety of its citizens.

Any experiment that includes the release large apex predators in close proximity to large populations of people could be seen as being direct conflict of a government's basic duty.

The need to restore the grizzly population and the ability to succeed in the restoration of these large predators to the lower 48 states is not well articulated in this proposal. It is noted that there were some grizzlies in Washington in 1975, or almost 50 years ago, but this is not the same environment of 1975.

Many areas have been clear cut, streams dammed, and have salmon runs that have been faltering for many years. Elk herds are protected, but are they enough, with current deer populations, to truly support these apex predators? And do these predators have a right to return?

I support animal rights, but when the rights and safety of existing human populations are impacted, I believe there is a need to balance human safety with the actual need of a population of grizzlies that exists without issues in Alaska and Canada. There is little in this proposal that provides a solid need to expand this population into the United States. Nor are any benefits to this proposal well articulated.

The human safety analysis presented in this report is for a small population of bears with no large human settlements nearby in Selkirk. This is not analogous with the proposal of releasing Grizzlies into an area down to Snoqualmie Pass, a major recreation area.

A more balanced comparison may need to look at the Grizzly population in Glacier National Park or the greater Yellowstone area. A look at population of humans vs grizzly incidents over at least the past ten years would be needed to identify true risk to nearby cities and towns as well as visitors, in the North Cascades proposal.

The natural food supply of a population of large predators is also not well articulated in the report, and it is unclear if the bears would come to rely on nearby human habitations as sources of food. Further analysis is needed on food supplies with an exclusion of salmon(ids), as these are endangered as well.

The danger of these predators not having a food source and coming to rely on humans is not explored or addressed. This urgently needs to be investigated now and into the future before grizzlies are released in the area.

Most troubling, the southern border of the proposed area is Snoqualmie Pass, which is a summer and winter recreation area for tens of thousands of inhabitants of nearby cities, such as Seattle, Bellevue, Tacoma and a number of smaller cities and

municipalities.

The public should have some say as to how the public lands are used. Currently, the public can enjoy hiking, skiing, water recreation and camping with minimal fear of a large predator attack. With the introduction of grizzlies (Latin name: *ursus arctos horribilus*), the likelihood of human bear encounters increase. Grizzlies are aggressive and can be known to attack people with no known provocation as humans are prey for this species.

Protection is difficult as multiple recent reports of grizzly bear fatalities note that an empty can of bear spray was found near the remains, indicating bear spray is not an effective deterrent. It may be surmised that the only reliable protection from a grizzly is a firearm.

Hiking and camping with a gun could become an unfortunate reality should a reintroduction of grizzly bears occur in the North Cascades. This increases risk to other humans and animals in the vicinity.

If the habitat can truly support this species, we would expect a migration from nearby areas in Canada where bear populations are larger than in the US. There should be no need to introduce the animals, but migration and expansion, unimpeded, and perhaps with supports, would seem a more natural and organic reintroduction of this species if the area truly could support it. Again, there is no provided evidence that the area can provide adequate natural food supplies for these large apex predators.

The very high population growth of the Puget Sound area and the very high usage of public lands for recreation throughout Western Washington should give federal and state officials pause.

Reintroducing a very large predator into the surrounding wilderness is an idea that requires careful further analysis and extensive preparation to provide an environment that can support a large species without conflict with the existing human population.

Finally, with the unknown results of climate change, it is possible that the North Cascades will not be a suitable environment for grizzly bears in the years ahead.

Correspondence ID: 14144Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Enumclaw, WA 98022
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 20:34:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do not favor grizzly bear recovery for Washington state.

Correspondence ID: 14145Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Redmond, WA 98052
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 20:35:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: No to reintroducing grizzly bears to the North Cascades

Correspondence ID: 14146Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Longview, WA 98632
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 20:36:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We already are having a predator problem. We don't need more.
Do not reintroduce the Grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 14147Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Tulalip, WA 98272
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 20:36:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please DO NOT bring grizzlies into the North Cascades.
As an avid hiker, I would quit going into the out doors. Our salmon population is already struggling and the bears will not help the situation. Activists are urging people to quit eating salmon because our orcas are starving. I see thousands of cars in the Cascades at the trail heads on any given day. Most WA state hikers and climbers already know to avoid the mountains on the weekends due to the massive crowds.
It will just be a matter of time before one of these grizzlies kills someone and then also have to be killed. These bears are thriving in Alaska, Canada, Montana, Idaho, just to name a few places. There is no need to bring them here to help their population. This sounds like a disaster waiting to happen especially if they have to compete for resources amongst themselves and the wild cats. Please consider the people that do live in the small towns all through out the cascades. The bears will most certainly enter public areas and not just break into trash cans, they are capable of climbing into peoples homes.

Correspondence ID: 14148Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Kalama, WA 98625
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 20:36:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think introducing more apex predators into our state is a huge mistake and should not be done.

Correspondence ID: 14149Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Addy, WA 99101
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 20:36:49
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Wdfw should not be introducing grizzly bears to our region. The department and state has clearly failed at introducing wolves and their ability to manage them, why would we want another dangerous predator here in our region. As if we don't already have a few around. Washington state is failing miserably at managing predators as clearly demonstrated. We live in a predator pit and all our ungulates have paid the price and are disappearing at an alarming rate. It's mind blowing to think Washington would even consider Introducing a predator like the grizzly knowing damn well we won't be able to manage them and the problems they will be causing with people and live stock not to mention public safety. These bears are not going to stay in the mountain ranges because the ungulate numbers are already depleted by wolves, cougar and black bear that are that are not being managed. These bears will end up in the lower elevations and valley where there are food sources and civilization.

For these reasons and many others I am against the reintroduction of the Grizzly bear.

Correspondence ID: 14150Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Addy, WA 99101
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 20:37:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Wdfw should not be introducing grizzly bears to our region. The department and state has clearly failed at introducing wolves and their ability to manage them, why would we want another dangerous predator here in our region. As if we don't already have a few around. Washington state is failing miserably at managing predators as clearly demonstrated. We live in a predator pit and all our ungulates have paid the price and are disappearing at an alarming rate. It's mind blowing to think Washington would even consider Introducing a predator like the grizzly knowing damn well we won't be able to manage them and the problems they will be causing with people and live stock not to mention public safety. These bears are not going to stay in the mountain ranges because the ungulate numbers are already depleted by wolves, cougar and black bear that are that are not being managed. These bears will end up in the lower elevations and valley where there are food sources and civilization.

For these reasons and many others I am against the reintroduction of the Grizzly bear.

Correspondence ID: 14151Project:112008Document:132104

Address: White Salmon, WA 98672
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 20:38:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To whom it may concern,

I am writing to support the restoration of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem, their historic range for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C but with needed changes to the proposed 10(j) rule. The proposal would bring up to 25 non-conflict grizzly bears - likely from Montana - into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade and manage them as an experimental population.

The proposed 10(j) rule as currently written fails to give grizzlies the best chance to succeed and is too permissible in allowing reintroduced bears to be killed.

Lethal removal of a grizzly bear should only be considered where there is a demonstrable threat to human safety, and, for non-immediate threats to human safety, only after non-lethal management options, including concerted use of conflict prevention methods, have been exhausted.

No grizzly bears should be hazed or relocated as a result of conflict with livestock unless demonstrable, repeated efforts have been made by the livestock producer to prevent such conflicts, using commonly-available techniques.

No grizzly bears should be killed on public lands as a result of livestock depredation.

Landowners/private citizens should not be given a permit, or otherwise authorized, to kill a grizzly bear.

No grizzly bear should be preemptively relocated if the bear is not a threat to human safety, particularly if the bear has not become habituated or food-conditioned, or when nonnatural foods/attractants have not been properly secured and made inaccessible to bears. Doing so acts as a disincentive for communities to employ conflict prevention measures, and increases the risk to the bear of injury or death from capture and relocation.

These changes are crucial in providing adequate protection for grizzly bears.

Respectfully,

Correspondence ID: 14152Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Dolores, CO 81323
United States of America

Outside Organization: Northern Rockies Conservation Cooperative Conservation/Preservation(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,13 2023 20:39:15

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear USFWS and NPS:

Thank you for your extensive work planning the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades. I support the reintroduction with an experimental population designation under section 10(j) of the ESA. My opinions are based on multiple perspectives, including as a wildlife biologist who once trapped and radio-collared grizzly bears (in the Selkirk Ecosystem, for Idaho Fish & Game and the USFWS), a human-carnivore coexistence specialist (in the Greater Yellowstone and Northern Continental Divide ecosystems), a rangeland scientist, and a former ranch manager.

This is an essential step towards the legal mandate to restore the grizzly bear throughout its range where feasible. The fundamental requirement of the ESA for delisting a species is that it no longer be threatened or endangered in a significant portion of its range. The grizzly bear remains extinct throughout the vast majority of its range in the contiguous U.S., and as such is unlikely to be delisted soon. The 1993 recovery plan was a good piece of work for its time; after three decades, we have two recovery zones with significant population growth, two recovery zones with little population growth, and two or three zones with no population at all (including the NCE). In that same three decades, we have a lot more science about grizzly bears, and a much better understanding of where bears could live (thanks in large part to federal scientists from the USFWS, NPS, USGS, and USFS). We need a recovery plan that adequately addresses recovery at the scale of the listed entity, i.e., the species in its historic range in the contiguous U.S., wherever feasible.

The NCE is one of two recovery zones where it has already been determined that grizzly bears should be reintroduced. The other is the Bitterroot Ecosystem.

In the long term the number of bears is less important than the number of human-bear conflicts. For delisting criteria, I caution against any language that might be construed to imply a maximum number of bears (e.g., 200). Recent analysis estimated the carrying capacity of the NCE might be about 280 bears. These numbers are sensitive to numerous factors, including where the boundary is drawn, and there will be bears that can survive outside of that boundary. We have seen social conflict in the Northern Rockies about the numbers of grizzly bears and wolves, concerns that are largely misplaced, but which are based in part on historic misperceptions about how many bears (or wolves) there would be.

In my experience working with livestock producers in Greater Yellowstone and the Northern Continental Divide, grizzly bears do kill cattle and sheep but the numbers are less than what one would expect. More importantly, there are strategies for reducing herd vulnerability, and tools for minimizing conflicts. For example I worked with ranchers on an allotment near the southern end of the GYE, on the Shoshone National Forest, where the permittees had lost a significant number of cattle to grizzly bears for at least three years; during the three years of our project, neither permittee had any confirmed losses. (We did this with range management methods: a strategic grazing management plan, applied by range riders using low-stress herding.)

In the long term, grizzly bears will require a different approach than traditional wildlife management. They will probably always be a conservation-reliant species in the greater NCE and may require occasional augmentation. I caution against any assumption that success necessarily means delisting and state management according to the North American Model. That Model has worked very well for ungulates, but poorly for carnivores, and especially poorly for grizzly bears.

Now, in the NCE, and in the BE, we have the opportunity to finally reintroduce the grizzly bear to long-identified portions of its historic range. Let's get to work.

Sincerely,

██████████
██████████ Northern Rockies Conservation Cooperative
Rangeland scientist and business owner, ██████████

Correspondence ID: 14153Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Washington, DC 20005
United States of America
Outside Organization: National Wildlife Federation Action Fund Non-Governmental
Received: Nov,13 2023 20:39:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Director Williams and Director Sams,

Below are 390 of 8,805 total comments submitted by advocates and supporters of the National Wildlife Federation Action Fund in regards to the Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/Environmental Impact Statement, North Cascades.

Thank you for releasing an environmental impact statement and draft plan that outlines a path forward to recover and restore grizzly bears in the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE).

Grizzly bears belong in the North Cascades. They roamed the region for thousands of years and their eventual decline was a loss to biodiversity and to the cultural traditions of First Nations and Indigenous communities throughout the Pacific Northwest and British Columbia. Restoring and managing grizzlies in the North Cascades is an important step in bringing the full ecosystem back together and it's a critical step to larger grizzly bear recovery efforts in the lower 48.

I'm grateful for your leadership on this issue and encourage you to continue the recovery process in coordination with Tribal governments, local partners, and other stakeholders. Doing so will ensure that grizzly bears maintain a path towards full recovery for the benefit of future generations.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED], Hendersonville, NC 28792
[REDACTED], Boonville, new york 133091220
[REDACTED], Seattle, WA 98116-4212
[REDACTED], Farmington, Minnesota 55024
[REDACTED], Staten Island, Ny 10309-3103
[REDACTED], Louisivlle, KY 40291
[REDACTED], West Palm Beach, Florida 33411-5119
[REDACTED], Crown Point, IN 46307
[REDACTED], Waite Hill, OH 440949639
[REDACTED] Elmsford, NY 105232025
[REDACTED] Edinboro, PA 164121347
[REDACTED], Midlothian, VA 23112-3157
[REDACTED], Huntington, ny 117431039
[REDACTED], Fort Myers, FL 33912
[REDACTED], Denver, CO 80246-7809
[REDACTED], Los Angeles, CA 90065
[REDACTED], Gastonia, nc 28054
[REDACTED], Wisconsin Rapids, WI 54494-4765
[REDACTED], North Bend, wa 980458727
[REDACTED], Greenville, Wisconsin 54942
[REDACTED] Milford, NE 68405
[REDACTED], Phoenix, Arizona 85029-3846
[REDACTED], Columbia, SC 29204
[REDACTED], Lake Worth, florida 33467
[REDACTED], Danbury, NH 32304412
[REDACTED], Moraga, CA 94570-5009
[REDACTED] Goshen, Oh 45122-9292
[REDACTED], East Stroudsburg, PA 183029032
[REDACTED], Santa Paula, CA 93060
[REDACTED], Tinton Falls, Nj 07712-7786
[REDACTED], Acworth, Georgia 301017643
[REDACTED], Saranac Lake, NY 12983
[REDACTED], Upland, CA 91786
[REDACTED], Saint Louis, Missouri 63109

[REDACTED], Chicago, IL 606477555
[REDACTED], Seattle, wa 98101
[REDACTED], Laurel, MD 20707-4143
[REDACTED], Cortez, Colorado 813213924
[REDACTED], Fort Worth, Texas 761074531
[REDACTED], Long Beach, CA 90808
[REDACTED], Martinez, GA 309071219
[REDACTED], Ozark, Missouri 65721
[REDACTED], Arvada, Colorado 800042240
[REDACTED], Bethlehem, Pennsylvania 18018-5038
[REDACTED], Clifton Park, Ny 120652539
[REDACTED], Grosse Pointe Park, MI 482301116
[REDACTED], New Oxford, PA 173509422
[REDACTED], Holly Springs, nc 275407810
[REDACTED], Melbourne, FL 329402336
[REDACTED], Jersey City, NJ 07302-2202
[REDACTED], Columbus, OH 43206
[REDACTED], Valdosta, GA 31605
[REDACTED], Bonners Ferry, idaho 838058523
[REDACTED], Yorkville, NY 134951807
[REDACTED], Plano, Tx 750932616
[REDACTED], Pittsburgh, PA 152082717
[REDACTED], Roswell, GA 300754654
[REDACTED], Lakewood, Co. 80227-6237
[REDACTED], Tuscaloosa, Al 354055424
[REDACTED], Springfield, Illinois 627072610
[REDACTED], Lincoln, Nebraska 68507-9450
[REDACTED], Emmaus, Pa 180491624
[REDACTED], Youngstown, ohio 445093039
[REDACTED], Northridge, CA 91325-3844
[REDACTED], Cambria, Ca 934283606
[REDACTED], Eastham, MA 26422080
[REDACTED], San Jose, CA 951321920
[REDACTED], Noblesville, Indiana 460604479
[REDACTED], Morristown, New Jersey 7960
[REDACTED], Redmond, Wa 980522632
[REDACTED], Miami Beach, Florida 33139
[REDACTED], Bradenton, FL 342025911
[REDACTED], POST FALLS, id 838548263
[REDACTED], Jacksonville, WA 626501692
[REDACTED], LOVELAND, Colorado 80538
[REDACTED], Glenn Dale, Md 207692028
[REDACTED], Midland, NC 281077802
[REDACTED], Hudson Falls, NY 128392340
[REDACTED], San Antonio, TX 782192016
[REDACTED], Hastings, Mn 550333443
[REDACTED], Lenoir City, Tennessee 377718221
[REDACTED] La Mesa, CA 91942
[REDACTED], Las Vegas, Nevada 891564916
[REDACTED], Rhinelander, WI 545012807
[REDACTED], Norfork, AR 726588540
[REDACTED], Oakland Park, FL 333341427
[REDACTED], Springfield, MA 11191831
[REDACTED], Johnson City, Tennessee 37601

[REDACTED], Wappingers Falls, NY 125906212
[REDACTED], Bainbridge Island, Washington 98110-1574
[REDACTED], Nine Mile Falls, Wa 990269354
[REDACTED], Highland, In 463221215
[REDACTED], Austin, TX 787025003
[REDACTED], Haddon Heights, NJ 80351013
[REDACTED], Eldersburg, MD 217846218
[REDACTED], Austin, Texas 787501727
[REDACTED], Bermuda Dunes, Ca 922031233
[REDACTED], Irvine, California 92618
[REDACTED], Boston, MA 02111-2238
[REDACTED], Kansas City, MO 64110-3109
[REDACTED], Lombard, IL 601484428
[REDACTED], Franktown, CO 801168549
[REDACTED], Titusville, Florida 32796
[REDACTED], Brooklyn, NY 11206-1060
[REDACTED], Cheektowaga, NY 14227
[REDACTED], Wilmington, MA 1887
[REDACTED], Saint Paul, MN 55114
[REDACTED], San Francisco, CA 941170625
[REDACTED], Lake Worth, Florida 33461
[REDACTED], Beavercreek, OR 97004
[REDACTED], Norfolk, VA 23518-2907
[REDACTED], Redmond, Washington 980523493
[REDACTED], Eufaula, Ok 74432-4235
[REDACTED], Albuquerque, NM 87107-6727
[REDACTED], New Braunfels, TX 78132-2670
[REDACTED], Orlando, FL 32822-7156
[REDACTED], Fort Myers, florida 339192182
[REDACTED], Mascoutah, Il 62258-1347
[REDACTED], Wimberley, TX 78676-5974
[REDACTED], Gainesville, Georgia 30507
[REDACTED], Franklin, TN 37067-8164
[REDACTED], Fort Wayne, indiana 468162472
[REDACTED], San Bernardino, CA 92404
[REDACTED], Yakima, WA 98902
[REDACTED], Ponderay, idaho 838520513
[REDACTED], North Port, Fl 342863231
[REDACTED], Merritt Island, FL 32952
[REDACTED], Arkdale, WI 54613
[REDACTED], Walnut Cove, North Carolina 270525808
[REDACTED], Lexington, KY 40513
[REDACTED], Seattle, WA 981123648
[REDACTED], San Diego, ca 921191725
[REDACTED], Mesquite, Tx 751494744
[REDACTED], ANSONIA, CT 6401
[REDACTED], Northglenn, COLORADO 80233-1354
[REDACTED], Petoskey, MI 497709582
[REDACTED], Tallahassee, Florida 32311-8585
[REDACTED], Jacksonville, Florida 32204-3550
[REDACTED], Frenchtown, MT 59834-9580
[REDACTED], Van Nuys, CA 914053142
[REDACTED], Brooklyn, NY 11231
[REDACTED], Northwood, IA 50459

██████████, Garden City, New York 115305126
██████████, Albany, Georgia 317216111
██████████ Modesto, CA 95355
██████████, Langhorne, Pennsylvania 19047
██████████, South Holland, Illinois 604733319
██████████, Albuquerque, Nm 871123333
██████████, Orangeville, Il 610609676
██████████, San Diego, CA 92128
██████████, Pelham, AL 351243983
██████████, Topeka, Kansas 66604-1535
██████████, Stone Mountain, Georgia 300883111
██████████, Rocky River, OH 44116
██████████, Keansburg, Nj 77341205
██████████, San Antonio, TX 78217-1885
██████████, Chiniak, Akasja 996155575
██████████, Roseville, MN 55113-1860
██████████, Si, NY 10309
██████████, Keller, texas 76244
██████████, Albion, MI 49224
██████████, Beverly Hills, California 90210
██████████, Houston, Texas 77084
██████████, Houston, Tx 77084
██████████, Austin, Texas 78703
██████████, Columbia, SC 29204
██████████, Tucson, AZ 85747
██████████, Hershey, PA 17033-1723
██████████, Wheat Ridge, CO 80033
██████████, Anchorage, Alaska 99501
██████████, Palm Desert, Ca 922118246
██████████, Phoenix, AZ 85020
██████████, Lake Elmo, MN 55042
██████████, Gary, Indiana 46408
██████████, Stony Brook, NY 11790
██████████, Carpentersville, il 60110
██████████, Schenectady, NY 12304-1819
██████████, Jamestown, ND 58401
██████████, Elburn, IL 60119-9517
██████████, Ashburn, VA 20148
██████████, San Francisco, California 94131
██████████, Union, NJ 7083
██████████, Saratoga Springs, New York 12866
██████████, Sheffield Lake, OH 44054
██████████, JBER, AK 99506
██████████, Wake Forest, NC 27587
██████████, Yonkers, NY 10707
██████████, Arlington, Texas 76013
██████████, Sun City West, Arizona 85375
██████████, Leominster, ma 1453
██████████, Nashua, NH 03062-3017
██████████, Cincinnati, Ohio 45233
██████████, Kingsport, tennessee 37660

Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America
Outside Organization: Chelan County Commissioners County Government(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,13 2023 20:39:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: November 13, 2023
Mr. Don Striker, Superintendent Director Hugh Morrison
North Cascades National Park Service Complex Pacific Region, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
810 State Route 20 911 NE 11th Ave
Sedro-Woolley, WA 98284 Portland, OR 97232

RE: 2022 North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/Environmental Impact Statement and proposed 10(j) rule

Dear Mssrs. Striker and Morrison:

Chelan County has reviewed the draft Environmental Impact Statement and proposed 10(j) rule associated with the joint National Park Service and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan. We have previously provided extensive comments opposing grizzly bear reintroduction into our local communities. We continue to oppose grizzly bear reintroduction given the likely negative impacts to our rural communities. The federal agencies leading this effort continue to fail to adequately analyze and address these concerns in the current draft EIS and proposed 10(j) rule.

1. The draft EIS fails to analyze and consider impacts to local communities

Chelan County and other local governments within the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE) requested Cooperating Agency status to participate in the development of the draft EIS and proposed 10(j) rule. Unfortunately, the National Park Service and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service chose not to engage local governments and their expertise in the development of the draft EIS and proposed 10(j) rule. Notably, the draft EIS does not adequately analyze or consider impacts to local communities within the NCE, including public safety, economic development, recreation opportunities and overall livelihood of rural communities. Counties, in particular, have special expertise and jurisdiction in land use planning, economic development, parks and recreation and road development and management that should be incorporated into the draft EIS and proposed 10(j) rule. We, again, request Cooperating Agency status and that completion of the draft EIS be delayed until the potential impacts to local communities are better analyzed and understood.

2. New and emerging information must be considered and incorporated into the draft EIS and proposed 10(j) rule

We learned from the October 2023 Interagency Grizzly Bear Task Force that extensive modeling is being completed by the U.S. Geological Survey to predict NCE grizzly bear habitat use, and the current modeling, described by USGS scientists as "highly predictive," shows high-value grizzly bear habitat well outside the proposed release areas identified in the draft EIS. We do not purport to be experts in wildlife biology, but the preliminary results of the modelling appear to point to obvious areas of potential conflicts between grizzly bears and local communities. Significant blocks of these high-value grizzly bear habitat areas are located outside the North Cascades National Park and designated wilderness areas and squarely within non-wilderness lands managed by the US Forest Service and private property. The current draft EIS and proposed 10(j) rule must be delayed to allow for the USGS modelling effort to be completed, incorporated into a new draft EIS and shared with the public.

= Large blocks of Predicted Grizzly Bear Habitat. Adapted from Sells and Costello (draft). Polygons created by Chelan County.

= Potential Grizzly Bear Release Areas (approximate). Adapted from draft EIS. Polygons created by Chelan County.

3. The role of the Okanogan Wenatchee National Forest in grizzly bear reintroduction must be fully analyzed and incorporated into the draft EIS.

Grizzly bear reintroduction appears to rely heavily on actions that will take place on the Okanogan Wenatchee National Forest (OWNF), yet OWNF is not participating in the development of the draft EIS or proposed 10(j) rule. The draft EIS can not be based on assumptions about future OWNF policies and actions and must identify, analyze and incorporate those issues now. We are particularly concerned that the draft EIS does not consider impacts to much-needed forest health treatments, road building and recreation, especially "high-use" roads and trails. It is unclear to us if there is sufficient "core area" within the NCE to support grizzly bear reintroduction given the recreational uses on the OWNF. Given the increase in size and scale of wildfires, the need for forest health treatments and road building to support those treatments is paramount for ecological and community needs and would likely be significantly constrained by grizzly bear protections.

4. Grizzly bear reintroduction and management must be re-considered in light of draft EIS deficiencies

The current proposed 10(j) and 4(d) rules need to be re-considered after the draft EIS deficiencies are addressed. It appears that the NCE does not provide sufficient habitat to support grizzly bear reintroduction population goals and that substantial preferred habitat is located on the OWNF and rural communities. Given the high level of activity in these non-wilderness areas, 10(j) and 4(d) provisions must be re-considered and expanded to anticipate and address significant conflicts between grizzly bears, local communities, forest practices and recreational activities. Conversely, the feasibility of grizzly bear reintroduction must be reconsidered given these likely conflicts.

We reiterate our opposition to grizzly bear reintroduction given the likely adverse impacts to our local communities and lack of local government engagement by the federal agencies. At

minimum, we hope that you will consider our comments and develop a draft EIS and proposed 10(j) rule that more accurately reflect the current science, management needs and local community impacts of grizzly bear reintroduction.

Sincerely,

██████████
Commissioner

██████████
Commissioner

██████████
Commissioner

Correspondence ID: 14155Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ferndale, WA 98248
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 20:40:01

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not support the reintroduction of grizzlies into the North Cascades. I grew up in and still live in Ferndale, Washington, near the North Cascades, and spend time hiking in the North Cascades every year. I've been on several multi day backpacking trips.

The benefit to the environment would be negligible because we already have a lot of black bears. What would the actual, concrete benefit of grizzlies being introduced? The impact statement mentions the abstract and insubstantial 'cultural heritage'.

The drawbacks will be real. The impact statement fails to acknowledge the danger of grizzlies. It mentions 'injuries' but completely and disingenuously ignores fatalities. Over 10 people have been killed in the US and Canada in the last three years by grizzlies. (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_fatal_bear_attacks_in_North_America). Over 30 dead since 2000.

While the risk is very small for an individual trip, eventually someone will be attacked and killed by a grizzly in the North Cascades if they are reintroduced. What will be the justification for their death? That someone wanted to improve the 'cultural heritage' of nature?

The impact statement claims there won't be long term closures like yellowstone because prey concentrations haven't been observed. But of course that analysis can change, so it seems like there's a risk of closures as well. And even short term closures of a day will ruin a hike for people if they can't go on the hike they planned. And it will ruin the experience for hikers if they planned a big hike and took time off of work for a trip that gets completely canceled due to a grizzly.

Hiking will become more expensive, and thus more exclusionary to traditionally marginalized people as well, due to required and recommended safety equipment.

Again, for what?

Perhaps the people eager to experience grizzlies in the wild can travel to one of the areas in North America where they already roam without putting North Cascades hikers at risk.

Thanks,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 14156Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 20:44:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We do NOT need another apex predator in this area. That money needs to go and manage the wildlife that we have. There is nothing good about bringing grizzly bears back to the north cascades. It is a waste of time and money.

Correspondence ID: 14157Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Ione, WA 99139
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 20:44:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzly bears should not be reintroduced. We have a major predator problem as is and bringing more predators into the area is a terrible idea. Predators are killing all of our wildlife!

Correspondence ID: 14158Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Elma, WA 98541
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 20:45:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Take your wolves, and Grizzlies and shove them where the sun don't shine! They were removed for a reason! KEEP THEM OUT OF WASHINGTON STATE!!

Correspondence ID: 14159Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Newport, WA 99156
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 20:46:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Our predator problem is off the chains! The wolf population it way way to bad ! I do not want anymore here especially a grizzly bears! I know hundreds more people that feel the same! We need to protect our deer and elk not creat more of a predator problem! I highly highly disagree!!!

Correspondence ID: 14160Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Colville, WA 99114
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 20:47:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: No grizzly introduction into WA. They're already here, and we have a major predator problem already with wolves, cougars. We've already exterminated the woodland caribou from WA state! No on grizzlies, we live, work and play here.

Correspondence ID: 14161Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Kennewick, WA 99338
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 20:48:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: No for anymore Grizzlies

Correspondence ID: 14162Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bothell, WA 98021
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 20:50:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To whom it may concern,

I am writing to support the restoration of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem, their historic range for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C but with needed changes to the proposed 10(j) rule. The proposal would bring up to 25 non-conflict grizzly bears - likely from Montana - into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade and manage them as an experimental population.

The proposed 10(j) rule as currently written fails to give grizzlies the best chance to succeed and is too permissible in allowing reintroduced bears to be killed.

Lethal removal of a grizzly bear should only be considered where there is a demonstrable threat to human safety, and, for non-immediate threats to human safety, only after non-lethal management options, including concerted use of conflict prevention methods, have been exhausted.

No grizzly bears should be hazed or relocated as a result of conflict with livestock unless demonstrable, repeated efforts have been made by the livestock producer to prevent such conflicts, using commonly-available techniques.

No grizzly bears should be killed on public lands as a result of livestock depredation.

Landowners/private citizens should not be given a permit, or otherwise authorized, to kill a grizzly bear.

No grizzly bear should be preemptively relocated if the bear is not a threat to human safety, particularly if the bear has not become habituated or food-conditioned, or when nonnatural foods/attractants have not been properly secured and made inaccessible to bears. Doing so acts as a disincentive for communities to employ conflict prevention measures, and increases the risk to the bear of injury or death from capture and relocation.

These changes are crucial in providing adequate protection for grizzly bears.

Correspondence ID: 14163Project:112008Document:132104
Address: OAK HARBOR, WA 98277
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 20:51:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am against the reintegration of grizzly bears into the northern Cascades. I have three young children, and we hike, camp, and visit the north cascades as often as we are able. The threat of grizzly bears in the area would make it very difficult to feel like a good father and putting my children near such an animal. Especially considering the two people in Canada that were just killed by a grizzly, and they even used bear spray. The environmental impact would be negative as well. They are a predator, and the area already has a low elk population that has required unit 418 to be special permit. Grizzly bears will only lower the population of existing animals, and will undoubtedly at some point take human lives as well.

Correspondence ID: 14166Project:112008Document:132104
Address: kingston, WA 98346
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 20:51:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Native Americans are in favor of this reintroduction and so am I. Indigenous people understand the importance of honoring nature and each of its creatures. Let's finally honor them and restore nature in every way we can.

Correspondence ID: 14167Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ferndale, WA 98248
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 20:54:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: "I do not support the reintroduction of grizzlies into the North Cascades. I live in Ferndale, Washington, and frequently go hiking in the North Cascades every year. This is one of our favorite ways to enjoy our beautiful area, and one which we can do safely while respecting nature. The reintroduction of grizzlies would seriously jeopardize that safety.

NO on grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 14168Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ferndale, WA 98248
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 20:56:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not support the reintroduction of grizzlies into the North Cascades. My wife and I raised our 3 children and we still live in Ferndale, Washington, near the North Cascades. We took the children for hikes and we continue to spend time hiking in the North Cascades every year. Over 10 people have been killed in the US and Canada in the last three years by grizzlies per Wikipedia. The risk outweighs the rewards.

Correspondence ID: 14169Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tacoma, WA 98445
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 20:56:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The Grizzly bear and the wolf have 1 thing in common, they both deserve to exist peacefully in their natural habitat. Unfortunately, with predator hunting/overhunting, and uneducated fear, both face a future without any protection, let alone access to their native lands. That needs to change. For the bear and the wolf. Let the bear roam free, same as the wolf, they both should be able to repopulate where they once called home.

Correspondence ID: 14170Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Snoqualmie Pass, WA 98068
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 20:57:21

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a person that I own a cabin in the Cascade Mountains and I caught numerous times on my camera Ring, Black bears roaming around my place, I completely oppose this plan to repopulate the area with one of the most dangerous animal in the world, the Grizzly Bear!

I consider this plan almost similar to a Jurassic Park movie, in which somebody thought that it was a great idea to revive the disappeared species of dinosaurs, including the T-Rex.

This is plan would put in danger the human life and it shall never be implemented!

Correspondence ID: 14171Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Newport, WA 99156-0414
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 20:59:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Washington state does not have quality predator control. This will only make things worse.

Correspondence ID: 14172Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Maple Falls, WA 98266
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 21:00:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I feel that grizzly bears should be restored to the North Cascades National Park area. We already have black bears. It's their habitat!

Correspondence ID: 14173Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98119
United States of America
Outside Organization: The Washington Chapter of the Wildlife Society Non-Governmental(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,13 2023 21:00:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Comment letter re: NPS/USFWS Draft Grizzly Bear Recovery Plan/EIS for the North Cascades Ecosystem

November 13, 2023

Dear Superintendent Don Striker and Supervisor Brad Thompson,

The Washington Chapter of the Wildlife Society writes to support further research and conversation about the possible restoration of a healthy population of grizzly bears to the North Cascades. We appreciate the efforts being made to reintroduce grizzly bears to their historical range, but would like to emphasize the importance of stakeholder engagement. At this moment, the chapter is not opposed to or in support of the reintroduction; we simply are hoping that the NPS and USFWS will continue to do their due diligence by researching and discussing this idea with all stakeholders before moving forward.

It is evident that the reintroduction of grizzly bears is a complex and controversial issue, and understanding the various stakeholder perspectives is crucial for a successful reintroduction effort. A comprehensive stakeholder conflict assessment should be conducted which includes the perspectives of local communities, conservation organizations, hunters, ranchers, and indigenous communities. By developing a platform for constructive dialogue, stakeholders have a chance to reach shared understandings and identify specific points of contention such as human-bear conflicts, land use, and economic impacts. We recommend considering replicating the example set by the Washington Wolf Advisory Group, and organizing cross-state dialogue opportunities with ranching communities in Montana and other entities in Montana that have been key to co-existence success there such as the Centennial Valley Association and the Blackfoot Challenge. Establishing common ground and mutual learning serves as a foundation for shared values to emerge.

We believe that addressing stakeholder concerns and finding shared values will enhance the likelihood of a successful grizzly bear reintroduction program. By actively engaging with all parties involved and considering their concerns and perspectives, a more inclusive and durable plan can be implemented.

Thank you for considering our comments. We look forward to the continued progress of this important initiative and hope to

see a harmonious and successful reintroduction of grizzly bears into their historic habitat.

The Wildlife Society's Position Statement on The U.S. Endangered Species Act states that the Society's policy is to "Assure that decisions under the ESA are transparent, replicable, and based on robust analyses of the best scientific data available." (TWS 2017)

Sincerely,
The Washington Chapter of the Wildlife Society

Correspondence ID: 14174Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 21:00:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I've written once before about having hiked and bikepacked extensively throughout US and Canadian territories through grizzly country, and how the sheer preposterous of the idea of reintroduction of grizzlies to the North Cascades is foolhardy at best and will result in deaths of both humans and bears. But I'd like to now comment against one of the "pros", specifically how their reintroduction will result:

"Contribute to the restoration and biodiversity of the ecosystem".

How in the world does having grizzlies in the North Cascades contribute a positive factor to the "ecosystem"? What, specifically, is out of balance due to their absence?

I would also ask, "In the North Cascades, how many humans have died in the last fifty year due to a grizzly bear encounter? It's pretty obvious the answer is zero.

When the question is switched to, "How many people in the US have died in the last TWO YEARS due to grizzly bear attacks?" The answer is "Between 2020 to 2022, there were eight fatal grizzly bear attacks in North America." By reintroducing grizzly bears to the North Cascades you would only be INCREASING that number. Furthermore, I would say that deaths, resulting from the reintroduction of the species, would be specifically the fault of this panel.

Regards,

Correspondence ID: 14175Project:112008Document:132104

Address: snoqualmie, WA 98065
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 21:01:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Animals are God's creations, we need to take better care of them, and their environment.

Correspondence ID: 14176Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Usk, WA 99180
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 21:01:37

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am against this, the state holds way to many predators as it is. We do not control these predators in the correct way.

Correspondence ID: 14177Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Issaquah, WA 98027
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 21:02:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We support the efforts to bring back the natural order of grisly bears living in their natural habitat.

Correspondence ID: 14178Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Tieton, WA 98947
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 21:02:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I fully support the restoration of Grizzly bears in Washington state.

Correspondence ID: 14180Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mercer Island, WA 98040
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 21:04:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I oppose the Bear Restoration plan to reintroduce grizzlies to the North Cascades. As an avid hiker and climber for over 10 years in the state I have only seen the number of visitors to wild areas increase. More and more unprepared, uninformed and innocent yet ignorant people are flocking to these wild places. While it is noble to want to restore the native plants and species it will only bring death to both bears and humans when they inevitably collide. We are not ready for this and being located within driving distance of a major city with millions of people I don't think we ever will be. I'm sorry but this is a bad idea!!

Correspondence ID: 14181Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Snohomish, WA 98290
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 21:04:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I would not like to see Grizzly bears introduced. I enjoy seeing deer and elk and the country. Really would not feel safe out there hiking and hunting with an apex predator out there.

Correspondence ID: 14182Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Marysville, WA 98271
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 21:06:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I Do Not support introducing grizzlies into Washington State. We do not need these vicious killers in our very extremely populated forests.

Correspondence ID: 14183Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Newport, WA 99156
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 21:06:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do NOT bring nay more.grizzlies into our area!! We do not want any more predators especially while our predator management capabilities are getting slowly taken away!

Correspondence ID: 14184Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Usk, WA 99180
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 21:06:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We have enough predators as it is, grizzly bears will do nothing except kill our wild game, livestock and pets, this is ridiculous and I can't even believe it's being considered!

Correspondence ID: 14185Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Port Angeles, WA 98362
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 21:08:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To whom it may concern,

I am writing to support the restoration of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem, their historic range for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C but with needed changes to the proposed 10(j) rule. The proposal would bring up to 25 non-conflict grizzly bears - likely from Montana - into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade and manage them as an experimental population.

The proposed 10(j) rule as currently written fails to give grizzlies the best chance to succeed and is too permissible in allowing reintroduced bears to be killed.

Lethal removal of a grizzly bear should only be considered where there is a demonstrable threat to human safety, and, for non-immediate threats to human safety, only after non-lethal management options, including concerted use of conflict prevention methods, have been exhausted.

No grizzly bears should be hazed or relocated as a result of conflict with livestock unless demonstrable, repeated efforts have been made by the livestock producer to prevent such conflicts, using commonly-available techniques.

No grizzly bears should be killed on public lands as a result of livestock depredation.

Landowners/private citizens should not be given a permit, or otherwise authorized, to kill a grizzly bear.

No grizzly bear should be preemptively relocated if the bear is not a threat to human safety, particularly if the bear has not become habituated or food-conditioned, or when nonnatural foods/attractants have not been properly secured and made inaccessible to bears. Doing so acts as a disincentive for communities to employ conflict prevention measures, and increases the risk to the bear of injury or death from capture and relocation.

Correspondence ID: 14188Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Chewelah, WA 99109
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 21:10:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We don't need any more predators especially grizzly bear or wolves

Correspondence ID: 14189Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Usk, WA 99180
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 21:11:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Predators need to be delisted and managed there's a reason why our ancestors removed the predators so the wild life could thrive and feed familys

Correspondence ID: 14190Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Olympia, WA 98502
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 21:12:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Humankind irresponsibly captured too much of nature. It's time to give back and I am supportive to share some of the land with Grizzly Bears and reintroduce them to land we took away from them initially

Correspondence ID: 14191Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Burlington, WA 98233
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 21:13:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I have been around grizzly (brown) bears more than anyone I know. I see a lot of people commenting out of ignorance and fear about something of which they have little knowledge. National Parks and wilderness should be managed to be in their "natural state". This includes the bears that used to roam these special places. I saw a Grizzly with my son and his friend at Monogram Lake in 1990. I saw one in Yellowstone August 10 and another on August 12 of this year. I have seen, and shared space with countless grizzlies in the Situk and Kenai watersheds in Alaska. Yes, just as you need hiking skills and knowledge to venture into the backcountry, in Grizzly country you need to know the rules and pay attention to what you are doing. These rules can be learned in five minutes by anyone. These are basically shy creatures who will avoid humans if you give them a chance. They can be managed, and if they cause trouble with ranchers or farmers, killed, and the ranchers compensated. But seeing a grizzly in the wild is an awe-inspiring and magical experience. People who say they will drastically reduce huntable deer populations would do better to slow down at twilight and watch the freaking road. Dozens upon dozens are killed by irresponsible motorists in the stretch of road near my Winthrop house. Give the bears a break, let go of uneducated fear, and return the North Cascades back to their natural state.

Correspondence ID: 14192Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Newport, WA 99156
United States of America
Outside Organization: Northeast Washington Wildlife Group Non-Governmental
Received: Nov,13 2023 21:14:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I would like to vote against reintroducing more wildlife into the state.

Correspondence ID: 14193Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Ann Arbor, MI 48103
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 21:17:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I want to express my support for re-introducing Grizzlies to the North Cascades in order to re-establish their historical range, assist with their conservation, and maintain a healthy and functioning ecosystem. I also love the natural beauty and wildness that exist in this part of our country, and support the idea of establishing Grizzlies here to further distinguish the North Cascades as one of the most wild and beautiful places in our great country. I acknowledged that I do not currently live in the Pacific Northwest (but I expect to later in my life) and those who currently live locally may have concerns, particularly related to safety. But, humans and bears can safely coexist in a healthy ecosystem together for both our benefit. Bring back the bears!

Correspondence ID: 14194Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 21:17:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I fully support the reintroduction of Grizzly Bears to the North Cascade Ecosystem. Sufficient food sources and space in this ecosystem for this native species will support the natural, cultural, tribal, and spiritual connections in this landscape. thank you for your time and efforts, -dean

Correspondence ID: 14196Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Santa Cruz, CA 95060
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 21:21:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Bears as predators are important components in regulating a healthy ecosystem. This is a good plan that undoes some of the early damage from overzealous hunting and habitat loss earlier in the century and is long overdue. I support the proposal to repopulate certain isolated areas of the Pacific Northwest with a native bear population.

Concerns from farmers are not valid as the USDA already has a system in place to compensate them for predation livestock loss.

Correspondence ID: 14199Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Peshastin, WA 98847
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 21:24:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Absolutely NOT reintroduced

Correspondence ID: 14200Project:112008Document:132104

Address: roslyn, WA 98941
United States of America

Outside Organization: none Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 21:24:31

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: yes, give the animals back their land. Protect them from hunters.

Correspondence ID: 14201Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98107
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 21:25:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of Grizzly bears into the North Cascades region, but I do not support provisions that would allow humans to hunt them.

Correspondence ID: 14202Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Orting, WA 98360
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 21:25:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do not support reintroducing the grizzly bear into the North Cascades, or anywhere in WA. Grizzly bear populations are prospering in all of the neighboring territories such as Canada, Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming. They will naturally migrate as habitat allows. There is no need to spend already limited resources to expedite something that will happen naturally if habitat can sustain it. In addition to this, the current wildlife commission has clearly demonstrated they are not capable of effectively managing the existing predator populations such as wolves, bears, and cougars. Until there is sustained improvement in this area there should not be any additional introductions that would strain this even more. As I tell my children, you earn respect and trust, and the only way you do that is by your actions and results. The wildlife commission has zero results in demonstrating effective predator management and is therefore in no position to even consider adding to that problem.

Correspondence ID: 14203Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Kirkland, WA 98033
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 21:26:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please bring back the Grizzlies! Humans are responsible for eradicating they should just have a fighting chance to exist in some of the few remaining wild places. Thank you for considering my deep felt comment.

Correspondence ID: 14204Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Renton, WA 98058
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 21:28:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As an avid hiker in the Cascades and raised on an Eastern Washington cattle ranch in the foothills of the Cascades, I support the re- introduction of grizzly bears into the Cascade Range. This number if introduced, will have a very limited exposure to those pursuing recreational activities in the mountains but help support the ecosystem and diversity of the Northern Cascades. These are incredibly magnificent animals which we've lost in the Cascades and almost lost elsewhere. I've only encountered grizzlies twice in the wild viewing at a great distance in Montana, they are worth the effort in bringing them back to the North Cascades. As with other wild animals currently living in the mountains that pose limited risks to humans, education and placement are key. Education and monitoring efforts have greatly improved over the years to reduce the risks of human encounters with the bears. It's time we welcome them back to the Cascades. Thank you for this opportunity to provide my comment.

Correspondence ID: 14206Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Chehalis, WA 98532
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 21:29:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Bring back the grizzly bear to the North Cascades and all of Washington State please. We need large predators in our ecosystem. We need biodiversity. We need to discontinue and reverse our encroachment into wild habitats and live with nature.

Correspondence ID: 14207Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Vancouver, WA 98664
United States of America
Outside Organization: Sierra Club Loo Wit Group Conservation/Preservation
Received: Nov,13 2023 21:31:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to support the restoration of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem, their historic range for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C but with needed changes to the proposed 10(j) rule. The proposal would bring up to 25 non-conflict grizzly bears - likely from Montana - into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade and manage them as an experimental population.

The proposed 10(j) rule as currently written fails to give grizzlies the best chance to succeed and is too permissible in allowing reintroduced bears to be killed.

Lethal removal of a grizzly bear should only be considered where there is a demonstrable threat to human safety, and only after non-lethal management options, including concerted use of conflict prevention methods, have been exhausted.

No grizzly bears should be hazed or relocated as a result of conflict with livestock unless demonstrable, repeated efforts have been made by the livestock producer to prevent such conflicts, using commonly-available techniques.

No grizzly bears should be killed on public lands as a result of livestock depredation.

Landowners/private citizens should not be given a permit, or otherwise authorized, to kill a grizzly bear.

No grizzly bear should be preemptively relocated if the bear is not a threat to human safety, particularly if the bear has not become habituated or food-conditioned, or when non-natural foods/attractants have not been properly secured and made inaccessible to bears.

These changes are crucial in providing adequate protection for grizzly bears.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C and with appropriate changes to Section 10(j). Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14209Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98125
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 21:37:49
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support bringing grizzlies back to the North Cascades!

Correspondence ID: 14210Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Talent, OR 97540
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 21:38:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am a lifelong backpacker. Besides backpacking all over Washington state, I've backpacked in the back country of Yellowstone, where there were grizzlies. Graizzlies are an important part of the ecosystem. They should never have been driven close to extinction in the first place. Please bring them back.

Correspondence ID: 14211Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 21:40:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I want to speak in favor of allowing the grizzly bear space to live

The low human population density in the North Cascades park means lower possibility of human -animal interactions

Leave them alone and they will leave us alone

I support reintroduction of the grizzly bear to return balance to the cycle of life

Correspondence ID: 14212Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Pasco, WA 99301
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 21:42:08

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The north cascades have been without grizzlies for about a century or more. Nature has balanced this ecosystem in the absence of this predator. The prey species in this area have no experience with Grizzlies. Grizzlies have not migrated into this area despite being connected to areas that hold sufficient Grizzly populations. We should closely examine why. It has apparently been studied and is suggested to be adequate for Grizzly population but again there have not been Grizzly migration into the area. We see repeatedly that nature balances what humans can not. Nature has not balanced Grizzlies into this area.

If humans reintroduce Grizzlies into this area the new bears will strain this ecosystem and the prey species there. Grizzlies will strain the predator species there. There will be grizzly interactions with humans. Why must humans be so arrogant to try to rebalance what nature has balanced. Grizzlies will introduce new death, destruction because of human hubris. Nature will balance our arrogance with loss of life. When that loss becomes a human loss this reintroduction will be at fault. Nature will not be at fault. Those that choose to push reintroduction will be at fault.

Correspondence ID: 14213Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98118
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 21:42:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To whom it may concern,

I am writing to support the restoration of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem, their historic range for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C but with needed changes to the proposed 10(j) rule. The proposal would bring up to 25 non-conflict grizzly bears - likely from Montana - into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade and manage them as an experimental population.

The proposed 10(j) rule as currently written fails to give grizzlies the best chance to succeed and is too permissible in allowing reintroduced bears to be killed.

Lethal removal of a grizzly bear should only be considered where there is a demonstrable threat to human safety, and, for non-immediate threats to human safety, only after non-lethal management options, including concerted use of conflict prevention methods, have been exhausted.

No grizzly bears should be hazed or relocated as a result of conflict with livestock unless demonstrable, repeated efforts have

been made by the livestock producer to prevent such conflicts, using commonly-available techniques.
No grizzly bears should be killed on public lands as a result of livestock depredation.
Landowners/private citizens should not be given a permit, or otherwise authorized, to kill a grizzly bear.
No grizzly bear should be preemptively relocated if the bear is not a threat to human safety, particularly if the bear has not become habituated or food-conditioned, or when nonnatural foods/attractants have not been properly secured and made inaccessible to bears. Doing so acts as a disincentive for communities to employ conflict prevention measures, and increases the risk to the bear of injury or death from capture and relocation.
These changes are crucial in providing adequate protection for grizzly bears.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C and with appropriate changes to Section 10(j). Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Correspondence ID: 14214Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Vashon island, WA 98070
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 21:42:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To whom it concerns,

I and everyone I know is strongly opposed to re introducing grizzly bears back into the lower 48. It's a terrible idea that will cause more harm than good.

Another terrible idea, this will create more human bear conflicts and endangers the personal well being of everyone that enjoys the out doors. Do what's right and stop only listening to the special interests groups and for once listen to the public.

Good talk,

██████████

██████████

██

████████████████████

Correspondence ID: 14215Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Index, WA 98256
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 21:42:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I feel we have too many grizzly bears already that are doing Damage in our northern cascades.

Correspondence ID: 14216Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 21:44:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Comment on: Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/Environmental Impact Statement--North Cascades Ecosystem 2023

I endorse Alternative C in the EIS for reintroducing grizzly bears to the North Cascades. The plan is sound, incremental, and the 10(j) designation will allow sufficient management flexibility to address issues that arise with wandering bears and possible conflicts

I lived in Montana for 4 years in the 70s and then for 42 years in Alaska, where I worked as a wildlife biologist all over the state on a variety of birds and mammals. My interactions with brown (coastal) and grizzly bears (interior) gave me admiration and respect for what I would call the sentinel species of wilderness. Without grizzly bears in their native habitat, wilderness is not wilderness.

I moved to the east slope of the Cascades (Winthrop) in 2020 and one of my regrets was that I left Alaska for a place where the wilderness was incomplete; it was missing the eminent species historically present in this ecosystem. Grizzlies had been extirpated in the 1990s and the North Cascades were seemingly isolated from other viable grizzly populations. Their absence is a giant hole in the wilderness landscape and fauna. The grizzly is a cultural icon for those who wander the backcountry in search of "wildness."

Briefly I will address the issue of conflicts with grizzly bears. Yes, they are scary, yes, they can inflict damage, and yes, they occasionally go rogue. But so do black bears, and so do cougars and wolves. People in Washington seem to accept these other species (wolves are re-establishing themselves and it is unclear to me how the locals feel about that) without a great deal of fear and antipathy. My observation is that people can adapt to wildlife, whether it is deer in your garden, coyotes in your chicken house, or bears in your bird feeders. The Alaska Department of Fish and Game has radio-collared black and grizzly bears in the Anchorage city limits and shown a startling number of bears that mostly go unseen and unnoticed within the city and suburb limits, until a bear gets into garbage (usually a black bear) and must be deterred or moved. Bears are for the most part wary and secretive, they do not seek out people or their residences or their domestic animals. In the 40 years I spent in Fairbanks, I don't recall any fatalities from grizzly bears in Anchorage or Fairbanks; there were several maulings, bears sometimes got into garbage that wasn't contained, and a few bears were shot by people who feared attack. This is amazing for two urban areas comprising 400,000-500,000 people. The numbers of such incidents pale in comparison with the number of people hurt or killed in car accidents, drug overdoses, or violent crime. The threat of grizzly bears is psychological and not supported by the frequency of negative encounters.

The North Cascades Ecosystem as defined in the EIS is larger than the Yellowstone Ecosystem and the Continental Divide Ecosystem, both of which support viable populations of grizzly bears. Habitats among these areas are similar; they are interior regions without substantial salmon or other fish runs, where bears will subsist on vegetation, berries, insects, carrion, occasional young ungulates in spring, and ground squirrels. The same is true for interior grizzly bears in Alaska and Canada. There is more than enough quality habitat to support 200 grizzly bears, and that aspirational population level would not be reached for 60-100 years (based on population growth estimates provided in the EIS). It is highly unlikely that conflicts will arise from the initial population of 25 bears, or the 5-7 bears introduced each year. In fact, we will be hard pressed to observe a bear in the wild for many years after re-introduction.

Establishment of a population of grizzly bears in the North Cascades will increase the resiliency of grizzly bears in North America and thus allow recovery and removal from the Endangered Species List. They will help bolster bears on the north side of the Canadian border (where they could disperse) and will add another population in the western region they once inhabited. This new population will potentially increase genetic diversity and serve as a source of immigration to other areas or source of bears for future transplants. All will help increase the viability of grizzly bears in the Northwest and Canadian border area. Re-introducing bears in small numbers over a small number of years (3-7 years) will allow the seed population to adapt to its new ecosystem and slowly grow with a minimum of human encounters. Bears that don't survive the translocation can be replaced as needed to ensure a seed population of 25 potential breeding bears is achieved. This approach has been successful in other areas, such as the Cabinet Yaak Ecosystem.

The 10(j) designation is critical to the success of the restoration effort in an area where people are not accustomed to grizzlies. It will allow managers and others to move or dispatch bears that have become problems. The ability to manage problem bears should decrease the fear and resistance to the establishment of grizzlies in the North Cascades.

Should this re-introduction not proceed, grizzlies are unlikely to re-inhabit the North Cascades on their own. What is the purpose of the Recovery Plan and the Endangered Species Act if we don't make a serious effort to re-establish this species where it once roamed? Alternative C is a good faith effort to fulfill the intent of the Endangered Species Act and the Recovery Plan.

To summarize:

1. Grizzly bears have a long history in the North Cascades before hunted to extirpation, therefore they were well-adapted to the ecosystem and a key part of the local ecology.
2. The North Cascades ecosystem is large (~10,000 sq. miles) and diverse, larger than the Greater Yellowstone or North Continental Divide ecosystems, therefore it has more than enough habitat for more than 200 bears and would allow sufficient uninhabited areas without human interference. Thus, the plan area would have a high likelihood for successful re-introduction.
3. Grizzly bears are a sentinel species highly valued by indigenous cultures and people who appreciate "true" wilderness.
4. Grizzly bears are a minor threat to humans and domestic animals; people have learned to live peacefully with grizzly bears throughout Alaska, western Canada, and parts of Montana; with a little education, people can do the same in the North Cascades.
5. The plan for re-introduction is incremental and will require 60 to 100 years to reach its population goal; the slow introduction and population growth will allow people to adapt to grizzlies and manage any conflicts that arise.
6. The 10(j) rule, for an experimental or non-essential population, will allow more management options for dealing with problem bears or human bear conflicts; management flexibility is essential to gain public approval and reduce fears of bears.
7. Alternative C has the highest probability to successfully recover grizzly bears in the North Cascades Ecosystem to a self-sustaining population in keeping with the intent of the Endangered Species Act.

Correspondence ID: 14217Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 21:44:41

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm not comfortable with the potential harm to human hikers who might encounter grizzly bears. Instead of introducing grizzly bears, put the funding and efforts into habitat restoration, wildlife corridors across highways and limiting human use of over-used trails. Put more back country rangers out there, and more facilities for human fecal matter. Then, the grizzlies will come back naturally in due time. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Correspondence ID: 14218Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Chelan, WA 98816
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 21:44:48

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello,

I find it interesting first that this initiative which has apparently been proposed a number of times since the late 1990's is being resurrected after being stopped most recently in 2017.

I object to this plan. It as near as I can tell is promoted by people who do NOT live or make their livelihood in the specific or nearby areas.

I find the use of historical population of Grizzly bears as the reason for bringing these bears to the area to be specious at best. Perhaps the presence of other wildlife could be studied with a similar time frame and establish the "seeding" of wolves, coyotes and other animals in the King, Snohomish and Pierce County areas.

In a more, current example I note a recent article in Bloomberg news by David Dudley ddudley23@bloomberg.net pointing out the many issues with both Black and Grizzly bears in Missoula MT a small/medium city not terribly near to Yellowstone National Park but apparently dealing with ongoing problems with bears coming into residential areas because of the ready food source (garbage) when other normal food sources are scarce.

This problem has apparently fallen to the city to solve with "bear proof" trash containers for residential and commercial areas. And other special suggestions on how to handle trash.

I know from a Yellowstone Park Ranger that Grizzly bears are omnivores, whose preferred food is some sort of cone or other vegetation. However, in this same talk it was explained that we could not go on our trail walk and talk by Yellowstone Lake because the wolves had taken a bison down and the grizzlies had picked up the scent and were in the process of 'sharing' the carcass with the wolves. A natural process in Yellowstone and cause for caution by tourists to a wild area,

The human population of the North Cascades has increased a great deal since they were naturally occurring in some quality here.. The bears are able to range over a large area and if they had an interest in the North Cascades, they could have (and may have) migrated to the area. I doubt there is complete information about this. I have no interest in trying to, after the fact, solve problems with grizzlies being added and then moving in search of food to populated areas as well as agricultural and ranching areas now existing in the North Cascades and surrounding areas. I wonder how many populated areas are in a range similar to the Yellowstone Park range from the mountains to Yellowstone Lake mentioned above.. Who will support the trash, livestock or orchard food source protection if they move from where they are 'placed'? Please note the article about communal trash collection and continuing issues developing bear proof trash containers. I doubt the environmental statement has any cost figures about projections on that cost. NOTE: there is a recommendation for Missoula, MT to use a system in force by Canmore, Alberta made by Chris Servheen a retired Fish and Wildlife Service biologist who supported restoring the bears to the lower 48.

So I'm sure the visitors to Okanogan, Winthrop, Chelan, Manson, Brewster and smaller communities further up in the North Cascades will be uninterested in trying to implement special trash collection for small populations spread over large areas. NOT to mention educating visitors to the area who continue to engage in activities that cause fatalities in the normal on water and hiking activities.

This is a bad idea. I'm sure it appeals to those who will not live with the consequences. I assure you it holds NO appeal to one of those who will have to live with the consequences. I may be reached by phone at [REDACTED] Thank you for your consideration.

Correspondence ID: 14219Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 21:45:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I live in Wenatchee, WA. I fully support reintroduction of grizzlies to the NCE. I have lived and worked as an outdoor backcountry professional in grizzly and brown bear country in Montana and Alaska for most of my adult life. I know from personal experience that humans and grizzlies can co-exist and share the same space. I do not, however, support the 10j designation. I support grizzlies being reintroduced with the full protection of the endangered species act. The proposed number and placement of reintroduced grizzlies is in such a low number over many years in a large landscape that the adaptive management approach in the preferred alternative using the 10j designation is entirely unnecessary. 10j provides a more politically palatable approach to reintroduction but is unnecessary for operational success of reintroduction and establishment of a viable reproducing population. Thank you for your hard work.

Correspondence ID: 14220Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spokane, WA 99205
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 21:46:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We don't need another predator problem in our state.

Correspondence ID: 14221Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 21:47:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing this comment as an opposition to reintroducing grizzly bears to the North Cascades. My reasoning is explained in the following:

I have grown up exploring the North Cascades, I am a hiker, mountaineer, skier, trail runner, fisherman and lover of nature and I strongly believe in conservation, but reintroducing a predatory species that have been unseen for some time can have unpredictable negative effects. There will be more competition for resources with the established native species that still exist in the areas, and it is difficult to predict if grizzlies or black bears will be pushed closer to areas populated by humans to look for resources. I think our time and various resources could be best put to use to conserve our current species in the area. They should also be put use in order to keep access to our beautiful parks maintained so we can all enjoy and experience our lands as responsible stewards. There are a lot of trails, bridges and roads that are in desperate need of our attention in the North Cascades, and could greatly benefit from these resources that would be put towards grizzly reintroduction. In order to maintain this area as it continues to be become more popular these resources will be essential.

Another point of importance is safety. I have spent many years in Alaska and have seen first hand how aggressive the grizzly bear species can be. Reintroducing a predatory species in our north cascades will likely lead to dangerous encounters with hikers and those exploring our parks. Keep in mind the recent attack in Banff national park. While a lot of outdoor enthusiasts may know how to encounter a bear in the wild, there are many visitors and less experienced people that may not be able to correctly read the body language of a bear and/or know how to act in a potentially dangerous situation. All of us who have spent time in the North Cascades can probably understand how quickly the wind could render bear spray completely useless when the situation may call for such means.

I understand wanting to restore a species, but we should place our energy and resources on our current local restorations rather than uprooting these animals from their current home and reintroducing a species that has been absent for many years. Thank you for taking the time to hear our opinions on the matter and allowing us to give input.

Correspondence ID: 14222Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 21:50:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Environmental Justice

The scope of the DEIS evaluation of environmental justice is deficient. The valleys of the Nooksack and Upper Skagit rivers, and associated tributaries, all within the NCE, has significant human habitation and construction, and extensive human recreational visitation. However analysis of these areas in the DEIS appears superficial and deficient; for example, human population within the County of Whatcom is not even considered.

As Long as Sex is More Popular than Death there will be increasing human population, and these folks will need place to live, work, and play. Human presence in and adjacent to the entire area of NCE habitat (both east and west side of the North Cascades) will only increase in the future, driving a corresponding increase in conflict with any introduced grizzly population. Many of these residents historically relied on resource extraction (lumber, mining) or resource exploitation (hydroelectric infrastructure construction and operation, livestock, renewable timber harvest practice). However, these economic activities have significantly decreased over time while the population has increased by orders of magnitude, leading to economically challenges for the resident human populations. This has created social challenges of poverty with some residents living a marginal existence. Many of these communities are attempting to meet economic challenges by increasing economic vitality through creating/improving opportunity for recreational opportunities. However, the introduction of grizzly to the NCE would adversely impact these efforts due to closure of access (the automatic first response by government entities to conflict), restraints imposed to human activities to 'protect grizzly health and reproduction', and reduction of tourist visitation due to fear.

Principles of environmental justice applied to this proposed action reveal an unequal protection from environmental and

health hazards due to the proposed action. Direct conflict with grizzly is without question an environmental / health risk issue. The social challenges of poverty are often linked with increases in other health challenges. The proposed action imposes both of these situations on the populations noted above creating a disproportionate burden on an economically challenged population.

Correspondence ID: 14223Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Woodinville, WA 98077
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 21:50:56

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think the reintroduction of Grizzly bears into the North Cascades is dangerous and untimely. The bears can veer miles from where they will be introduced, and because their range, those bears will be alarmingly close to humans. Just this summer, there have been three reports of Grizzlies attacking and in some cases, killing hikers in the Pacific Northwest. There is no indication that the bears will not also be in danger by threatened and frightened humans. It is not hard to envision residents taking their own safety and dangers (whether real or imagined) into their own hands and destroying bears despite any laws or protections in place. Fear will always overpower laws that appear to threaten humans.

This is a bad idea, and it is one that will result in death on all sides of the equation.

Please DO NOT proceed with the plan to reintroduce the grizzlies to the Pacific Northwest.

██████████

Correspondence ID: 14224Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Blaine, WA 98230
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 21:51:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The greater the biodiversity, the better for our park lands. Please reintroduce the grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 14225Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kenmore, WA 98028
United States of America

Outside Organization: none Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 21:52:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We must remember that we are the stewards of our wildlife - we need to take good care of them and guard their welfare.

Correspondence ID: 14226Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98109
United States of America

Outside Organization: Sierra Club Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 21:52:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To whom it may concern,

I am writing to support the restoration of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem, their historic range for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C but with needed changes to the proposed 10(j) rule. The proposal would bring up to 25 non-conflict grizzly bears - likely from Montana - into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade and manage them as an experimental population.

The proposed 10(j) rule as currently written fails to give grizzlies the best chance to succeed and is too permissible in allowing reintroduced bears to be killed.

Lethal removal of a grizzly bear should only be considered where there is a demonstrable threat to human safety, and, for non-immediate threats to human safety, only after non-lethal management options, including concerted use of conflict prevention methods, have been exhausted.

No grizzly bears should be hazed or relocated as a result of conflict with livestock unless demonstrable, repeated efforts have been made by the livestock producer to prevent such conflicts, using commonly-available techniques.

No grizzly bears should be killed on public lands as a result of livestock depredation.

Landowners/private citizens should not be given a permit, or otherwise authorized, to kill a grizzly bear.

No grizzly bear should be preemptively relocated if the bear is not a threat to human safety, particularly if the bear has not become habituated or food-conditioned, or when nonnatural foods/attractants have not been properly secured and made inaccessible to bears. Doing so acts as a disincentive for communities to employ conflict prevention measures, and increases the risk to the bear of injury or death from capture and relocation.

These changes are crucial in providing adequate protection for grizzly bears.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C and with appropriate changes to Section 10(j). Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Correspondence ID: 14227Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 21:53:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: In proposing the reintroduction of Grizzly into the NCE through application of ESA Section 10(j), the government specifically recognizes this is a non-essential, experimental population, as specifically declared by the 10(j) language.

However, the proposed habitat includes areas of significant human intrusion (orders of magnitude increases in human population, visitation, and construction since historic presence of any grizzly population has been recorded). Human recreation, habitation, and construction have irreversibly altered the nature of the proposed habitat in a manner non-supportive of the proposed species and greater impact will occur into the future resulting in conflict between the grizzly and humans, ultimately there will occur fatal consequences for both species. With these considerations, it is clear the proposed habitat has been unsuitably and irreversibly altered or destroyed by human presence and actions and is therefore not conducive to a successful (and safe) reintroduction of a grizzly population. With an ESA listing, 10(j) proposal does not offer adequate tools to manage the grizzly and prevent conflict with humans. Also, the 10(j) proposed action does not offer adequate protections to humans who may experience conflict with a grizzly. Under these restrictions, the only path available to ensure no loss of grizzly is to not introduce them into an area of likely conflict. This is a non-essential experiment with fatal consequences for grizzly and human.

Correspondence ID: 14228Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Usk, WA 99180
United States of America

Outside Organization: Northeast Washington Wildlife Group Non-Governmental

Received: Nov,13 2023 21:55:10

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: With the current mismanagement of predators in the state of Washington, I strongly disagree with reintroducing the grizzly bear back into the North Cascade ecosystems.

Correspondence ID: 14229Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bremerton, WA 98311
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 21:55:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This proposal seems to be relying on the assurances of supposed experts' assurances that there are zero safety concerns in introducing this apex predator to this area. I, and many residents of the proposed area all disagree. Rather than introducing seven bears annually, a better proposal would be to allow grizzly bears to naturally find their way into the North Cascades from both Canada and Idaho (via eastern Washington, where they have naturally migrated into). In summary, no to this reintroduction proposal.

Correspondence ID: 14230Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98109
United States of America

Outside Organization: Sierra Club Conservation/Preservation

Received: Nov,13 2023 21:55:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To whom it may concern,

I am writing to support the restoration of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem, their historic range for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C but with needed changes to the proposed 10(j) rule. The proposal would bring up to 25 non-conflict grizzly bears - likely from Montana - into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade and manage them as an experimental population.

The proposed 10(j) rule as currently written fails to give grizzlies the best chance to succeed and is too permissible in allowing reintroduced bears to be killed.

Lethal removal of a grizzly bear should only be considered where there is a demonstrable threat to human safety, and, for non-immediate threats to human safety, only after non-lethal management options, including concerted use of conflict prevention methods, have been exhausted.

No grizzly bears should be hazed or relocated as a result of conflict with livestock unless demonstrable, repeated efforts have been made by the livestock producer to prevent such conflicts, using commonly-available techniques.

No grizzly bears should be killed on public lands as a result of livestock depredation.

Landowners/private citizens should not be given a permit, or otherwise authorized, to kill a grizzly bear.

No grizzly bear should be preemptively relocated if the bear is not a threat to human safety, particularly if the bear has not become habituated or food-conditioned, or when nonnatural foods/attractants have not been properly secured and made inaccessible to bears. Doing so acts as a disincentive for communities to employ conflict prevention measures, and increases the risk to the bear of injury or death from capture and relocation.

These changes are crucial in providing adequate protection for grizzly bears.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C and with appropriate changes to Section 10(j). Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Correspondence ID: 14231Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Olympia, WA 98501
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 21:56:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Do not reintroduce Grizzlies in this area, they do not benefit anyone or anything

Correspondence ID: 14232Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Lynnwood, WA 98036
United States of America
Outside Organization: n/a Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 21:58:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To whom it may concern,

I am writing to support the restoration of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem, their historic range for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C but with needed changes to the proposed 10(j) rule. The proposal would bring up to 25 non-conflict grizzly bears - likely from Montana - into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade and manage them as an experimental population.

The proposed 10(j) rule as currently written fails to give grizzlies the best chance to succeed and is too permissible in allowing reintroduced bears to be killed.

1. Lethal removal of a grizzly bear should only be considered where there is a demonstrable threat to human safety, and, for non-immediate threats to human safety, only after non-lethal management options, including concerted use of conflict prevention methods, have been exhausted.
2. No grizzly bears should be hazed or relocated as a result of conflict with livestock unless demonstrable, repeated efforts have been made by the livestock producer to prevent such conflicts, using commonly-available techniques.
3. No grizzly bears should be killed on public lands as a result of livestock depredation.
Landowners/private citizens should not be given a permit, or otherwise authorized, to kill a grizzly bear.
4. No grizzly bear should be preemptively relocated if the bear is not a threat to human safety, particularly if the bear has not become habituated or food-conditioned, or when non-natural foods/attractants have not been properly secured and made inaccessible to bears. Doing so acts as a disincentive for communities to employ conflict prevention measures, and increases the risk to the bear of injury or death from capture and relocation.

These changes are crucial in providing adequate protection for grizzly bears.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C and with appropriate changes to Section 10(j). Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Correspondence ID: 14233Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 21:58:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello -

I'm writing to support grizzly bear recovery plans for the North Cascades, one of a few remaining places in this world that's big and wild enough for grizzly bears. And big and wild enough for grizzly bears and people to co-exist.

I support Alternative C, and appreciate the 10j rule proposal. Please reclassify the Okanogan Range/Loomis Forest as Zone 1. Grizzly were documented at Snowshoe Mountain, Chopaka, and Long Draw well through the 1960s, where ample grasses, roots, and white-bark pine occur. The area is well connected with the North Cascades and should managed for population recovery.

I also ask that you manage lethal take, rather than delegate lethal take to others, when all other deterrence and relocation options have been exhausted.

I also support providing financial aid or otherwise outfitting lower income communities with bear proof garbage cans and dumpsters, hotwire fencing and other measures to prevent conflicts. If that's a cost, it should be assessed in the EIS.

Thanks for the public hearings recently. I believe it would have been more productive if you'd offered some information, introduced the topic, explained 10j, etc. before opening up the floor for comments.

Sincerely,

Correspondence ID: 14235Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Marblemount, WA 98267

United States of America

Outside Organization: N/A Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 21:59:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello, I live less than a mile from our local salmon hatchery and have personally already encountered black and brown bears where I live. Grizzlies have been a protected species in the region for over thirty years and exist in bordering states. The grizzlies are not here because the ecosystem does not have enough draw to support their migration.

In comparison to our border states, the state of WA has a population of over 7 million people - triple that of what most states with active grizzly populations have, there is no doubt in my mind that there will be a higher human impact here than occurs in states already experiencing grizzly attacks, like MT, AK and WY. When I first read this was being proposed, sincerely and truly, it felt like my federal government was actively trying to put my life and the lives of everyone who resides or vacations here in harms way.

Upon learning that the state of WA has already passed legislation prohibiting the transplant of grizzlies to the state, it seems like malicious government overreach.

I now find myself wondering why 1970s legislation protecting a species that has basically been removed from the endangered species list is taking a higher priority to federal tax dollars than any human living does. The federal government is in the wrong in this scenario and all that will come of this incredibly expensive plan is death and destruction. The people of WA have already voted on the issue and that ought to be the end of it. Moving forward will lead to dead humans which will lead to dead bears too.

Sunken cost fallacy will dictate that you've 'come too far to stop now';. Will that be what you tell the parents of the first killed in a grizzly attack?

Correspondence ID: 14236Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Usk, WA 99180

United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 22:00:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please, no more predators dropped off in our back door.

Correspondence ID: 14237Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Riverside, WA 98849
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 22:00:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Do not introduce Grizzly bears in the North Cascades. We have to many predators now. Thank you,
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 14238Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 22:01:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To whom it may concern,

I am writing to support the restoration of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem, their historic range for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C but with needed changes to the proposed 10(j) rule. The proposal would bring up to 25 non-conflict grizzly bears - likely from Montana - into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade and manage them as an experimental population.

The proposed 10(j) rule as currently written fails to give grizzlies the best chance to succeed and is too permissible in allowing reintroduced bears to be killed.

Lethal removal of a grizzly bear should only be considered where there is a demonstrable threat to human safety, and, for non-immediate threats to human safety, only after non-lethal management options, including concerted use of conflict prevention methods, have been exhausted.

No grizzly bears should be hazed or relocated as a result of conflict with livestock unless demonstrable, repeated efforts have been made by the livestock producer to prevent such conflicts, using commonly-available techniques.

No grizzly bears should be killed on public lands as a result of livestock depredation.

Landowners/private citizens should not be given a permit, or otherwise authorized, to kill a grizzly bear.

No grizzly bear should be preemptively relocated if the bear is not a threat to human safety, particularly if the bear has not become habituated or food-conditioned, or when nonnatural foods/attractants have not been properly secured and made inaccessible to bears. Doing so acts as a disincentive for communities to employ conflict prevention measures, and increases the risk to the bear of injury or death from capture and relocation.

These changes are crucial in providing adequate protection for grizzly bears.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C and with appropriate changes to Section 10(j). Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Sincerely,
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 14239Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98106
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 22:02:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to STRONGLY support the restoration of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem--brong them back!! A healthy ecosystem requires them.

I support Alternative C but with needed changes to the proposed 10(j) rule. The proposal would bring up to 25 non-conflict grizzly bears - likely from Montana - into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade and manage them as an experimental population.

The proposed 10(j) rule as currently written fails to give grizzlies the best chance to succeed and is too permissible in allowing reintroduced bears to be killed. THE below changes must be made--

--Lethal removal of a grizzly bear should only be considered where there is a demonstrable threat to human safety, and, for non-immediate threats to human safety, only after non-lethal management options, including concerted use of conflict prevention methods, have been exhausted.

--No grizzly bears should be hazed or relocated as a result of conflict with livestock unless demonstrable, repeated efforts have been made by the livestock producer to prevent such conflicts, using commonly-available techniques.

--No grizzly bears should be killed on public lands as a result of livestock depredation.

--Landowners/private citizens should not be given a permit, or otherwise authorized, to kill a grizzly bear.

--No grizzly bear should be preemptively relocated if the bear is not a threat to human safety, particularly if the bear has not become habituated or food-conditioned, or when nonnatural foods/attractants have not been properly secured and made inaccessible to bears. Doing so acts as a disincentive for communities to employ conflict prevention measures, and increases the risk to the bear of injury or death from capture and relocation.

These changes are crucial in providing adequate protection for grizzly bears.

I'm an avid hiker, and have deeply appreciated my hikes in grizzly habitat. I was fortunate enuf to see 2 grizzlies when hiking in AK. Top predators rule!!

thank you

Correspondence ID: 14240Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Port Angeles, WA 98362
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 22:02:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I wish to see alternative A , the no action option selected. With Washington's population approaching 8 million and millions of Canadians living within 50 miles of the North Cascades there are too many people recreating in the Cascades to expand the population of a species that has proven for two centuries to be incompatible with human habitation.

Correspondence ID: 14241Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bothell, WA 98011
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 22:02:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I feel this measure, while it does have benefits, poses too great a hazard to back-country hikers and climbers. Despite the risk being low that one would encounter a grizzly bear, it still remains a much lower risk if we do not re-introduce grizzly bears to the North Cascades. I appreciate the opportunity to submit a comment for consideration.

Correspondence ID: 14242Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Port Angeles, WA 98362
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 22:02:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I would like to see Alternative A , the no-action alternative adopted.

I am opposed to restoration of the grizzly bear into the NCE unless it is through a naturally occurring process.

Correspondence ID: 14244Project:112008Document:132104
Address: North Bend, WA 98045
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 22:06:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I strongly urge the National Park Service to choose Alternate A: No Action.
"Because they once thrived" is not an acceptable reason to reintroduce an apex predator into our communities putting ourselves and loved ones at risk. With fetal Grizzly Bear attacks on the rise (11 since 2020), reintroducing these bears is costly both financially and emotionally. Even if the risk of a fetal attack is low; it is still there. The only way to keep 0 deaths in WA by Grizzly Bears is to take no action.
The financial cost of relocating bears, the risk to those bears safety, and the negative effects on our ecosystems (both the original bear location and relocation), is far greater than any possible positive outcome. The notion to reintroduce this species is irresponsible and unnecessary.
If Grizzly Bears are reintroduced, it will only add stress to our outdoor recreational activities and livestock businesses. But worst of all, it will only be a matter of time until one of our loved ones are killed by these dangerous creatures.

Correspondence ID: 14245Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Cusick, WA 99119
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 22:06:47
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do not introduce more grizzly bears into Pend Oreille county.

Correspondence ID: 14246Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Darrington, WA 98241
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 22:08:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hello, my name is Austin Westwong. I was born and raised here in the Stillaguamish Valley, and am currently residing at the foot hills of the North Cascades.
I wanted to give my opinion on this matter with really well thought out detail, but like a lot of people I am a husband, father of two young kids, and a full time working/full time contributor to our society, and just could not get the time to really prepare something with full attention.

All of that being said here is my comment.

I fully support Alternative A: No action.

I am a outdoorsman, and spend a lot of time enjoying our beautiful ecosystem with my family year round. If these bears are released in this area it will directly affect me and my family.

I was at the Darrington public meeting, where the NPS rep Striker made a statement that "this is an emotional subject and people have emotional comments." I agree with this 100%, and there were a lot of emotional for as well as opposed comments that night. I also heard some logical, and science based comments, but these comments were only from folks opposed to the idea.

Emotionally I would love to see the wild places of our Cascade Range remain wild, with all animals thriving (including the Grizzly.) But to manage an ecosystem, and wildlife in all, one cannot let emotion persuade their decision making. Without any emotional involvement this reintroduction makes no sense to me.

"Restore where they once lived, Contribute to the ecosystem, Enhance long term survival of Grizzly's, and get them off the federal list of endangerment."

-These are the "Needs" for reintroduction. Without emotional involvement I cannot help but think; lots of things have changed since grizzly bears and other creatures of the past roamed here. Trying to bring something back because it was the natural way of life into a completely unnaturally changed setting just doesn't add up.

-What benefits do these large brown bears bring to the ecosystem that there thriving, surviving, and majestic little cousin the black bear doesn't already? Black bears are found at the bottom of the valleys and at the top of the cascades. Would bringing 200 large bears benefit the ecosystem more than the 1,500 plus smaller bears already here? Once again this doesn't add up.

Long term survival of Grizzly's as a whole seems to be looking up. Neighboring states in the lower 48 are seeing more and more. This species is not in decline outside of the North Cascades. Especially North of the Border. I have read that these animals are doing so well in Yellowstone area's that they have already been taken off endangered entitlement before.

The local tribe members said it themselves, its pains me to say it because these bears are a part of our native way of life and natural wild world. But we do not have the land, and food for these bears to survive alongside man.

I provide my family of four with only wild game meat sourced from these hills. Just as all mankind has done. I can tell you from personal physical involvement, we don't need another predator in this area. Times have changed, and man has changed the natural setting.

These are my personal thoughts without emotion. I am no biologist, or wildlife manager. I am a blue collar citizen who shares his life and respect with the natural world. I work a full time job, and cannot dedicate my time to what is happening in our ecosystem. You and all the folks in the WDFW can. Make the right logical choice and strive to do better. Please.

Thank you for taking a nobody's comment into consideration.

With respect.

██████████

Correspondence ID: 14247Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Manson, WA 98831
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 22:10:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I would like to express my objections to the entire process being used to reopen the program introducing Grizzly Bears to the North Cascades. My objections are:

The comment period is much too short to outline the errors in the Plan in depth. These objections have been outlined before but evidently have been ignored. New data for instance show a Grizzly Bear range to be much greater than previously thought. This information shows many towns and communities to be at risk

Grizzly Bears are naturally found in Canada, just north of the border, and have no boundaries that have prevented their natural movement into the North Cascades. Any action should take into consideration that natural process should always prevail.

Grizzly Bears are magnificent creatures but are also an apex predator that has no fear of humans.

Anyone that has ever lived with Grizzlies has a justifiable fear of what they are capable of doing to anyone that inadvertently is in the wrong place at the wrong time.

The only reasonable conclusion in this case is to EXTEND the comment period

The only reasonable option is

NO ACTION

Correspondence ID: 14248Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Edmonds, WA 98020
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 22:12:50

Correspondence Type:Web Form

Correspondence: I do not want the grizzly bears introduced.

Correspondence ID: 14249Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Edmonds, WA 98020
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 22:13:44

Correspondence Type:Web Form

Correspondence: I do not want the grizzly bears introduced.

Correspondence ID: 14250Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98105
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 22:14:24

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The few grizzlies in the North Cascades are VERY good at avoiding people and creating problems with people. I'm not aware of another population of such people-avoiding grizzlies. I worry that bringing in new grizzlies from elsewhere will create problems for the new bears that they are not adapted for. I am in favor of protecting the current bear population and allowing it to increase. I do not think that new bears should be introduced to the area. IF new bears are introduced, then Alternative C should be used to manage them and the people around them.

Correspondence ID: 14251Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tracyton, WA 98393
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 22:15:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think we should restore our natural eco system to what it was before we distributed it. People and bears can coexist in the same state.

Correspondence ID: 14252Project:112008Document:132104

Address: edmonds, WA 98020
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 22:16:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do not want grizzly bears to be reintroduced

Correspondence ID: 14253Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98105
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 22:17:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: NO to bringing grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem in Washington.

Correspondence ID: 14254Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98103-3669
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 22:19:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: How is this even a question? Grizzly bears belong in the North Cascades because they were there long before humans began invading their territories. We must begin to undo the colonization that forced these bears out of their homes.

You must be the guest if you live in or visit bear territory. Removing any apex predator disturbs the natural balance in ways we can't even begin to understand.

I have been with bears in the wild - grizzlies in Alaska, brown/black bears in the North Cascades and on Mt. Rainier, and polar bears off the Labrador coast. I visited their domain. I obeyed common sense bear etiquette and had zero issues.

Please help restore the natural order by reintroducing animals to their original habitats!

Sincerely, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 14255Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98102
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 22:19:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am strongly in support of the proposed regulations. This proposal has been discussed for over 20 years; it is time to bring it to...bear! (Pun intended.) Restoring this apex predator to the ecosystem will be good for the North Cascades, good for tourism, and good for Washington State's ecology. As an avid backpacker and NCNP user, I urge the NPS to bring this proposal forward.

Correspondence ID: 14256Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Stehekin, WA 98852
United States of America
Outside Organization: STEHEKIN Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 22:20:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: If the NPS & USFW hopes to receive informed, thoughtful, and substantive comments from the general public, an extension to the comment period is necessary. Six weeks is not enough time to read the EIS and associated studies and research papers and compose cogent comments for submission. Submitting substantive input requires time.

Citizens responding to this DRAFT EIS are responding to a plan that has been over a decade in the making and requires significant time.

At the present time, I cannot substantively comment on the Draft EIS; therefore, I would support "No Action" until an extension for comment is granted.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Hopefully, more time will be granted to study and respond to the Draft EIS.

Correspondence ID: 14257Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Pasco, WA 99301
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 22:20:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We do not need more grizzlies reintroduced in Washington state. We do not have enough public back country land to support them. Let alone the wolves you folks have already dropped at our door. But I know there is a larger agenda at stake here and our opinions will not matter. But hard to complain when I won't do my civic duty. So consider it done. And continue on with the one world agenda to destroy America. You take our guns as planned cause you will say we won't need them anymore since there will be no game left to hunt. Because you have done a bang up job convincing the masses we only need them to hunt. So kill our food source. Take our guns. And keep us dependent on the government and Bill Gates fake meat. Go ahead and laugh it off but your know it's true. And if you don't. Then do your job to project Americans and their rights. Thanks

Correspondence ID: 14258Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 22:20:52

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The DEIS does not address complementary activities from the proposed action - reintroduction of other species absent from the NCE due to human depredation. These activities, not included in DEIS analysis, present cultural, ecosystem, and risk management considerations.

The proposed action to introduce the apex predator grizzly is only one part of the process of reintroduction of species that have been eliminated from the NCE habitat due in part to past human hunting practices. Current agrarian human populations are culturally deprived to not have the experience of an orchard being ravaged by a meandering Mastodon or a wheat field being consumed by a Columbian Mammoth; similarly, backcountry travelers miss being serenaded to sleep by the night-time howl of a dire wolf. Reintroduction of these species, and others such as the Sabre-tooth cat (Smilodon), are within near-term human technical capability due to advances in DNA recovery, genetic engineering, and through surrogacy by biological compatible current species. Their reintroduction would drive an enhanced ecosystem balance not seen in recent memory. The grizzly, a competing apex predator, would likely be kept in check by some of these other predators; and the mastodon, a herbivore foraging on undergrowth and small trees in the NCE would create decreased fuel loading and subsequent reduction in wildfire risk. The creation of a laboratory specific to this restoration effort would bring economic benefit to challenged local economies adjacent to the habitat, and a public viewing location would drive increased ecotourism (Quaternary Park). It is obvious that any grizzly reintroduction into the NCE would be the first step in restoration of these and other megafauna to the NCE, addressing past elimination from the ecosystem due in part to human hunting.

Correspondence ID: 14259Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bremerton, WA 98311
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 22:21:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: It's time for compassion for all animals including the Grizzlies. Bring them back home and allow them to live out their life where they belong. Please open your hearts and minds and do the right thing for these majestic creatures. Thank you for your consideration and positive decisions.

Correspondence ID: 14260Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Tracyton, WA 98311
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 22:22:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Bears are an important part of our eco system. They can be predators, scavengers, and seed dispersers.

Correspondence ID: 14261Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Newport, WA 99156
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 22:23:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: No I do not agree with relocating your problem bears especially into an area that has been devastated by other predators and disease.

Correspondence ID: 14262Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 22:26:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I was born in Washington, am public educator, and support a scientific, community-engaged process for restoring grizzlies to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 14263Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 22:28:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I'm a high school student in Seattle and I support the restoration of grizzly bears to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 14264Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 22:28:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzly bears deserve to live in peace.

Correspondence ID: 14265Project:112008Document:132104

Address: EVERETT, WA 98201
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 22:29:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please, please do not follow through with Alternatives B or C. I can't even begin to fathom the damage this could do were 200 grizzlies to be introduced into the NCE. This beautiful area provides so much joy, wonder and awe to countless people. I have a hard time believing that there is only "potential" for negative human-grizzly bear interactions. There will undoubtedly be deaths, both bear and human, if this goes through. You state it's estimated that 2% of the grizzly bear population in the NCE would be lost to human-caused mortality each year. How many humans lives will be lost? More and more people recreate on the backcountry, and despite numbers of bear-caused injury in the last 42 years being low, we have all seen the explosive growth of hiking in the parks. So injuries and deaths will also increase.

In this 303 page document, it is stated that restoration of grizzly bears to the NCE could increase visitation and recreational use of the park and national forests as visitors seek to experience grizzly bears in their native habitat. This would absolutely NOT be the case. I know so many people who will absolutely not be taking the chances of running into grizzlies, and this will reduce the number of people who visit the NCE. I also have an extremely hard time believing that introduction of grizzlies would not involve any disturbance of fish habitat, OR change populations of other animals listed when it's specifically stated that a reason to introduce the bears is for prey control.

In addition, further human lives will be put at risk because despite allowing lethal take in limited circumstances, there are many areas where it is illegal in parks to discharge a firearm. So you face litigation or death/ injury. I do not like guns, and have never wanted to own one yet it seems that would be the only defense I would have if I want to continue to hike and backpack in these areas.

On a personal note, as a single female, I already take an increased risk hiking alone. I have to be mindful of cougars/ cats, black bears, and human men, all while trying to be at peace in nature. Now to add another predator?

I strongly urge whoever is considering these options to NOT pursue alternative B or C. I do not believe that the (potential) benefits listed outweighs the danger to human and bear life, the financial cost, or the ecological changes that will occur.

Correspondence ID: 14266Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Olympia, WA 98501
United States of America
Outside Organization: American Forest Resource Council Non-Governmental(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,13 2023 22:29:49
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: November 13, 2023

Public Comments Processing
Attn: FWS-R1-ES-2023-0074
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
MS: PRB/3W
5275 Leesburg Pike
Falls Church, VA 22041-3803

Don Striker, Superintendent
North Cascades National Park Service Complex
810 State Route 20
Sedro Wooley, WA 98284

Re: Public Comment on 50 CFR Part 1, Docket No. FWS-R1-ES-2023-0074, Establishment of a Nonessential Experimental Population of Grizzly Bear in the North Cascades Ecosystem, Washington State, and Draft North Cascades Grizzly Bear

Restoration Plan / Environmental Impact Statement

Dear U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service/National Park Service:

The American Forest Resource Council (AFRC) submits the following comments regarding the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) proposal to establish a nonessential experimental population (NEP) of the grizzly bear within the U.S. portion of the North Cascade Ecosystem (NCE) in the State of Washington under section 10(j) of the Endangered Species Act (ESA). Additionally, these comments are submitted on the National Park Service (NPS) Draft North Cascades Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/Environmental Impact Statement ("Draft Grizzly Restoration Plan").

AFRC represents over 50 forest product businesses and forest landowners throughout Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, California, and Nevada. . AFRC's mission is to advocate for sustained yield timber harvests on public timberlands throughout the West to enhance forest health and resistance to fire, insects, and disease. We do this by promoting active management to attain productive public forests, protect adjoining private forests, and assure community stability. We work to improve federal and state laws, regulations, policies, and decisions regarding access to and management of public forest lands and the productivity of all managed forest lands. Many of our members have their operations in communities adjacent to the Mount Baker Snoqualmie (MBS), Gifford Pinchot (GPNF), Okanogan-Wenatchee (OkWen), and Colville (CNF) National Forests. The management of these lands ultimately dictates not only the viability of their businesses but also the economic health of the communities themselves.

Our members also rely on the many forestland owners in Washington state who actively and sustainably manage their lands. This includes the trust lands managed by the Department of Natural Resources, which benefit defined beneficiaries, including schools, fire/EMS services, libraries, and county services.

The forest products sector in Washington State continues to provide around 40,000 direct and 100,000 indirect jobs. Many of these jobs are found in rural communities near these National Forests and surrounding areas. In addition to the wages paid, the taxes and other monetary transactions generated by these businesses and family-wage jobs, contribute to the infrastructure and well-being of the local communities.

The lack of supply of raw materials to fill manufacturing demands for wood products continues to be an issue in Washington. There has been a desire by several communities, including Chelan County, to recruit new wood products manufacturing infrastructure to their communities. These projects and the existing infrastructure can only succeed with a stable and reliable timber supply. The economic activity created through these treatments contributes to the greater community's well-being. Further reductions in manageable acres and associated reductions in volume harvested will put the entire sector at risk.

Additionally, AFRC and our members have invested significant time and resources into the effort to increase the pace and scale of forest health treatments on these National Forests. The State of Washington has also invested millions of taxpayer dollars into assisting the US Forest Service in addressing its forest health crisis. Additional regulations, such as any related to the potential grizzly reintroduction in the North Cascades Ecosystem, could slow this critical forest health work, putting not only human lives at risk but also much of the work to enhance habitat for other endangered species, such as the Northern Spotted Owl (NSO). We have already seen grizzly bear-related regulations slowing the needed forest management work to address the risk of catastrophic wildfire in Region 1 of the US Forest Service.

AFRC's primary concerns are related to any impacts the reintroduction of grizzlies would have on the ability of non-federal landowners, especially the Department Natural Resources trust lands program, to conduct otherwise legally allowed forest management on their lands. We are also very concerned this effort could negatively impact land management activities on US Forest Service-managed lands.

Mortality from insect and disease infestations along with catastrophic wildfires has negatively impacted the habitat on federal lands of other listed species that require last successional characteristics. Any re-introduction plan should consider the trade-offs between the need for active forest management to prevent the further loss of habitat for species such as the NSO with the need for grizzly bear habitat.

Appendix B of the Draft EIS includes references to existing land use plans for US Forest Service managed lands. The following is the standard in the OkWen and MBS current LRMPs:

No net loss of existing core area within any Bear Management Unit (BMU), with core area defined as area >0.3 miles from any open motorized access route or high-use nonmotorized access route.

The EIS goes on to conclude that "Based on agency review of the local land use plans, the restoration of grizzly bears to federal lands within the NCE grizzly bear recovery zone is unlikely to result in substantial conflicts with objectives identified in local land use plans."

As mentioned above we have seen the US Forest Service in Montana experience difficulties with LRMP implementation due to grizzly bears. This has included impacts from illegal road use outside the control of the agency. As part of its vegetation management environmental analysis, the Forest Service has analyzed any potential impacts to grizzlies from roads and provided mitigation efforts such as seasonal road closures. However, we have seen implementation challenges to work due to the illegal use of roads by the public during these closures. We would like to see assurances that vegetation management projects, especially for forest health and wildfire risk reduction are not adversely impacted due to illegal use of Forest Service lands by the public.

While AFRC is not declaring a position on the reintroduction of grizzlies to the NCE, we do support the selection of Alternative C within the EIS. Designating the population as a NEP of the grizzly bear under section 10(j) of the ESA would appear that if re-introduction proceeds this would provide the greatest assurances possible to non-federal landowners as well as the implementation of forest health work on US Forest Service lands. We believe that Alternative C provides the ability to continue to conduct otherwise legally allowed activities on these lands.

We encourage the USFWS and NPS to make the following clarifications prior to adoption of an alternative:

- Road use permits granted by the U.S. Forest Service to nonfederal entities where the road in question is not located on National Forests should not need ESA Section 7(a)(2) consultation. At present the exemption appears to apply only to National Forest Lands.
- Consideration for road maintenance agreements and easements granted to non-federal entities should also be considered for exclusion from ESA Section 7(a)(2) consultation.
- Any nonfederal lands within the proposed boundary of Management Zone 1 and Management Zone 2 should be explicitly identified as Management Zone 3 by definition. Relying on the Figure 1 map may lead to errors and interpretation differences.
- Forest managers, loggers, and others conducting otherwise lawful forest management activities should be included in the list of those authorized to conduct non-lethal deterrence activities.
- Permissible incidental take on nonfederal lands should include any habitat modification resulting from otherwise lawful forest management activities consistent with the Forest Practices Act and Rules and/or pursuant to an approved Habitat Conservation Plan, Enhancement of Survival Permit, or similar federal authorization.
- The nonlethal incidental take reporting requirements due to habitat modification resulting from otherwise lawful activities are impractical and should be exempted from reporting

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposal. Should you have any questions regarding the above comments or would like additional information, please contact me at 360-352-3910 or mcomisky@amforest.org.

Sincerely,


Washington State Manager
American Forest Resource Council

Correspondence ID: 14268Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Everett, WA 98201
United States of America

Outside Organization: Self and friends Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 22:30:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: General Norman 'Storman' Swartzkopf, combat warrior and Ursus Arctos recovery promoter, favored a robust recovery plan. That is my choice also. As a combat veteran, I too, want the most biologically robust recovery plan in this EIS.

After all, I fought to protect and defend my country. The Great Bear is included in that sacrifice. Biology, not politics.

The mission is that clear!

Thank You!

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Ecological Foundations of Biodiversity

Correspondence ID: 14269Project:112008Document:132104
Address: El Cajon, CA 92021
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 22:30:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To whom it may concern,

I am writing to support the restoration of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem, their historic range for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

Bring back the bears!

I support Alternative C but with needed changes to the proposed 10(j) rule. The proposal would bring up to 25 non-conflict grizzly bears - likely from Montana - into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade and manage them as an experimental population.

The proposed 10(j) rule as currently written fails to give grizzlies the best chance to succeed and is too permissible in allowing reintroduced bears to be killed.

Lethal removal of a grizzly bear should only be considered where there is a demonstrable threat to human safety, and, for non-immediate threats to human safety, only after non-lethal management options, including concerted use of conflict prevention methods, have been exhausted.No grizzly bears should be hazed or relocated as a result of conflict with livestock unless demonstrable, repeated efforts have been made by the livestock producer to prevent such conflicts, using commonly-available techniques.No grizzly bears should be killed on public lands as a result of livestock depredation.Landowners/private citizens should not be given a permit, or otherwise authorized, to kill a grizzly bear.No grizzly bear should be preemptively relocated if the bear is not a threat to human safety, particularly if the bear has not become habituated or food-conditioned, or when nonnatural foods/attractants have not been properly secured and made inaccessible to bears. Doing so acts as a disincentive for communities to employ conflict prevention measures, and increases the risk to the bear of injury or death from capture and relocation.

These changes are crucial in providing adequate protection for grizzly bears.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to The Cascades through the strategy laid out in Alternative C and with appropriate changes to Section 10(j). Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Thank you

Correspondence ID: 14270Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Puyallup, WA 98372
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 22:32:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Your ruining are deer and elk populations no grizzlies or wolves

Correspondence ID: 14271Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Lynnwood, WA 98087
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 22:32:49
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Strongly against! Please see what happened in other states. Use your common sense.

Correspondence ID: 14272Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 22:34:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I live in Twisp and recreate frequently in the North Cascades. I support reintroducing grizzlies in this area. In particular, I support Alternative C to give land managers more leeway and discretion in managing the bear population.

Correspondence ID: 14273Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98125
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 22:34:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I think they should reintroduce grizzlies to the N Cascades, they are an amazing species

Correspondence ID: 14274Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Shoreline, WA 98177
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 22:34:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: RE: Grizzly Bear Restoration into the Cascades

I am very much against this project. I respect wildlife as it currently exists but I also feel bringing back grizzly bears will make it more unsafe for hikers, skiers, naturalists, etc. and prey animals who are there, some of them struggling to survive. There are already black bears in large numbers that already cause problems for humans either by coming into residential areas or are problems to hikers and campers. We don't need to add grizzly bears to the mix. Grizzlies already have their living spaces in Alaska, Montana, Wyoming and other places where they are well established and thriving. It isn't worth risking lives of hikers who want to enjoy our mountains without having to fear being attacked, maimed, or killed by a grizzly. Please do not bring grizzly bears into Washington state.

Sincerely,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 14275Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98102
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 22:34:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: backpacked for 25 years in the N Cascades. Let's work to reintroduce Grizzlies.
They have more rights than we do to live there. Much of
The territory is remote and rugged: suitable for them, away from us

Correspondence ID: 14276Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Cusick, WA 99119
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 22:36:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I don't want any grizzlies reintroduced to our area. We have way to many wolves, cougars, and other predators already. They are killing all of our game. I should be able to supply food to my family. Reintroducing the grizzlies, wolves and others to my area, ruins my ability.

Correspondence ID: 14277Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98112
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 22:37:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Yes! Please reintroduce Grizzlies to the North Cascades Ecosystem.
It would be heartfelt to witness a contribution back to PNW of this magnitude in my life time.

Correspondence ID: 14278Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Usk, WA 99180
United States of America
Outside Organization: Kalispell tribe Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 22:38:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: There's too many predators in northeastern washington

Correspondence ID: 14279Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Anacortes, WA 98221
United States of America
Outside Organization: Skagit Alpine Club Recreational Groups
Received: Nov,13 2023 22:40:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a mountain climber & outdoor enthusiast in the North Cascades, & a veterinarian & animal lover, I wish to offer my support & a positive HELL YES to bringing the grizzly bears back to their previously usurped habitat in the North Cascades area of Washington State. I think the benefits far outweigh the negative concerns.
Thank you for your consideration & time. Sincerely, Jill Youde, DVM

Correspondence ID: 14280Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Kent, WA 98032
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 22:41:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Native wildlife must be brought back. STOP favoring cattle. STOP favoring white ranchers.

Correspondence ID: 14281Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Deer Park, WA 99006
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 22:41:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please, there is no reason to restore Grizzly in the N Cascades or in Washington state.

Correspondence ID: 14282Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Woodinville, WA 98072
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 22:41:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am writing to strongly support the restoration of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem, which is their historic range. Here grizzly bears would thrive, in an environment of clean water and abundant native fish and other wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C, but with important changes to the proposed 10(j) rule. The proposed action would bring up to 25 non-conflict grizzly bears (possibly from Montana) into remote areas of the North Cascades Ecosystem over the next decade and manage them as an experimental population.

The proposed 10(j) rule, as currently written, fails to give grizzlies the greatest chance to succeed and survive and additionally poses a significant likelihood that the reintroduced bears could be killed for no adequate rationale. Lethal removal of a grizzly bear should only be considered where there has been a clearly demonstrated threat to human safety, and, for non-immediate threats to human safety, and then only after non-lethal management options, including concerted use of conflict prevention methods have been completely exhausted.

No grizzly bears should be relocated because of conflict with livestock unless demonstrable, repeated efforts have been made by livestock producers to prevent such conflicts, using commonly available techniques. Particularly, no grizzly bears should be killed on public lands as a result of livestock depredation or alleged depredation.

Landowners or other private citizens should not be permitted, or otherwise authorized, to kill a grizzly bear. No grizzly bear should be preemptively relocated unless that particular bear is deemed a threat to human safety, particularly if the bear has not become habituated or food-conditioned, or when nonnatural foods/attractants have not been properly secured and made inaccessible to bears. Unjustified removals act as a disincentive for communities to employ potentially effective conflict prevention measures, and increase the risk to the bear of injury or death from capture and relocation procedures. These changes are crucial in providing reasonable and adequate protection for grizzly bears.

Public opinion polls have demonstrated broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades Region. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C, but with the appropriate changes to Section 10(j) as discussed above. Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and our natural heritage.

Correspondence ID: 14283Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98126
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 22:43:47
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The grizzly bear restoration plan is a terrifying idea. As a hiker, I have appreciated the great outdoors here in Washington without having to worry about grizzly bear encounters. The black bears I have encountered when hiking tend to go about their business, but that might not be the same case crossing paths with a grizzly.

Correspondence ID: 14284Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Sedro Woolley, WA 98282
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 22:45:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Grizzlies were here long before we were. Bring them back. When I was a boy, my Dad and I watched them wandering on the ridges high above us while camping at Monogram Lake, near Lookout Mountain in the North Cascades. It changed my entire perspective on the world and my place in it, seeing these massive creatures with their own lives, their own families, and sharing our mountain places with them.

Thank you,
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 14285Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98125
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 22:46:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am not a fan of the proposal, sounds dangerous to the hikers and campers frequent to the area

Correspondence ID: 14286Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bow, WA 98232
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 22:47:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am against the introduction of Grizzly Bears in the North Cascades. There is documented evidence the the Grizzly bear is already in the North Cascades and if the habitat is sufficient for them to exist they will do so on their own and increase population without wasting time and money relocating them. The North Cascades have a sufficient predator base with mountain lion and black bears.

Correspondence ID: 14287Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Usk, WA 99180
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 22:48:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am against the grizzly bear restoration plan.

Correspondence ID: 14288Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Everett, WA 98208
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 22:48:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a resident near, and frequent user of, North Cascades National Park and Mount Baker Snoqualmie National Forest, I support Alternative A: No Action. These wilderness areas differ from current grizzly bear habitats as they are within an hour of a major population center. Masses of recreationists flood these areas during peak season, and will result in human-bear encounters. Proper food storage and wilderness ethics practices are not enforceable with the sheer number of humans currently in the back country, and the negative side effects of this will only be exacerbated with the presence of grizzly bears. I would like to keep these mountains as safe as possible for both humans and animals for years to come, and with an ever growing population this means not introducing a new predator that we are inadequately prepared to live with.

Correspondence ID: 14289Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bremerton, WA 98312
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 22:48:31

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am 100% in favor for the reintroduction of grizzlies in the North Cascades. Referring to Gregory Scruggs excellent article in the Seattle Times on Sunday, I feel informed of the well thought out reintroduction plan laid out for this magnificent animal back into its natural environment. My children, their children and generations to follow will look back on this decision as wise stewardship on your part.

YES ON REINTRODUCTION OF THE GRIZZLY BEAR TO THE NORTH CASCADES!!



Correspondence ID: 14290Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Everett, WA 98208
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 22:48:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not think it's a good idea to reintroduce grizzly bears to the North Cascades National Park. I strongly recommend going with Alternative A: no action. I am very concerned about the safety of hikers, especially backcountry hikers. There have been a concerning amount of grizzly bear attacks in other areas where grizzly bears are present, like in National parks in Canada. It especially effects people who are hiking in the back country doing overnight trips or even day trips in less populated trails and areas. I am one of those people and I would be very concerned about the added threat of grizzly bears. It is not worth the threat to hikers lives. Even though the number of backcountry hikers or hikers in less populated areas is small, their lives and safety are still very important. I would no longer feel safe hiking trails by myself or doing overnight trips on less popular trails. It is very concerning. I hope you consider that there are a fair amount of people who enjoy being out in nature on less populated trails or in the backcountry and this would drastically affect their safety and could cost them their lives. It is not worth that risk.

Correspondence ID: 14291Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98119
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 22:50:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I oppose the Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan in the North Cascades Ecosystem for several reasons. Firstly, the introduction of grizzly bears could pose a significant threat to local communities and their livestock. Additionally, concerns about potential conflicts between humans and grizzlies raise valid worries about public safety. The economic impact on industries like agriculture and tourism cannot be overlooked, as the presence of these apex predators may deter visitors

and disrupt existing ecosystems. Overall, I believe alternative conservation strategies should be explored to protect both the environment and the well-being of local communities.

Correspondence ID: 14292Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America
Outside Organization: Methow Valley Citizens Council Civic Groups(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,13 2023 22:50:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Superintendent Donald Striker
North Cascades National Park Complex
810 State Route 20
Sedro-Woolley, WA 98284

November 11th, 2023

Dear Superintendent Striker,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Park Service's joint Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE). Methow Valley Citizens Council (MVCC) would like to express our strong support for Alternative C of the draft EIS -- active grizzly bear reintroduction alongside a 10(j) rule.

Grizzly bears were an integral part of our ecosystem here for over 20,000 years until settlers hunted, trapped and poisoned them to local extinction. We now have the once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to bring them back, and many community members in the Methow Valley and wider Okanogan County support this initiative. The North Cascades is ideal grizzly bear habitat: with nearly 10,000 square miles of mostly public lands, the recovery area encompasses enough space for successful reintroduction. We also know there is enough food for bears here: nearly 80% of the diets of interior grizzly bears consist of berries, roots, tubers and insects, and of the 124 different species of plants that grizzlies have been shown to eat, the North Cascades is home to 100.

Through connections with other organizations and agencies doing wildlife coexistence work we have seen firsthand how rural communities in neighboring states very similar to ours ecologically, socio-economically and culturally are already living, recreating and thriving alongside grizzly bears. We know that preventative coexistence measures like electric fencing, carcass composting programs, range riding and bear-proof garbage containers have been proven to work with grizzlies. MVCC and other organizations here are eager to help facilitate the implementation of these necessary conflict prevention strategies, but to do so, we will need additional resources and funding. While the Methow Valley currently has a 'Bear Aware' program, much more work needs to be done to get our communities ready for grizzly bears, and MVCC does not feel the current draft EIS adequately plans for those needs. The potential for conflict with humans is arguably the biggest threat to grizzly recovery in the NCE, and we live in a region whose population of both full-time residents and visitors is growing. We strongly believe living alongside grizzly bears is possible, but it will require increased education campaigns and even legal mechanisms (like food storage orders) to adequately prepare for the presence of grizzlies and to keep both humans and bears safe. Please explicitly include these in your plan.

MVCC also supports implementation of the 10(j) rule, with one caveat: while we appreciate the management flexibility it provides for local agencies, we do not feel it is appropriate to give lethal take authorization to private landowners. In situations of extreme conflict when other forms of deterrence or relocation are exhausted, we strongly advocate that local management agencies be in charge of handling bears rather than private landowners.

MVCC is also disappointed that agency staff did not take advantage of this last round of public meetings to share accurate information about the complex 10(j) rule with our communities. In the face of fear-based misinformation campaigns run by opposition in Okanogan County, many community members were simply never given a real opportunity to learn. Going forward, we hope that agency staff will reconsider the format of their meetings to also include the presentation of accurate, up-to-date relevant information in a group setting. This is a specific ask that we have heard repeatedly from many people

within our community.

Through our outreach work over the last few years, we have also heard many in the Methow and Okanogan valleys voice concerns specifically for the wellbeing of the individual translocated bears. Beyond being mere members of a 'population', these individuals have intrinsic value in and of themselves, and we hope that each of them will be treated with the utmost care, respect and reverence through the disorienting process of translocation. This is critically important as we shift toward a culture that values the rights of nature.

Here in WA and around the globe we are facing a biodiversity crisis of immense proportion, we're losing species left and right, a trend that is only expected to increase as we continue to see the growing impacts of climate change. We are encouraged by recent studies that have shown that under nearly all of the various potential climate models ahead, the NCE will only become better, more viable grizzly bear habitat. Grizzlies are an endangered keystone species that belong in the North Cascades - - they have a right to be here - - and we as a community have an incredible opportunity to bring them back, making our ecosystem more resilient for future generations by doing so.

Thank you for your hard work on this decades-long project. We are excited at the prospect of having grizzly bears back on the landscape again.

Sincerely,


Public Lands and Wildlife Program Coordinator
Methow Valley Citizens Council

Correspondence ID: 14293Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Brush Prairie, WA 98606
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 22:51:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Just as humans deserve space to live, so do grizzlies. Bears long preceded us in North America and have an unalienable right to live and prosper. Paws off!!

Correspondence ID: 14295Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 22:51:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am wholly opposed to the introduction of grizzlies to the North Cascades. There is an indigenous population of grizzlies already there. People have seen them. We know they are there but the people/organizations wanting to bring out of area grizzlies here deny anyone has actually seen them. There are not accurate numbers and research of the indigenous population of grizzlies in this area. Leave the population that is holding on here alone! Leave them reproduce and live without competition and genetic invasion from outside grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 14296Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Renton, WA 98056
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 22:52:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please re-establish Grizzly bears in North Cascades. They are essential species in the ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 14297Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Lopez Island, WA 98261-0813
United States of America
Outside Organization: [REDACTED] Business(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,13 2023 22:53:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Sir/Madam

I am writing to support the restoration of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem, their historic range for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C but with needed changes to the proposed 10(j) rule. The proposal would bring up to 25 non-conflict grizzly bears - likely from Montana - into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade and manage them as an experimental population.

The proposed 10(j) rule as currently written fails to give grizzlies the best chance to succeed and is too permissible in allowing reintroduced bears to be killed.

Lethal removal of a grizzly bear should only be considered where there is a demonstrable threat to human safety, and, for non-immediate threats to human safety, only after non-lethal management options, including concerted use of conflict prevention methods, have been exhausted.

No grizzly bears should be hazed or relocated as a result of conflict with livestock unless demonstrable, repeated efforts have been made by the livestock producer to prevent such conflicts, using commonly-available techniques.

No grizzly bears should be killed on public lands as a result of livestock depredation.

Landowners/private citizens should not be given a permit, or otherwise authorized, to kill a grizzly bear.

No grizzly bear should be preemptively relocated if the bear is not a threat to human safety, particularly if the bear has not become habituated or food-conditioned, or when non-natural foods/attractants have not been properly secured and made inaccessible to bears. Doing so acts as a disincentive for communities to employ conflict prevention measures, and increases the risk to the bear of injury or death from capture and relocation.

These changes are crucial in providing adequate protection for grizzly bears.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C and with appropriate changes to Section 10(j). Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 14298Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Snohomish, WA 98290
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 22:53:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As an avid backcountry hiker and climber, annually I spend many days within the proposed NCE area. This year I again traversed within all three of the proposed Grizzly releasement zones. While inside these extraordinary spaces I welcome the afforded solitude but in so doing I have regularly (and disappointingly) observed a paucity of small mammals and of larger ungulates. Which is to say by my experience I do not believe that an adequate supply of these would-be and necessary food sources presently exist sufficiently to sustain the re-establishment of a sufficient grizzly bear population. This is my 'feet on the ground' opinion and coupled with other reasons I support Alternative A - the No restoration Action.

Many of our national parks, monuments and wilderness areas struggle with a dichotomy: preservation/ecosystems vs. personal

use & liberties. This problem is the crux of the controversy that exists with the proposal. The Draft EIS brushes over this problem with an attempt to persuade that the potential (likely?) personal downsides don't exist or can be easily mitigated. To wit - From the Draft EIS executive summary: 'Purpose and Need Contribute to the restoration of biodiversity of the ecosystem to build ecological resilience and for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations of people.'

George Orwell, author of Animal Farm, wrote that 'All animals are equal, but some animals are more equal than others'.

As witnessed by the extreme differences of opinions via the prior 2022 public scoping correspondence this question arises - Would the proposal's preferred alternative C unequivocally 'provide for the enjoyment of present and future generations of people' as per the above? Certainly not as it depends on which side of the dichotomy these 'present and future' people may benefit from - or not. With the current public comment period in process another round of 'opinions' will soon be layered in. On the surface this will be a bit overwhelming to properly tally and assess. On the other hand perhaps this task need not be daunting. Why? My answer - I submit that 'some people are more equal than others.

Although many of the proposed NCE areas are of wilderness quality suitable for biodiversity they are equally places for people to use and enjoy. We can all vicariously relish and enjoy from a distance: as in knowing that certain 'far away areas' of biodiversity do exist and provide stability. However for those persons who actively use these NCE areas; for those who intend to do so; and for those potentially economically impacted by the proposed restoration plan - their comments should be 'more equal' when it comes to the ranking assessment of their submittals.

Conversely other comments should be relegated. Flippant comments like "We need to restore our earth's balance to save our planet" are just that: glib and it would be wrong to give them any value or status. Extracting from those earlier 2022 comments there are hundreds upon hundreds of group copy/submitted comments like that of " A healthy population of grizzly bears belongs in the NCE ..." or "Thank you for moving forward with the process of restoring grizzly bears to the ..." Those types of comments were sent only to stuff the ballot box. Same for the other version which begins "[I] Oppose the capture of grizzlies from the Northern Continental Divide Ecosystem". Most all of these comments are identified as coming from persons far distant from Washington State, This begs the question of how valuable their comment really is. And I'm certain that many or most of these persons have not or never will visit the NCE area. I hope that the agency's authors and promoters of this draft EIS/action are professional enough to structurally discount these types of comments by assessing them as a single (1) comment together with questionably solicited support. I'd expect the same of my opinion if I were to simply click upon a web-link expressing strong opinion on some poignant proposal, for example an important issue to the Everglades community a place I'm never seen and won't be visiting.

As for the food chain, I submit that 'some animals are more equal than others. Grizzly Bears may well be omnivores, but meat definitely is high on their preferred menu. Would be starving Grizzly Bears will not be dissuaded from finding food. Likely they might prey upon easy to kill domestic stock since Grizzlies will learn and then be able to travel widely if need be. Then again, as we've learned this past September, any meat will do as did befell the horrific fate of two campers in Banff National Park. When placed in harm's way, theory and good intentions go out the proverbial window and anyone so commenting on their held belief of a safe coexistence with Grizzlies, (perhaps for purpose of biodiversity and/or their personal enjoyment) would certainly have 'their foxhole conversion' in such a desperate confrontation. No doubt just as happened to the famed but foolish Timothy Treadwell in Alaska, as per his own audio record of anguish when attacked and eaten.

Of course, we all take chances in life but why temp fate. But sadly, whose temping who? The NPS and NFWS agency authors, proponents and decision makers must at this moment in time recognize their own culpability in their likely queuing of the fate and lives of a few human beings other than themselves. Such will happen when Grizzly Bears and humans come into unwelcome battle. Not conflict - battle, don't whitewash it. A life and death battle. And not if - but when - inevitably. At some point in time the public will no longer remember or recognize these few agency persons names. But these few persons will undoubtedly learn and know when such a tragedy happens and then that burden of guilt, that of the taking of a life will and must befall their conscience because they themselves yielded that hand that ultimately resulted in the deed. Whereas Alternative A alleviates any such guilt by expressly allows for Grizzlies to come into the NCE of their own volition, thereby (eventually) achieving the same stated goal as per the proposed action.

"If the only tool you have is a hammer, you tend to see every problem as a nail." Given the background data and the job titles of those NPS and NFWS persons involved with the proposed action common sense informs that a strong bias of a predetermined result already existed from their beginning involvement. There is no surprise here: one's training and education preempts what might be other thoughts and outcomes. Then too, jobs and aspirational achievement are otherwise at risk. Perhaps in the process of this Draft EIS review the preferred alternative C might be jettisoned and the available Alternative A - No Action option be miraculously selected. Some commentators will be vindicated, others dashed. But the upshot will be that the general public can be deeply grateful that the method/purpose of the Draft EIS is both valid and viable. That the review process can actually spawn a valid reassessment, perhaps even an abrupt change. Let us not forget that the conjuring of several alternatives is to be a real opportunity for the consideration of a change. Not a rubber stamp on what far too often is simply a predetermined outcome. On the other hand, if no changes occur following the submitted comments the public will never know if, if not, or to what degree the biases of those few NPS and NFWS individuals dominated start to finish.

To me, how sad it is that so much effort and funding has and is being proposed to accomplish an action that has dubious goals. Especially when by honestly naming and identifying the action as 'Nonessential' we know that always limited resources might have been applied elsewhere. When in my backcountry travels I am constantly reminded of two important aspects of our public areas: What a great asset has been developed over a long period of time: that of the building and maintaining of trails and wilderness accommodations. What a great amount of maintenance of these assets is required: resurrection of lost trails as well as annual restoration work. An amazing amount of hard physical labor is necessary to provide the resources for people to access and enjoy the wilderness. People, don't let the perfect be the enemy of the good. Don't wish for a perfect (but nonessential) biodiverse wilderness. Let's just pay to keep and maintain the good wilderness access we already have.

Correspondence ID: 14299Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Issaquah, WA 98027
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 22:53:41

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I would not feel safe hiking with my kids knowing grizzlies are out there in the north cascades. That experienced hiking couple in Banff emptied a whole can of bear spray and they were still mauled to death. Grizzlies are thriving in yellowstone, and protected there. The species won't be lost since they have sanctuaries there, Canada and Alaska. I think proponents for bringing grizzlies back need to prove that the benefits outweigh the risk. Right now there are zero deaths from mauled grizzlies, those who vote to bring them back will have that blood on their hands for those rare cases humans do get attacked. For the same reason we dont bring back poison ivy after we've removed them from a public park-- let's leave the existing grizzlies alone and out of Washington. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14300Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America

Outside Organization: American Bulltrout Society Conservation/Preservation(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,13 2023 22:54:45

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am a life long Washingtonian and strongly support repatriating one of the greatest American icons the wilderness has to offer.

I personally have spent time with Brown/ Grizzly bears in Canada and in Alaska. They are magnificent and amiable, inclined to solitude and open space. They are an integral and currently missing piece of our ecological landscape here in Washington. Washington can never claim to be a repaired land until the great bear once again can call it home.

Correspondence ID: 14301Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98108
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 22:54:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To whom it may concern,

I am writing to support the restoration of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem, their historic range for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C but with needed changes to the proposed 10(j) rule. The proposal would bring up to 25 non-conflict grizzly bears - likely from Montana - into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade and manage them as an experimental population.

The proposed 10(j) rule as currently written fails to give grizzlies the best chance to succeed and is too permissible in allowing reintroduced bears to be killed.

Lethal removal of a grizzly bear should only be considered where there is a demonstrable threat to human safety, and, for non-immediate threats to human safety, only after non-lethal management options, including concerted use of conflict prevention methods, have been exhausted.

No grizzly bears should be hazed or relocated as a result of conflict with livestock unless demonstrable, repeated efforts have been made by the livestock producer to prevent such conflicts, using commonly-available techniques.

No grizzly bears should be killed on public lands as a result of livestock depredation.

Landowners/private citizens should not be given a permit, or otherwise authorized, to kill a grizzly bear.

No grizzly bear should be preemptively relocated if the bear is not a threat to human safety, particularly if the bear has not become habituated or food-conditioned, or when nonnatural foods/attractants have not been properly secured and made inaccessible to bears. Doing so acts as a disincentive for communities to employ conflict prevention measures, and increases the risk to the bear of injury or death from capture and relocation.

These changes are crucial in providing adequate protection for grizzly bears.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C and with appropriate changes to Section 10(j). Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Correspondence ID: 14302Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Alexandria, VA 22306
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 22:55:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Regarding reintroduction of grizzly bears in the Northern Cascades of Washington:

While being an east coast resident the last many years, I've lived over 30 years in the West. I've seen one grizzly bear on the shores of Glacier Lake in Montana while I was in a boat. Not even close. I've also seen many black and brown bears during my time in the West. However, when it comes to Grizzlies, they're an undeniable death machine with humans.

To advise "playing dead" when confronted with a bear this size is a 50/50 gamble most humans don't want to take. The fact there would be restrictions on shooting the animal if attacked leaves one no where to go. Yes, this region is currently wild, but there is human activity. Native Americans hunted these bears in the past, and would likely hunt them

again. So, if a non-native had to protect themselves from attack by killing a bear, I believe this should be considered essential to reintroduction.

Further, the smaller the number of Grizzly bears introduced, the better both for the safety of the bears and the humans.

Correspondence ID: 14303Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98107
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 22:56:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am against bring grizzlies back.

People who don't know what they are doing are out in the wilderness more than ever now. I think it will cause two things to occur: 1. More attacks will happen, causing harm to people and then much like just happened with the couple that was killed in Banff, then the grizzly will be killed. 2. I think more people (than I have already seen on the trails), will start bringing guys with them as protection, which does not actually make me feel safe to be around while out in nature.

Correspondence ID: 14304Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Redmond, WA 98052
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 22:56:58

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I ask that you NOT reintroduce grizzlies into the N. Cascades Wilderness. The risks are too great and the ecosystem has been thriving for over 30 years without the reintroduction.

Correspondence ID: 14305Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 22:58:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm writing to support grizzly bear reintroduction to the North Cascades. They are native to that area and deserve to be returned. There are so few places wild enough to allow them anymore and we must aloe them the few places they have left. Thank you

Correspondence ID: 14306Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Port Townsend, WA 98368
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 22:58:12

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To whom it may concern,

I am writing to support the restoration of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem, their historic range for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C but with needed changes to the proposed 10(j) rule. The proposal would bring up to 25 non-conflict grizzly bears - likely from Montana - into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade and manage them as an experimental population.

The proposed 10(j) rule as currently written fails to give grizzlies the best chance to succeed and is too permissible in allowing reintroduced bears to be killed.

Lethal removal of a grizzly bear should only be considered where there is a demonstrable threat to human safety, and, for non-immediate threats to human safety, only after non-lethal management options, including concerted use of conflict prevention methods, have been exhausted.

No grizzly bears should be hazed or relocated as a result of conflict with livestock unless demonstrable, repeated efforts have been made by the livestock producer to prevent such conflicts, using commonly-available techniques.

No grizzly bears should be killed on public lands as a result of livestock depredation.

Landowners/private citizens should not be given a permit, or otherwise authorized, to kill a grizzly bear.

No grizzly bear should be preemptively relocated if the bear is not a threat to human safety, particularly if the bear has not become habituated or food-conditioned, or when nonnatural foods/attractants have not been properly secured and made inaccessible to bears. Doing so acts as a disincentive for communities to employ conflict prevention measures, and increases the risk to the bear of injury or death from capture and relocation.

These changes are crucial in providing adequate protection for grizzly bears.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C and with appropriate changes to Section 10(j). Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Sincerely,

██████████

Correspondence ID: 14307Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Anacortes, WA 98221
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 23:01:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing in support of grizzly reintroduction in the North Cascades. As someone who has spent years working in the bush near grizzlies in Alaska, I think it is overblown the potential danger they bring. We should continue to work to bring greater balance to ecosystems we have undone, and having them be part of the landscape is an obvious first step.

Correspondence ID: 14308Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Selah, WA 98942
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 23:01:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The people that want to bring back grizzlies to the Cascades should have to live in the vicinity of the bear drops. Innocent citizens should not be endangered by a few people who have no idea what the results will be because animals are unpredictable and do not follow rules. Please consider the people that will be impacted before you turn loose apex predators into even sparsely populated areas. These are either food growing areas, or recreational areas where people are at their most vulnerable.

NO BEARS PLANTED IN WASHINGTON STATE, ANYWHERE.

Correspondence ID: 14309Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98121
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 23:02:55

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please reconsider the risk of loss of human life due to this reintroduction. There are millions of acres of grizzly territory in the United States and Canada. Regardless of the amount of education provided on bear safety, it is inevitable that there will be a grizzly bear on human attack in the park. I do not see a strong enough case on biodiversity to balance this tremendous risk out when there are existing black bears. This is coming just weeks after the Banff attack on two backpackers.

Correspondence ID: 14310Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 23:03:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To whom it may concern,

I am writing to support the restoration of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem, their historic range for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C but with needed changes to the proposed 10(j) rule. The proposal would bring up to 25 non-conflict grizzly bears - likely from Montana - into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade and manage them as an experimental population.

The proposed 10(j) rule as currently written fails to give grizzlies the best chance to succeed and is too permissible in allowing reintroduced bears to be killed.

Lethal removal of a grizzly bear should only be considered where there is a demonstrable threat to human safety, and, for non-immediate threats to human safety, only after non-lethal management options, including concerted use of conflict prevention methods, have been exhausted.

No grizzly bears should be hazed or relocated as a result of conflict with livestock unless demonstrable, repeated efforts have been made by the livestock producer to prevent such conflicts, using commonly-available techniques.

No grizzly bears should be killed on public lands as a result of livestock depredation.

Landowners/private citizens should not be given a permit, or otherwise authorized, to kill a grizzly bear.

No grizzly bear should be preemptively relocated if the bear is not a threat to human safety, particularly if the bear has not become habituated or food-conditioned, or when nonnatural foods/attractants have not been properly secured and made inaccessible to bears. Doing so acts as a disincentive for communities to employ conflict prevention measures, and increases the risk to the bear of injury or death from capture and relocation.

These changes are crucial in providing adequate protection for grizzly bears.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C and with appropriate changes to Section 10(j). Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Correspondence ID: 14311Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spokane, WA 99205
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 23:03:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please do everything possible to restore the grizzly bears to their former habitat, to ensure that they have a sustainable population and a strong future in the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 14313Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Boulder, CO 80304
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 23:05:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Boulder, CO 80305

Brad Thompson, State Supervisor
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Washington Fish and Wildlife Office
500 Desmond Drive, Suite 102
Lacey, WA 98503

Denise Shultz
National Park Service
1849 C St NW Washington,
District of Columbia, 20240

Dear Mr. Thompson and Ms. Shultz,

We request you accept this comment on the proposed rule and Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the reintroduction of the grizzly bear in the North Cascades and hope you incorporate its content into the final rule. We are graduate students at the University of Colorado Boulder and are currently in an environmental decision making course, and have drafted this comment as part of this course. We request an extension of the comment period until December 8th, 2023 and that you view this comment as a place-holder until we are able to submit a final draft after receiving feedback from our professor. We chose to comment on this proposal in particular because this topic is important to us. In a world where many ecosystems are being destabilized by the climate crisis and there is an unprecedented rate of biodiversity loss, it is our responsibility as humans and as American citizens to ensure that we do everything in our power to help promote biodiversity and ecosystem functioning whenever we can. As is noted in the proposal, reintroduction of grizzly bears into the Northern Cascades has the potential to do that.

Table of Contents:

Introduction Pg. 4

Grizzly Bears Have the Potential to Cause Ecological Benefits in the Northern Cascades -Pg. 4

Predator-Prey Relationships Can Aid in Disease Management Pg. 4

Other Benefits of Apex Predators in Ecosystems Include Balancing the Food Web

Pg. 5

The EIS Should Consider Several Different Methods to Prevent Human-Bear Conflicts

Pg. 6

Equipping landowners with resources and knowledge to minimize conflicts will support the successful

reintroduction of grizzly bears. Pg. 7

Recreationalists will need support to keep themselves safe in the Recovery Zone.

Pg. 12

Bear Spray Pg. 12

Avoidance Pg. 14

Motorists pose a risk to grizzly bears and steps should be taken to avoid vehicle collisions.

Pg. 16

Effective Public Outreach Requires Relationships to be Built Pg. 18

Adaptive Management Improves the Success of Management Goals Pg. 20

Ranching Pg. 21

Logging Pg. 22

Recreation Pg. 22

Impacts of Action Without the U.S. Forest Service Should be Addressed

in the EIS Pg. 23

Conclusion Pg. 24

Introduction

We support the reintroduction of the grizzly bear to the Northern Cascades using the preferred alternative outlined in the DEIS. We stand with the 80% of Washington voters who support reintroduction efforts. We support this effort as the grizzly bears will help disease management and overall aid in restoring the ecosystem. However, we request that the National Parks Service (NPS) and Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) make efforts to prevent as much human-bear conflict as possible. We also believe the agencies should engage in public outreach to educate the public that will be near the grizzly bears, and that the agencies engage in adaptive management of the grizzly bears after reintroduction. We also encourage the agencies to further address the impacts of the Forest Service not engaging in the reintroduction of the grizzly bears.

Grizzly Bears Have the Potential to Cause Ecological Benefits in the Northern Cascades Predator-Prey Relationships Can Aid in Disease Management

Chronic wasting disease (CWD) has been slowly spreading throughout the United States. This disease infects mule deer, white-tailed deer, elk, and moose. CWD is a prion disease spread through saliva, feces, velvet, urine, and infected carcasses. The spread is difficult to control and population control is frequently used to control the amount of infected individuals. CWD causes wasting and behavioral changes. There is evidence that predators target individuals with CWD. For instance, in a study conducted in Colorado, mountain lions were more likely to prey on mule deer with CWD than without. While this study found the impact of this selective predation on populations with CWD, there has been evidence that there is an impact when the predators are wolves. In models based on data from Yellowstone, it is predicted that when high rates of CWD occur in adults, wolves are more likely to select for individual adults with CWD.

Grizzly bears would likely contribute to decreasing the prevalence of CWD. Grizzly bears "are versatile yet relatively ill-equipped for cursorial predation." Demonstrated by the studies on mountain lions and wolves, predators select for easier prey. CWD causes behavior changes such as listlessness that make individuals with CWD easier to catch. The selection for sick

individuals would possibly decrease prevalence of CWD in animal populations. It is possible that grizzly bears could impact other types of disease prevalence in different species.

Other Benefits of Apex Predators in Ecosystems Include Balancing the Food Web

The reintroduction of an apex predator also benefits the ecosystem past disease mitigation in prey. Reintroducing an apex predator like the grizzly bear fills an ecological niche. Grizzly bears will help balance the ecosystem's food web. Without control of ungulates, woody plant species can suffer from overbrowsing. Predators control the population of ungulates, allowing recovery of the woody plant species. This predator-prey relationship repeats throughout the food web, helping sustainably manage the area. A study of grizzly bears in Yellowstone found that grizzly bears helped maintain natural equilibriums in the food web.

The EIS Should Consider Several Different Methods to Prevent Human-Bear Conflicts

We recognize that human-bear conflicts are a massive area of concern for NPS and FWS (the Services) as well as the people in and around the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE) area. While grizzly bears can improve the area's ecosystem, their reintroduction should be done in a way that ensures human health and well-being as much as possible. Section 4(d) of the Endangered Species Act, which applies to 10(j) nonessential experimental population (NEP), states that "the Secretary shall issue such regulations as he deems necessary and advisable to provide for the conservation of such species." We believe that it is necessary and advisable for the Services to do everything in their power to minimize the risk the NEP poses to the people in the NCE Recovery Zone. We believe that by making sure the reintroduced grizzly bears do not get improperly acclimated to humans, the Services will reduce the amount of dangerous bear behavior that could potentially lead to the legal takings of grizzly bears by the Services and of private individuals. Furthermore, we believe that it is necessary and advisable that the Services do everything in their power to make people in and around the NCE Recovery Zone feel safe around the reintroduced grizzly bears to prevent any illegal takings before they happen. If any of the NEP is purposely killed, either legally or illegally, this will significantly slow down the population's conservation due to grizzly bear's slow reproduction time. The Services limited resources that have gone into the reintroduction efforts will be wasted. We believe the Service should be as proactive as possible in order to reduce the amount of purposeful takings of the NEP. Much of the opposition to this reintroduction is and has been from people who are worried about the safety of themselves, their loved ones, and potentially their livelihoods. These risks can be overblown and based on ignorance of how to reduce the risk of living alongside grizzly bears, but they are certainly not baseless. The Services should take these concerns into account and do everything in their power to alleviate the risk of the NEP while also reducing the overblown perception of risk. The Services should especially focus these efforts for landowners, recreationalists, and motorists.

Equipping landowners with resources and knowledge to minimize conflicts will support the successful reintroduction of grizzly bears.

Much opposition to the grizzly bear's reintroduction into the NCE comes from landowners who are concerned for not only their lives and safety, but also for their livelihoods, which are tied to their land. In particular, ranchers and other farmers are concerned that their livestock and livestock feed will be stolen by the reintroduced bears. This is a valid concern, one that the Services should take steps to alleviate. The Services should use the most up-to-date science to equip landowners with the resources and knowledge to minimize these risks.

Research has shown that one of the most effective ways to deter bears from non-natural attractants is through the use of electric fences. These fences offer an electric shock to anything that touches it. This shock is not enough to seriously harm a human or bear that touches it, but it is enough to deter bears from further attempts to get past it. Using fences to protect bear attractants like livestock, livestock feed, fruit trees, and garbage not only protects these attractants, it also prevents the bears from seeing humans and non-natural attractants as viable sources for food, reducing human-bear conflicts preemptively, potentially even for those without electric fences and throughout bear generations, as bears teach their young appropriate behaviors.

Electric fences need to be set up properly in order to be effective. They have to be at the right height and have the right voltage, tension, and grounding. Concerned ranchers inexperienced in using electric fencing would benefit from receiving technical assistance with both how and where to set up electric fencing to best secure their bear attractants. This would also be an opportunity to inform them about proper techniques to further reduce human-bear conflicts like the removal of bear attractants, namely deadstock as well as the proper monitoring of calving operations.

The Services should consider providing this technical assistance and education at the least. This is an opportunity to not only make sure that electric fences are set up in a way that effectively deters bears from attractants and proper attractant-removal

practices are being used, it also allows the Services to build trust with ranchers and other landowners and ensure that not only are their assets safe, but that they feel like their assets are safe, and that they are not being abandoned to face the threat of grizzly bears alone.

This can save the Services time and money in the long term in two key ways. First, it reduces the amount of complaints they have to respond to that result from human-bear conflicts. The most common source of call to the British Columbia Conservation Officer Service between 2014-2017 were from conflict resulting from unsecured access by grizzly bears to livestock, livestock feed, fruit trees and berries.¹¹ By proactively ensuring that these attractants are secure, the Services reduces the amount of time spent responding to conflicts after the fact, and potentially saving livestock, property, and human health/lives.

Building trust and ensuring that people feel secure living in/around the NCE Recovery Zone alongside the reintroduced bear population reduces lethal-takings from private landowners. When people feel threatened, they take matters into their own hands to secure their land and property, despite the final legality of those takings as determined by the Services and courts. By educating ranchers/landowners in best practices to reduce human-bear conflicts, the Services would help further promote the conservation of the population by reducing lethal-takings. In turn, this would help reduce the amount to restock the Services would have to provide to ensure that the population remains stable.

While providing technical assistance and education is a good start to reducing human-bear conflict for landowners, providing the electrical fencing itself is an even better way of doing this. Providing technical assistance and education alone still leaves it up to the individual property owners to ensure that this assistance and education is put to use, potentially leaving major gaps in implementation. This is potentially enough to make the educational assistance pointless in actually reducing human-bear conflicts. Landowners against the reintroduction of grizzly bears will potentially see these efforts as the government telling them what to do after introducing a new threat to their livelihoods. By providing bear deterrents such as electric fencing, the Services can work with landowners to ensure that this assistance is put to use and fences are established properly. It gives landowners a reason to trust the Services and alleviate the feeling of one-sidedness many people feel when faced against government action.

The Services should also consider providing other forms of bear deterrents such as bear-spray and livestock guard dogs. While electric fences have been shown to be the most effective bear deterrents, they are not always applicable for certain landowners. Bear spray is effective for personal protection (see more under "Recreationalists"), and livestock guard dogs would be effective for those whose land is too large or otherwise difficult to fully fence-in. It is useful for herders who frequently move their livestock across large distances.

It is the Services who are re-introducing the threat of bear-attacks to these landowners, so it should be the Service's responsibility to make sure that these threats are mitigated as much as possible. By providing not only technical assistance and education to landowners, but also material assistance in the form of various bear deterrents specific to the individual landowners, the Services can ensure that the process of re-introduction does as well as possible for the bears and the landowners involved. At the very least, the Services can promote the financial assistance provided by organizations such as Defenders of Wildlife, which will provide up to \$500 of fencing used to secure bear attractants. The Interagency Grizzly Bear Committee (IGBC) should pool the resources of the different agencies within it to come up with a full gambit of financial and material assistance they can provide to landowners to completely cover the cost of bear security for those living in and around the NCE Recovery Zone.

The Services can best ensure that this assistance gets used by regularly (annually) hosting informational sessions where landowners can be informed of the assistance the Services are offering and sign up to receive them. The Services should reach out to landowners who do not attend these informational sessions directly, potentially in-person and leaving flyers if necessary with relevant information for signing up for these services. The Services should start with property that is closest to the area where grizzly bears are likely to be based on where they are reintroduced and expand outward from there. The Service's outreach efforts should occur where evidence indicates the bears are located. If the bears move to unexpected locations, the Services' outreach efforts should shift appropriately. What is most important is ensuring the safety of people, bears, and securing the attractants that bring them into conflict, and the Services should do everything within their power to do so as a means to promote the conservation of the population. Evidence shows that community and evidence-based efforts like these can reduce the number of human-bear conflicts and increase the feeling of security for those involved.

Recreationalists will need support to keep themselves safe in the Recovery Zone.

Similarly, recreationalists should also be equipped with everything they need to keep themselves safe from bear attacks while in and around the NCE Recovery Zone. Even though the chances of recreationalists encountering a bear will be low, especially in the early years when there will be very few grizzly bears in the NCE Recovery Zone, the Services should do everything in their power to minimize the chances of human-bear conflicts to ensure the safety of recreators and the continued conservation of bears.

Bear Spray

The science suggests that one of the most effective ways to minimize personal risk around grizzly bears is the proper use of bear spray. Bear spray is an aerosol product comprised of 1-2% capsaicin and related capsaicinoids that is sprayed as a cloud from a pressurized canister at speeds greater than 100 km/h. 92% of people carrying bear spray were uninjured by bears in close-range encounters. The Services should ensure that all recreationalists hiking, camping, and hunting in areas with reintroduced bear populations should have access to and proper knowledge of the use of bear spray.

Bear spray should be distributed, free-of-charge, to hikers and campers utilizing Parks within the NCE Recovery Zone as much as possible. For example, in North Cascades National Park, at some point in the process of making reservations and/or paying fees for camping/backpacking, campers and hikers should be asked if they are currently in possession of bear spray. If they do not, they should be encouraged to take some. Bear spray should be left at registration kiosks. Or, when Park workers check on camper/backpackers to ensure that they have permits and have paid the fees, they also check that the recreators have bear spray and distribute them if they do not. However it would best fit into the Parks Service current operations, they should ensure that as many recreators have bear spray as possible, especially for long-term/overnight recreators. They should potentially all have two as is recommended by the IGBC.

The point of distribution should also be the point of education on the proper use of bear spray. Recreators should understand the difference between bear spray and pepper spray and that pepper spray should not be used in place of bear spray. They should understand that bear spray should not be carried in a backpack but should instead be carried on a hip or chest holster for easy access. It should also not be sprayed on the ground or on tents as that can actually attract bears. And they should understand how to properly deploy their bear spray if necessary, perhaps using an inert bear spray canister as practice (The Services could provide demonstrations and practice as a part of their educational efforts, making it fun and memorable). Even if recreators already have bear spray, they should be reminded of its proper use. They should also be encouraged to double check that their bear spray is not expired and be given another canister if it is. An important part of education is context. Recreators should be made aware of the NEP status of the grizzly bear and the Services conservation efforts, and the importance of the bears having negative associations with humans to prevent future attacks.

Recreators should also be made aware that bear spray successfully stops negative human-bear encounters at a greater rate than firearms. Guns help people, especially hunters, feel safe, in this case a false sense of security. Reminding people that their safety is more important than their pride and machismo can save lives, both of the humans and of the bears. As well as the current practice of informing hunters of the illegality of purposefully taking a bear and testing hunters to make sure they can correctly identify a black bear as opposed to a grizzly bear, the Services should also make identity-based appeals that will actually resonate with hunters and other firearm carriers. Appeals from other hunters, especially those who have survived bear attacks have the potential to be very effective. Idaho-based hunting guide Bob Legasa, who survived a grizzly bear attack, warns that "a gunshot is like a dinner bell for grizzly bears". Hunters, and people who interact with hunters a lot, will understand what will appeal to other hunters to convince them that their gun is not the most effective to stay safe in areas with grizzly bears.

Avoidance

While equipping recreators with bear spray and ensuring they are able and willing to use it is important in helping them stay safe during human-bear conflicts, helping recreators avoid bears altogether is the surest way to maintain safety. We appreciate the efforts the NPS and USFS are taking to promote the use of proper food storage and reduce unsecured attractants. However, the Services can further through education and potentially seasonal closures during hyperphagia.

As noted in the proposed action, the IGBC already has efforts in place to inform the public of the dangers of bears via signage, but there are other steps the Services can take to promote bear avoidance through education. Campers, backpackers, hunters and other long-term recreators could watch a video, or attend a class of a worker of one of the Services, to receive

their permits and/or pay their fees. In cases where educational efforts like these are used, the Services should work with outdoor educational experts to create a curriculum and teaching method that is evidence-based to make sure the classes or videos are maximally effective.

In the proposed action, the only closures that are mentioned are short closures for hours or days as needed. We understand that the Services want to limit the impact the grizzly bear reintroduction has on tourism and the people who depend on it. However, we believe the Services should leave the option open for annual closures during the grizzly bears' hyperphagia phase. Hyperphagia is the drive in bears that increases their feeding activity both before and after hibernation. Seasonal and annual deficits of natural foods are the best predictors of nuisance activity in bears. The Services' policies on closures should reflect this. If nuisances and closures during hyperphagia being too common, it might be less disruptive to tourists and the tourism industry to have regular annual closures rather than ad hoc ones. This would allow for people to plan their trips to the NCE while taking hyperphagia and bear activity into account.

Motorists pose a risk to grizzly bears and steps should be taken to avoid vehicle collisions.

As stated in the proposed rule, "Because road access was identified by the IGBC as one of the most imminent threats to grizzly bears, the recovery plan recommended that road management be given the highest priority for grizzly bear recovery." We whole-heartedly agree. Human-bear conflicts in the form of vehicle collisions are much harder to mitigate through education and awareness than the other forms of human-bear conflict that has been mentioned so far. The physical infrastructure of the road has to change in order to reduce the amount of premature fatalities at the hand of vehicle collisions. Fortunately, not only are there road changes that can be made to help prevent these collisions, there are federal resources outside of the Services already constrained resources available to help alleviate this problem.

Wildlife crossing structures have been shown to be an effective means of preventing vehicle collisions with grizzly bears. These structures usually take the form of underpasses or overpasses that allow wildlife to cross roads without putting themselves or vehicles at risk of collision. We recognize that these structures can be costly and disruptive to the local ecosystem to build into pre-existing roads. We believe the Services should work with the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) as well as the Washington Department of

Transportation to expand the use of these structures as much as possible across the state and specifically in and around the NCE Recovery Zone as a way to further the Services broader conservation goals, including the conservation of the NEP. For this rule in particular, we believe that the Services should incorporate wildlife crossings into their "no-net-loss of core" approach to road construction. As the draft rule proposal states, "[The no-net-loss] approach indicates that if a road is constructed or opened to motorized travel, another road must be closed to motorized use in order to maintain core habitat." We believe that in addition to closing a road when a new one is opened, that new road should be constructed or retrofitted with wildlife crossing structures utilizing the best available science and observations. The current best science, as described by Ford et al. for wildlife crossings as it relates to grizzly bear conservation that takes cost into account, involves a combination of wide open-span bridges for mothers with cubs and box culverts as a cost-effective way to support singletons (that is, nonbreeding adults). This is effective because it optimizes the behavioral ecology and demographic connectivity of grizzly bears. The box culverts allow singletons to avoid families, which helps reduce intraspecies killings. The open-span bridges allow for families to easily use wildlife crossing, which is a lesson mothers can pass on to cubs, reducing the "learning curve" of bears figuring out how to use wildlife crossing structures.

There are many co-benefits to wildlife crossing structures beyond grizzly bear conservation, including conservation of other species that are often the victim of wildlife-vehicle collisions, as well as economic costs to motorists and human lives, and as mentioned earlier the Services should consider expanding the use of wildlife crossings throughout their operations, especially in the NCE. They should incorporate wildlife crossings into their current "no-net-loss" approach to roads within the NCE Recovery Zone.

Congress and the U.S. DOT agree that wildlife crossing structures are a viable way to reduce wildlife-vehicle collisions, which is why they have established the Wildlife Crossings Pilot Program (WCPP) as part of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act of 2021. This program allows the DOT, through the Federal Highway Administration, to award \$350 million total in Federal-aid for Federal Fiscal Years 2022 through 2026. Eligible entities to receive this award include: State Departments of Transportation, units of local government, regional transportation authorities, Indian tribes, federal land management agencies, and a group of any other eligible entities. We recommend that the Services apply to receive this funding for wildlife crossing. We also recommend they use the consultation and collaboration processes that are a part of this recovery plan to coordinate with other federal and local entities to try and get as much of this award into the NCE Recovery Zone as possible.

Less than 3 years is not a long time to plan and develop wildlife crossings, and even though the Services should try to be a part of the WCPP, there are other steps the Services can take to promote the use of wildlife crossings in the NCE Recovery Zone. Namely, the Services and other members of the IGBC should encourage the U.S. DOT to join the IGBC. If "road access was identified by the IGBC as one of the most imminent threats to grizzly bears" and, according to their charter, the purpose of the IGBC is "To coordinate grizzly bear policy, planning, management, research, and communication activities of state, provincial, tribal, and federal agencies to ensure the best utilization of available resources" it makes sense that the federal agency most responsible for road access and construction should be officially a part of the committees conservation efforts. As a member of the IGBC, the DOT would be able to keep the other agencies up to date on future DOT efforts to promote wildlife crossings, as well as providing advice on other ways roads on agency lands can be used to promote the conservation of grizzly bears.

Effective Public Outreach Requires Relationships to be Built

Public outreach is incredibly important when implementing a potentially controversial regulation. Human relationships with grizzly bears have been fraught at times, causing the need for grizzly bears to be reintroduced into the Northern Cascades. Already, the public has participated in the earlier Draft EIS in 2014. The 2014 public comments were considered in the formation of the current Draft EIS. Public scoping also included the interested public early in this process. We would recommend further public involvement to streamline the acceptance of grizzly bears.

As FWS and NPS begin to reintroduce grizzly bears, the agencies can host town halls. Town halls provide the public the opportunity to make comments to officials and express their concerns. The agencies can then respond in real time to the comments and concerns of the public. Town halls help build trust with the agency if the officials respond in a meaningful manner. Open houses should be avoided as these do not provide the agencies and public opportunity to meaningfully interact. Open houses are beneficial to inform the public, but not an opportunity for an exchange of ideas and information.

To increase safety of recreationists, education to differentiate between bear types should occur. To achieve this, a permit should be issued to camp and to backpack in the backcountry. Before a permit is issued, the permit holder must complete a test on their ability to differentiate between bear types. This would be similar to the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) permit required for hunters. If completing a test still fails to increase the safety of recreationists, the permit should include a course and then a test. The effectiveness should be evaluated.

To prevent conflicts, public outreach will be important in towns near grizzly bear populations. This will be especially important in Zone 3. Town halls should be offered to exchange ideas about effective bear safe regulations. Also, signage should be included on trash receptacles. Open houses would be beneficial for educational outreach.

In the Draft EIS, the agencies place some of the responsibilities on nonprofit organizations. The agencies expect the organizations will likely continue outreach about safety concerns, provide information about grizzly bears, and policies and regulations in the recovery process. This reliance on nonprofit organizations is problematic. The Draft EIS does not indicate that this reliance is official. Placing this responsibility on nonprofit organizations without communication will likely leave gaps in public outreach. Nonprofit organizations will need to devote resources to public outreach on grizzly bears where otherwise the resources may have gone towards other projects. The agencies should contact nonprofit organizations to develop relationships. As these relationships develop, both agencies and organizations should discuss what public outreach needs to occur. This should be evaluated frequently and the agencies and organizations should discuss which group would be best for delivering the information.

Adaptive Management Improves the Success of Management Goals

Adaptive management allows agencies to learn while they implement various projects and adapt to changing circumstances. Adaptation should be science-based and use the up-to-date science and methods. It also requires monitoring, assessment, and recalibration. To determine if the management objective is being achieved, there needs to be accurate baseline data as well as SMART criteria. SMART stands for specific, measurable, attainable, relevant, and time-sensitive. This criteria should inform the management goals and the intermittent goals. Adaptive management also removes the need for a repeat of the NEPA process unless circumstances change in an extreme manner.

The metrics put forth in the EIS are good metrics. However, other potential metrics include the human population's feelings

of safety near bear habitat, the geographic spread of the reintroduced population, and interactions between different populations of grizzly bears. The Draft EIS should address how the agencies plan to gather quality baseline data for the metrics chosen. The EIS should also describe how the metrics included relate to monitoring the success of the bears. The management goals are outlined well in Draft EIS. However, the steps for adaptive management are largely limited to releasing additional grizzly bears to compensate for mortality, genetic limitations, population distribution, and sex ratio. This lack of flexibility is inconsistent with adaptive management as it will not address the root issues causing the need for more bears.

Already, one potential impact that will require adaptive management is salmon poison disease. While the EIS states that populations where berries are the main food source would be the most likely source populations, it does not rule out populations dependent on salmon. An encysted fluke causes this disease and occurs in salmon in lower latitudes. If the source population has not been exposed to this fluke, the bears could become sick and lower the success of the population. In this example, simply releasing more bears would not address the issue. However, carefully choosing bears to release and developing preventative measures would.

Human actions also have potential to affect recovery, requiring adaptive management to occur.

Ranching

Under the current EIS, ranchers will be compensated for depredation of livestock. The EIS also prevents releases near the grazing allotments. However, should bears find ranches to be easy food sources or attractive for other reasons, adaptive management would be an appropriate response. An adaptive response could include new deterrents or new release areas further away from the ranches. It could also include increases to compensation to disincentivize the take of grizzly bears without the intervention of federal or state government.

Logging

Logging has been on the decline in recent years. However, with the uptick in wildfires, timber harvest may be used as a mitigation measure. The EIS predicts minimal conflict between logging and bears. The populations would likely avoid timber operations as they avoid humans according to the EIS. However, should the prediction not be accurate as logging activities may also present opportunities for easy food, the methods to avoid conflict will need to change. Perhaps permits for timber harvest should no longer be issued near grizzly bear habitat. Roads need to be built for logging, although an agreement between agencies prevents the decrease of any habitat for grizzly bears thus requiring another road to close. The new road still creates an opportunity for vehicle collisions. Should these activities prevent a successful population from growing, it may be necessary to decrease logging in the area.

Recreation

Recreation may increase or decrease depending on the public's feelings about the grizzly bears. Some may want to see grizzly bears in their natural habitat and others may want to avoid the grizzly bears. Conflicts occur more frequently when there are items such as food and trash that attract bears closer to humans. The conflicts could impact bear recovery due to the removal of problem bears. These bears would need to be relocated or euthanized to prevent deadly conflicts with humans. Adaptive management would be beneficial here to prevent conflict with humans for future bears. Some of the possible solutions could be more education for recreationists, different release sites for bears, or closures throughout the year.

Impacts of Action Without the U.S. Forest Service Should be Addressed in the EIS

As put forth in the Draft EIS, the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the Northern Cascades originally included the U.S. Forest Service (USFS), but USFS has decided to prioritize other objectives. Currently, USFS has not started working towards approval to allow grizzly bear reintroduction of USFS lands. As the process has not started, the reintroduction would be limited to NPS lands. The Draft EIS, past stating the reintroduction would be limited to NPS lands, does not discuss the consequences of eliminating USFS lands. The Draft EIS assumes access to USFS lands. By limiting the reintroduction to NPS land, the bears will be closer to each other. It also would limit the habitat the bears would have access to. It could also change the protection experienced by the bears if they were to leave NPS lands. Areas of USFS land are not equipped for grizzly bear reintroduction as well. For instance, as noted in the Draft EIS on page 25, "[t]he Okanogan-Wenatchee NF does not have food storage restrictions." The lack of regulations could lead to human-bear conflict if the USFS does not take action to prepare for grizzly bear reintroduction.

We request that the agencies take a hard look at the consequences of elimination of USFS participation in the current plan for reintroduction. The analysis should include impacts on human-bear conflict, geographic spread of the bears, and the impacts of the protection the bears would experience. The analysis should also include impacts to adaptive management strategies to human conflicts on USFS land. Depending on the outcome of the analysis, it is possible that the section 10(j) designation

should be reconsidered.

Conclusion

We respectfully request that the agency consider the following items before issuing the final rule and EIS.

Methods for preventing human-bear conflicts

Landowners

Provide information and knowledge to landowners.

Provide electric fencing or dogs to prevent bears from entering the land.

Recreationalists

Provide education on bear safety.

Provide bear spray and teach avoidance.

Motorists

Create wildlife crossings to allow safe crossing for grizzly bears.

Public outreach

Meaningful engagement

Town halls

Educational outreach

Relationships with nonprofits to help agencies with continuing outreach.

Adaptive management

Adopt SMART criteria to evaluate the effectiveness of current methods and adapt to changing circumstances.

Consider human activities that may impact recovery and decide if limiting these activities would be beneficial.

Ranching

Logging

Recreation

Partnership with USFS

Provide detailed analysis of the possible impacts on grizzly bear reintroduction.

We thank you for spending the time to read our comment and consider the options we have laid out here. We hope you incorporate at least some of our suggestions into the final rule. Most of all, we hope for the successful reintroduction of grizzly bears into the NCE, and a more sustainable, ecologically-friendly world for all.

Correspondence ID: 14314Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Boulder, CO 80305
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 23:06:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Our comment can be found here:

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1e5Ja49L253SPONx3sPv2I-isoIZc4udbvfiFxSEn0HQ/edit>

As mentioned in the document, we hope that you grant us an extension to submit our final comment by Dec. 8th.
Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14315Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tumwater, WA 98512
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 23:08:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please consider my thoughts and comments as a family with roots in the Methow Valley and a deep passion and care for the North Cascades Ecosystem. My wife and I hope to one day call the valley our home, and with family in the area believe it is one of the most important places to us and our four children on earth.

We enjoy the outdoors in many ways, hiking, fishing, hunting, skiing, cycling and anything that allows us to enjoy the natural

and unique beauty of the North Cascades.

I was saddened to read an EIS which has logical fallacies and even borders on data manipulation in order to conclude what many (who may not even be impacted directly by this decision) want to happen. The EIS attempts to compare other areas and systems that do not relate closely enough to the ecosystem and human population of the North Cascades to make any thoughtful conclusions. Grizzlies are amazing creatures, but should not be considered above and beyond the current fauna, flora and human population.

Please make the decision to "do nothing" and allow for the natural migration of grizzlies from the large and healthy population of them just north of this precious ecosystem. (That have not naturally made the decision to call the NCE their home). If for no other reason then to allow time to further study the need and viability for us to purposely manipulate this process.

Correspondence ID: 14316Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ellensburg, WA 98926
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 23:09:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is a terrible idea. I strongly oppose

Correspondence ID: 14317Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Chimacum, WA 98325
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 23:09:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We have enough protected predators with horrible management we dont need more

Correspondence ID: 14318Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Rockport, WA 98283
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 23:12:08

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am a resident of Rockport, WA writing to relevant parties in favor of Grizzly Bear Restoration in the North Cascades Ecosystem under Alternative C. Grizzlies are a critical part of this ecosystem and deserve active management in their return to the region. However, I am concerned that the management of human communities in bear country could be the source of ongoing human-human and human-bear conflict if not planned for appropriately.

Living previously in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem, I've seen first hand ways that bears can thrive and also struggle on the margins of large tracts of public land. Where I lived in Wyoming, many locals were supportive or at least resigned to the reality of a growing population of brown bears on the landscape. This led to a participatory and generally compliant citizenry willing to take additional measures and precautions to mitigate ursine conflict. Based on my experience during some of the public listening sessions for this EIS and from conversations with neighbors, I am deeply concerned about public buy-in for any measures to reduce human-bear conflict should bears return to our area.

Please consider the following questions in the final decision about grizzlies in the North Cascades:

What funding and personnel exist to support bear safe infrastructure (ex: bear proof residential trash bins)? What funding and personnel exist to support education on bear mitigation measures for local industries (ex: livestock protection best practice)? What funding and personnel exist to support public outreach on how to recreate safely in bear country (ex: signage at

trailheads)?

Who will be the messenger of any bear interaction messaging for local communities? How will this person generate rapport and trust with locals?

What role will local tribal communities and first nations have in the management of bear populations? Will there be avenues for co-management if interest is expressed by local tribal nations?

Correspondence ID: 14319Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Concrete, WA 98237
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 23:14:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Regarding the Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan:

It is with great frustration and sadness that I have to write this again. This 'plan' is as ludicrous now as it was just a few short years ago. (I guess with Biden as Pres. and Covid going on, it was a good time to try and push your agenda through again...is it 'Agenda 21' or 'Biodiversity' now??? I can't keep them straight.)

Your EIS is still one-sided and delusional, with the same great phrases such as 'tools' and 'educate' and 'enforcement'. Your 'public hearings' are still a farce.

I have no desire to be 'educated' on how to co-exist with grizzly bears...No gardens, no compost, no greenhouse, no bees, no birdfeeders, no animals. Oh, and no walks... (lest I have to prove that I was not the 'aggressor' when I shot a grizzly to save my life.) My property will not be 'core grizzly habitat', while I am alive.

It is still obvious that you couldn't care less about the thousands of people who live in the towns and villages between Sedro-Woolley and Winthrop, Darrington...the towns and residences and schools and businesses that you conveniently leave off of your 'maps'. SHAME ON YOU! (Good luck to the kids waiting for a school bus, with a snack lunch!)

You say that the bears you're proposing to bring to the area will have plenty of nuts and berries to eat (even in times of drought and wildfires)...and that they will be 'educated' not to eat meat, fish, or follow the rivers down for more salmon...

PLEASE STOP INSULTING PEOPLES' INTELLIGENCE!

'NON-ESSENTIAL AND EXPERIMENTAL' SHOULD SAY IT ALL...BUT SINCE COMMON SENSE IS NOT YOUR PRIORITY...

I VOTE 'DO NOTHING' OPTION, AGAIN.

Correspondence ID: 14320Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Lummi Island, WA 98262
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 23:15:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: What is the blatant disregard we seem to have for the value of our Apex predators? They were here before we were, we have decimated their habitat, and yet we continue to put them in the crosshairs. Leave them alone. Give them a place to thrive.

Correspondence ID: 14321Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America
Outside Organization: none Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 23:16:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the reintroduction of grizzly bears into the Cascade mountains. The grizzly is a frightening but beautiful animal who was once present in our Washington state mountains but sadly was rendered extinct by hunting. We need to restore this beautiful creature for all of us to enjoy. I do not fear the grizzly and have backpacked in grizzly country (Glacier Park, the Bob Marshall Wilderness and the Beartooth-Absaroka for many years with no issues. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14322Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Arlington, WA 98223
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 23:17:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I agree with the recommended alternative C.
It's time that we start helping our environment. I think restoring Grizzlies to the North Cascade Ecosystem will have positive effects. The Grizzlies might even teach us a thing or two if we pay close attention.

Correspondence ID: 14323Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Ellensburg, WA 98926
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 23:19:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We already have a significant predator problem and have seen a drastic decline in deer and elk population. A grizzly bear restoration plan is the last thing we need in this state. I strongly disagree with the plan

Correspondence ID: 14324Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Eastsound, WA 98245
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 23:19:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: All life is interdependent

Correspondence ID: 14325Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 23:19:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I prefer Alternative A: No Action.

If the bears return across the border on their own, so be it. At this time, I do not see that adding up to 200 bears to a North American population of approximately 60,000 bears will make a critical difference. The EIS talks about a low number in the

lower 48 states but not overall.

In addition, Washington state has 7.785 million people. That has grown from 2.8 million in 1960. Washington has 3.4 million more people than Alaska, Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming combined. Washington has a population that recreates in the Cascade Mountains north of Snoqualmie Pass daily and very heavily in the summer. The chances of human/bear interactions seems much higher than in vastly lesser populated areas. Tourists can go to Galcier and Yellowstone Parks and be in grizzly bear territory if they desire. Recreationists in Washington state will not be able to stay home and avoid them.

I realize that the number of bears in Washington will be relatively low. Hopefully, if we have 200 bears in the future few humans or bears will die if and when they meet. At this time I do not see the need to inject a very large and powerful apex predator into a very highly populated area.

Correspondence ID: 14327Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Cashmere, WA 98815
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 23:20:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I think introducing grizzlies is a selfish idea. Not only are you putting a huge population of people at risk you are affecting our ecosystem. I do not agree with this introduction!

Correspondence ID: 14328Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Roslyn, WA 98941
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 23:20:49
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I think this is desperately needed. This is their home too and first they need to be protected not shot and disposed of as is being done right now.

Correspondence ID: 14329Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Snohomish, WA 98290
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 23:21:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I absolutely oppose re-introducing grizzlies into the North Cascades. Already low Elk and deer populations will suffer. No grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 14331Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Ellensburg, WA 98926
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 23:22:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: N of I90 to the BC border is radically different now than in the 18th century when grizzlies were prevalent here. Fort Colville is the only trading post in Wa State in the 1800's that had done ANY trading in grizzly pelts in the 1800's.

They were NOT common south of the BC border but were seen in the NE corner of outer State..

You cannot actually think that the I tolrodu tion of grizzly bears in the aascades will not involve e deadly contact with

humans. What is the point since they were NOT common in the Central Cascades.

Do NOT introduce them south of Withrop/Twisp area. Totally un-needed.

Wow, really hard to believe my tax dollars are being wasted on such a plan to try to introduce such an UNCOMMON animal I to a populated area. This is NOT Yellowstone so don't compare it to ANY path.

Everyone I know in Kittitas County is against this- everyone!

Sorry for any spell check errors. I am doing this on my phone.

Correspondence ID: 14332Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mukilteo, WA 98275
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 23:23:03

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I DO NOT support reintroducing grizzly bears to the North Cascades.

Other species have been living and people have been recreating in the area for years without grizzlies. "Because they used to live here" is not sufficient reason to re-introduce an apex predator. Inexperienced or unprepared people are not the only ones who can be hurt by Grizzlies. People will certainly die as a result if this effort prevails.

Correspondence ID: 14334Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lake Stevens, WA 98258
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 23:25:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To whom it may concern,

I am writing to support the restoration of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem, their historic range for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C but with needed changes to the proposed 10(j) rule. The proposal would bring up to 25 non-conflict grizzly bears - likely from Montana - into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade and manage them as an experimental population.

The proposed 10(j) rule as currently written fails to give grizzlies the best chance to succeed and is too permissible in allowing reintroduced bears to be killed.

Lethal removal of a grizzly bear should only be considered where there is a demonstrable threat to human safety, and, for non-immediate threats to human safety, only after non-lethal management options, including concerted use of conflict prevention methods, have been exhausted.

No grizzly bears should be hazed or relocated as a result of conflict with livestock unless demonstrable, repeated efforts have been made by the livestock producer to prevent such conflicts, using commonly-available techniques.

No grizzly bears should be killed on public lands as a result of livestock depredation.

Landowners/private citizens should not be given a permit, or otherwise authorized, to kill a grizzly bear.

No grizzly bear should be preemptively relocated if the bear is not a threat to human safety, particularly if the bear has not become habituated or food-conditioned, or when non-natural foods/attractants have not been properly secured and made inaccessible to bears. Doing so acts as a disincentive for communities to employ conflict prevention measures, and increases the risk to the bear of injury or death from capture and relocation.

These changes are crucial in providing adequate protection for grizzly bears.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in

the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C and with appropriate changes to Section 10(j). Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Correspondence ID: 14335Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Tumwater, WA 98501
United States of America
Outside Organization: The Carnegie Group (of Thurston County) Civic Groups
Received: Nov,13 2023 23:26:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To whom it may concern,

Removing the larger wild creatures from the earth, as well as the seas and sky, leaves us a living-scape featureless of human scale challenge. Without these wild things to stimulate our imaginations, our lives are diminished.

I am writing to support the restoration of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem, their historic range for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C but with needed changes to the proposed 10(j) rule. The proposal would bring up to 25 non-conflict grizzly bears - likely from Montana - into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade and manage them as an experimental population.

The proposed 10(j) rule as currently written fails to give grizzlies the best chance to succeed and is too permissible in allowing reintroduced bears to be killed.

Lethal removal of a grizzly bear should only be considered where there is a demonstrable threat to human safety, and, for non-immediate threats to human safety, only after non-lethal management options, including concerted use of conflict prevention methods, have been exhausted.

No grizzly bears should be hazed or relocated as a result of conflict with livestock unless demonstrable, repeated efforts have been made by the livestock producer to prevent such conflicts, using commonly-available techniques.

No grizzly bears should be killed on public lands as a result of livestock depredation.

Landowners/private citizens should not be given a permit, or otherwise authorized, to kill a grizzly bear.

No grizzly bear should be preemptively relocated if the bear is not a threat to human safety, particularly if the bear has not become habituated or food-conditioned, or when nonnatural foods/attractants have not been properly secured and made inaccessible to bears. Doing so acts as a disincentive for communities to employ conflict prevention measures, and increases the risk to the bear of injury or death from capture and relocation.

These changes are crucial in providing adequate protection for grizzly bears.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C and with appropriate changes to Section 10(j). Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Correspondence ID: 14336Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Renton, WA 98059
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 23:26:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do not support the introduction of Grizzly Bears in the North Cascades.

WA state has proven to now be willing or able to manage the current predators in our state. WA state continues to make

policy based on politics and feelings rather than facts and science.

Canada already is planning to reintroduce Grizzlies so they will be here regardless. We should work on a plan to manage those bears when they move South.

Correspondence ID: 14338Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Selah, WA 98942
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 23:27:21

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Thank you for this opportunity to comment on restoration of the Grizzly Bears to the North Cascades. Contrary to the what Representative Newhouse keeps saying, I am a resident of central WA and firmly believe that grizzly bears should be restored to the North Cascades. I support Alternative C and the proposal to bring up to 25 grizzly bears into the North Cascades. I would also like to see changes made to the proposed 10(j) rule because I am concerned the proposed 10(j) rule as written is too permissible in allowing reintroduced bears to be killed.

Lethal removal of a grizzly bear is allowable when there is a real demonstrable threat to a person's safety. I am concerned that grizzly bears may be killed due to livestock conflict on public lands, I do not think that should be allowed. No landowners or private citizens should be given a permit to kill a grizzly bear.

The counties surrounding the grizzly bear reintroduction should begin the use of something equivalent to a Bear Smart program to help minimize the chance of grizzly bears become habituated to garbage.

Correspondence ID: 14340Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Oak Harbor, WA 98277
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 23:28:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am against reinsertion of grizzly bears in the North Cascades of Wa State. There are too many camper, hikers, and those of us who wish to enjoy the beauty of the N Cascade parks and trails without fearing for these animal attacks. Keep them in their own habitat and quit meddling by relocation. If they migrate on their own, fine. But inserting them into this area in an inorganic way goes against nature.

Correspondence ID: 14341Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Arlington, WA 98223
United States of America

Outside Organization: Cascade Horse Club a chapter of Back Country Horseman of Washington Non-Governmental(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,13 2023 23:28:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the: Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Environmental Impact Statement for the North Cascades Ecosystem

As a member of Back Country Horsemen of Washington, I am very concerned with the ability to continue to recreate in the North Cascades should a small population of heavily protected grizzly bears be mechanically moved into the region that we recreate in. The DEIS does not sufficiently analyze the impact to recreation or present any options for how trails can be maintained open in the presence of protections implemented to reduce human-grizzly interactions.

1. The Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail runs through the core habitat and has permitted distance hikers of around 10,000. When considering the other trail users in and along the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE) since this is one of the most populated areas around any bear

ecosystem, the use likely exceeds a quarter million visits. However, the DEIS indicates that the use is insignificant. It is very significant and will likely result in many human-bear interactions.

2. The Pacific Northwest National Scenic Trail also runs through the NCE as well as other bear ecosystems to the east, including the Cabinet-Yaak (CYE). The CYE has a more established population of bears but still has resulted in challenges to the very existence of the trail due to the limited number of bears in the CYE (20-40). Opposition to the National Scenic Trail in the recovering bear population area as well as the connecting landscapes between ecosystems has also been expressed by USFWS staff, the same agency putting forth the NCE proposal through which the same trail will pass.

3. Without a more detailed analysis of how to retain the carrying capacity of the trails, trailheads, and campgrounds without resulting in long-term or permanent closures, there is no way to effectively review this DEIS.

4. Furthermore, the NPS and USFWS have pointed out that the Canadian counterparts and First Nations are preparing to release grizzly bears in the northern part of the NCE. IF that was the only release point, it would move the core recovery/release area north and away from the more densely human-populated areas of Washington State. It also would be in line with Washington State law as well since no bears would be translocated directly into Washington, and there also would be predictability on how many bears are being moved into the entire NCE which overlaps both countries. The BC government has noted that its Recovery Plan is being developed jointly with the USFWS even though this US EIS only addresses the Washington effort.

5. As a trail horse rider in the NCE, I ask that the No Action Alternative be selected. The areas we ride in include the Mt Baker Snoqualmie National Forest, the Okanogan Wenatchee National Forest including the Pasayten Wilderness, and the North Cascades National Park. We have many horse camps along the boundary of the NCE. We cannot support either Action Alternative without more substantive analysis on impacts on recreation as well as knowing more on the joint planning with Canadian counterparts.

Correspondence ID: 14342Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ellensburg, WA 98926
United States of America

Outside Organization: Individual Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 23:30:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this important issue. There is no reason to reintroduce an apex predator such as the grizzly bear into the north cascades. It has been too long since they were there and too many changes have happened since that time with humans and other wildlife in the area. It is irresponsible to even consider bringing them back. Please give up this outlandish idea once and for all. There will be unintended consequences and it will be the innocent victims who suffer those consequences. Just say NO to grizzly bears in the North Cascades. Wolves have done enough harm in their reintroduction to Washington State, please stop.

Correspondence ID: 14343Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 23:30:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please support restoring grizzly bears to their natural habitat in the North Cascades for their help in dispersing seeds, aerating alpine soils and bringing back this important part of our biodiversity.

Correspondence ID: 14344Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 23:31:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do not allow the reintroduction of grizzly into my back yard!!!!
We enjoy our forests by hiking, horse back riding and camping. This is WAY to close to where people reside!!!
Do not do this!!

Correspondence ID: 14345Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Ellensburg, WA 98926
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 23:31:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: With the influx of people to the eastern side of the state, we are taking away the natural habitat from native wildlife. By introducing aggressive bears into the mix is just asking for trouble. It's a lose/lose situation for both humans and bears. It's unfortunate those who claim to be experts are oblivious to the tug-of-war between land developers and wildlife. Such a tragedy...

Correspondence ID: 14346Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Olympia, WA 98516
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 23:32:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: After study there are several weaknesses in the preferred Alternative C that should be rectified and that make Alternative B a method more likely to promptly result in repopulation of the grizzly bear to the NCE. Alternative C compromises recovery by allowing takes in a lax, less restrictive manner. An unintentional "take" during black bear hunting season, even if repeated during several seasons by an individual hunter might be forced to go unsanctioned. Recovery efforts of the Gray Wolf in NE Washington have been plagued by depredation complaints, the majority of which come from a very small number of gray wolf recovery opponents. Is there a reason to repeat this mistake in a recovery plan? Alternative C also gives weight to the economic interests of mining and forest harvesting that are destructive to the essential habitat of this threatened species. There is no good science or evidence that promoting the interests of extractive industries promotes recovery of a threatened species. The lower requirements for consultation in Alternative C also do not do the better job of helping the threatened grizzly bear recover in the NCE or its natural range in Washington State. By creating the expansive management zones of Zone 2 and 3 that encompass all of WA state outside the Selkirk Ecosystem the preferred Alternative C, without science or evidence to support it and by a fait accompli removes the grizzly bear's threatened species designation from vast areas of potential habitat in Washington state. This would include such areas as all NPS and NFS lands south of Interstate 90 including Mount Rainier NP, the Goat Rocks Wilderness, the W.O. Douglas Wilderness, Mount Adams Wilderness, and lands on the Olympic Peninsula including the vast wilderness lands of Olympic NF and Olympic NF For these reasons and given statements in the draft EIS referencing socioeconomics and prioritizing these concerns at the same level as grizzly bear recovery the preferred Alternative C should not be adopted and Alternative B should be accepted and adopted.
Respectfully,
[REDACTED]
Olympia, WA

Correspondence ID: 14347Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 23:33:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To whom it may concern,

I am writing to support the restoration of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem, their historic range for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C but with needed changes to the proposed 10(j) rule. The proposal would bring up to 25 non-conflict grizzly bears - likely from Montana - into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade and manage them as an experimental population.

The proposed 10(j) rule as currently written fails to give grizzlies the best chance to succeed and is too permissible in allowing reintroduced bears to be killed.

Lethal removal of a grizzly bear should only be considered where there is a demonstrable threat to human safety, and, for non-immediate threats to human safety, only after non-lethal management options, including concerted use of conflict prevention methods, have been exhausted.

No grizzly bears should be hazed or relocated as a result of conflict with livestock unless demonstrable, repeated efforts have been made by the livestock producer to prevent such conflicts, using commonly-available techniques.

No grizzly bears should be killed on public lands as a result of livestock depredation.

Landowners/private citizens should not be given a permit, or otherwise authorized, to kill a grizzly bear.

No grizzly bear should be preemptively relocated if the bear is not a threat to human safety, particularly if the bear has not become habituated or food-conditioned, or when nonnatural foods/attractants have not been properly secured and made inaccessible to bears. Doing so acts as a disincentive for communities to employ conflict prevention measures, and increases the risk to the bear of injury or death from capture and relocation.

These changes are crucial in providing adequate protection for grizzly bears.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C and with appropriate changes to Section 10(j). Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Correspondence ID: 14348Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 23:33:56

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Although Grizzly bears are beautiful creatures, I do not feel they should be brought to the Pacific North West. So my vote is for alternative A (do nothing, do not bring grizzly's here). Our national forest is a host to many different types of recreation in all 4 seasons. If Grizzly bears were brought back, they could cause a real threat to the people who recreate in our national forest. The Grizzly is a real danger to people's safety. I am then afraid if this happens that it would give the government reason to shut down the national forest to the people. The people whose tax dollars pay for its maintenance. If closures were to happen this would create a ripple effect that would harm the local communities. There are many small mountain communities that rely to the people who recreate in the mountains. They're tourist towns and if the tourist who come there to recreate no longer come due to the Forrest being shut down, due to Grizzly bears, than you will harm the people's lively hood.

Correspondence ID: 14349Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Everett, WA 98208
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 23:34:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello! Thank you for your time. I want to say that I strongly disagree with grizzly bears being considered for the North Cascades ecosystem. I hope that you will listen to the everyday people that this decision will impact. I'm a mom with two young children and I am so excited that they are finally getting old enough to explore the beauty, splendor, and serenity of the one of a kind North Cascades wilderness. I grew up exploring this beautiful area on hikes with my family and they are some of my most treasured memories. I know that being in nature has inherent risks, but I will not feel comfortable at all bringing my kids to the North Cascades anymore if this happens. It is heartbreaking to think about my kids not sharing these same memories I have. In addition, even though this area is wild, it is nearby so many large populations of people that are ever expanding. It would be unfair for the bears to be placed in this area because it would set up conflict and confrontation with humans that are entirely unavoidable. Additionally, several heavily used highways access the very heart of the NCE including, SR 20, US 2 and I90. The hundreds of overflow-vehicles lining SR 20 on weekends around trailheads is a testament to the intense recreational interest and use of these wild lands, which is steadily increasing. I have experienced lines of hikers and their dogs using the popular trails along the crest of the Cascades. Estimates of use in this area are definitely underestimated, because not everyone signs the trail logs.

The EIS seems to rely heavily on Yellowstone Park statistics regarding bear/person interactions citing the park's large visitor use. However, the data doesn't reveal that the great majority of those visitors are primarily driving along the roads and hiking heavily used boardwalks to popular hot springs. In the North Cascades, there are many more people accessing backcountry trails in the deep wilderness where encounters will be much more likely. You can't compare experience at Yellowstone Park to the NCE, Yellowstone has been in the business of people & bear Management for over a hundred years. Also, unlike Yellowstone, the NCE has no big herds of ungulates to prey upon.

There is no logical reason why bringing grizzly bears to this area is a necessary or positive thing for anyone (or animal) directly involved in the situation. The main reason that I have heard in support of it is simply because it used to be an area where they lived. But, the area has changed so dramatically and it is not a positive thing for the bears to have to be confronted by angry or scared people who could act in drastic ways and harm or kill the bears. And, it is not a positive thing for the farmers, ranchers, and recreationalists who would be facing the threat of encountering grizzly bears when going about their daily lives. I very strongly support the 'no action' alternative and I hope this is just one story of many that helps encourage this decision. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Correspondence ID: 14350Project:112008Document:132104

Address: North Bend, WA 98045
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 23:34:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to express my reservations regarding the proposed reintroduction of grizzly bears to the state of Washington, particularly concerning the potential impact on local elk and deer populations. While I appreciate the importance of wildlife conservation, I am concerned that the presence of grizzly bears may have detrimental effects on these key prey species.

Elk and deer are crucial components of Washington's ecosystems, and their populations are already subject to various challenges, including habitat loss and other environmental pressures. The introduction of grizzly bears, as apex predators, has the potential to further disrupt the delicate balance within these ecosystems.

One of the primary concerns is the predation pressure that grizzly bears could exert on elk and deer populations. Grizzly bears are known to be opportunistic hunters, and their reintroduction may lead to a decline in these ungulate species. This could have cascading effects on the entire ecosystem, affecting not only the populations of elk and deer but also the predators and scavengers that depend on them.

The potential decrease in elk and deer populations could have significant repercussions for hunters, who play a vital role in wildlife management and contribute substantially to conservation efforts through licensing fees. A decline in these popular game species could adversely impact local economies and recreational activities, leading to unintended consequences for

both residents and the state as a whole.

Before moving forward with the reintroduction of grizzly bears, a comprehensive and scientifically rigorous assessment of the potential impact on elk and deer populations is essential. This should include thorough modeling of predator-prey dynamics and consideration of alternative conservation strategies that minimize disruption to existing ecosystems.

I urge you to carefully weigh the potential consequences on local wildlife populations, taking into account the concerns of hunters, conservationists, and other stakeholders. It is crucial to strike a balance that ensures the conservation of endangered species without unduly compromising the well-being and sustainability of existing ecosystems.

Correspondence ID: 14352Project:112008Document:132104
Address: EDMONDS, WA 98020
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 23:35:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To whom it may concern,

I am writing to support the restoration of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem, their historic range for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C but with needed changes to the proposed 10(j) rule. The proposal would bring up to 25 non-conflict grizzly bears - likely from Montana - into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade and manage them as an experimental population.

The proposed 10(j) rule as currently written fails to give grizzlies the best chance to succeed and is too permissible in allowing reintroduced bears to be killed.

Lethal removal of a grizzly bear should only be considered where there is a demonstrable threat to human safety, and, for non-immediate threats to human safety, only after non-lethal management options, including concerted use of conflict prevention methods, have been exhausted.

No grizzly bears should be hazed or relocated as a result of conflict with livestock unless demonstrable, repeated efforts have been made by the livestock producer to prevent such conflicts, using commonly-available techniques.

No grizzly bears should be killed on public lands as a result of livestock depredation.

Landowners/private citizens should not be given a permit, or otherwise authorized, to kill a grizzly bear.

No grizzly bear should be preemptively relocated if the bear is not a threat to human safety, particularly if the bear has not become habituated or food-conditioned, or when nonnatural foods/attractants have not been properly secured and made inaccessible to bears. Doing so acts as a disincentive for communities to employ conflict prevention measures, and increases the risk to the bear of injury or death from capture and relocation.

These changes are crucial in providing adequate protection for grizzly bears.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C and with appropriate changes to Section 10(j). Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Correspondence ID: 14353Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98226
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 23:36:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have been a Whatcom County Resident for over 30 years.
I am against reintroducing a Grizzly Bears into our region they are lethal animals they have no predators. I would opt for Alternative A: No Action.

Correspondence ID: 14354Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 23:37:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The DEIS, as written, seems adequate for the NEPA process associated with the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE). The alternatives and their comparative evaluation seem reasonable and suitable to restoration the grizzly bear population in the contiguous 48 states under the Endangered Species Act.

General Comments

Restoring grizzly bears to the NCE is a critical step to making the ecosystem whole again. It completes the wilderness. It restores the integrity of the ecosystem, notably rebuilding interspecies relationships and behaviors. As the reintroduction of wolves to the Yellowstone ecosystem illustrated, the chain of behavioral changes (elk/beaver/riparian birds) may be more impactful than the simple competition for resources.

Alternatives B and C are both proactive recovery plans to establish a small population. The presence of grizzlies on the landscape will: reverse the trend towards extinction and improve biodiversity and transform the backcountry experience. Grizzlies are not without downsides: risk to human safety, risk of livestock and agricultural losses, cost and opportunity cost, changes in human behavior, and deterrence to risk-averse visitors.

For me, the rewards greatly exceed the downsides.

"Substantive" Comment

One aspect of grizzly reintroduction to the NCE that is not developed in the DEIS is the interaction with recovery efforts in Canada. There are a dizzying set of possible outcomes that have some chance to seriously impact management of the US reintroduction that are only hinted at in the DEIS.

On pages 24 and 48-49, the DEIS notes that the British Columbia government and First Nations intend to recover grizzly bears in the Canadian portion of the NCE, likely by translocation. The presence of translocated bears across the border raises the possibility of several immigration scenarios that impact Alternatives A, B and C in complicated ways.

The permutations of outcomes are too many to review, but some examples illustrate the possible impact on US management plans. For the purposes of illustration, let's assume that translocated Canadian bears have radio-tracking collars and their DNA has been sampled. Hence, they can be tracked and individually identified. Their progeny may be unknown, untrackable and only identifiable through DNA sampling. And assume that US and Canadian wildlife management are in complete communication and harmony, say, through IGBC ecosystem executive committees.

The DEIS (p. 24) says that a Canadian bear immigrating into the US would be covered under the 4(d) rule but not 10(j), if triggered. If a collared bear crossed into the US, one would imagine that BC authorities would notify US authorities. Is that bear managed differently from a translocated US bear, who, ironically, might have been translocated from BC? If an uncollared bear immigrated to the US, it would represent "natural recovery" and fits how into Alternative C? Determining an individual bear's origin would require a DNA sample.

A single bear doesn't make a population, but a female with a range straddling the border could, in a couple of years. How do you treat the first immigrant?

An extreme example of the possibilities would be: if the US EIS process is suspended again and Alternative A is selected by default, translocated bears in Canada could immigrate and seed a "natural recovery" that would necessitate ingredients from Alternatives B and C: public education; improved sanitation; and research and monitoring to determine grizzly bear presence, distribution, habitat, and home ranges. Alternative A is no longer viable.

It isn't obvious to me how probable any scenarios like these are. The interaction with Canadian activities seems important and complicated, and might beneficially have been addressed in the DEIS.

However, it may be just too arcane to address them in a public document like an EIS. The IGBC is the cited mechanism of coordination with Canadian authorities. Hopefully, at this point in history, this is a well-oiled and effective mechanism. I trust that the public employees will know the right thing and do it if the time comes.

Correspondence ID: 14356Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Woodland, WA 98674
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 23:37:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do not want grizzlies re-introduced into the Cascades

Correspondence ID: 14357Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 23:39:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do not do this. As an avid outdoors person the last thing I want to encounter is a grizzly. Also, quit trying to reintroduce Wolves into Washington state. Why on earth people want to reintroduce apex predators is beyond me.

Correspondence ID: 14358Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 23:40:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To whom it may concern,

I am writing to support the restoration of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem, their historic range for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C but with needed changes to the proposed 10(j) rule. The proposal would bring up to 25 non-conflict grizzly bears - likely from Montana - into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade and manage them as an experimental population.

The proposed 10(j) rule as currently written fails to give grizzlies the best chance to succeed and is too permissible in allowing reintroduced bears to be killed.

Lethal removal of a grizzly bear should only be considered where there is a demonstrable threat to human safety, and, for non-immediate threats to human safety, only after non-lethal management options, including concerted use of conflict prevention methods, have been exhausted.

No grizzly bears should be hazed or relocated as a result of conflict with livestock unless demonstrable, repeated efforts have been made by the livestock producer to prevent such conflicts, using commonly-available techniques.

No grizzly bears should be killed on public lands as a result of livestock depredation.

Landowners/private citizens should not be given a permit, or otherwise authorized, to kill a grizzly bear. No grizzly bear should be preemptively relocated if the bear is not a threat to human safety, particularly if the bear has not become habituated or food-conditioned, or when nonnatural foods/attractants have not been properly secured and made inaccessible to bears. Doing so acts as a disincentive for communities to employ conflict prevention measures, and increases the risk to the bear of injury or death from capture and relocation. These changes are crucial in providing adequate protection for grizzly bears.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C and with appropriate changes to Section 10(j). Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Correspondence ID: 14359Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ellensburg, WA 98926
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 23:40:58

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am strongly opposed to bringing Grizzlies to the North Cascades. I am perturbed that the title of the plan is "restoration"; if the habitat for Grizzlies was present in this area, there would be Grizzlies there. Where the habitat exists there are Grizzlies. They are not endangered where there is proper habitat. Please do not force the people who live and recreate in the North cascades to have to deal with Grizzlies. Respectfully, find something better to worry about than putting bears in areas where there are people.

Correspondence ID: 14360Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ellensburg, WA 98926
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 23:41:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is not a good idea. As someone who rides horses, four wheels, hikes, camps and fishes on park lands, this is going to result in some very bad situations.

You can say you're only going to release grizzlies in areas where humans don't live, but as you can see by the wolf and cougar, elk, deer, coyotes and more populations, that only lasts until the population gets so large that the ecosystem can no longer sustain them. Then they start to move where humans live, recreate or have livestock and we are back in competition with them again.

I hate to say it, but there are a lot of people who are in the parks and on the trails that have no sense, as seen by the people trying to pet the buffalo. These are the people who most likely are wanting the Grizzlies reintroduced because they lived there a couple hundred years ago. But they don't have to live with them in their back yard or put up with them when they are no longer scared of humans. They are the ones who will leave food out either through ignorance or because they don't think a bear will hurt them and either cause the animal to be killed or other people to get hurt.

I know that I don't want to come across one while out riding or doing any of things I like to do.

What is going to happen when they have a population explosion because hunting isn't allowed? What is going to happen when livestock gets hurt or eaten? When pets or people get hurt? Are we going to have the same situation like what is going on with the wolves?

We have to remember that Grizzlies are an apex predator, meaning that they have no natural enemies except other grizzlies and/or humans. I know that the, and I hate to use the term, "greenies"; won't want them to have any sort of population control until they get to be way to big of a problem.

Correspondence ID: 14361Project:112008Document:132104

Address: marysville, WA 98271
United States of America

Outside Organization: Department of Defense Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 23:41:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I fully support the reintroduction of grizzlies to the Cascades. Please do not let close-minded, uneducated, lazy, and irresponsible individuals to deter this plan from happening. So many people have already submitted uninformed, ignorant comments that are fueled by propaganda and the unwillingness to acknowledge facts. Grizzlies returning to the North Cascades will hardly impact humans whatsoever, and the humans that it does stand to affect, can mitigate the issues they are concerned about through personal responsible measures. Grizzlies would still be in these areas if it were not for the same type of individuals who are being vocal about the bears not returning. Please help these wonderful creatures return to their former home.

Correspondence ID: 14362Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Anacortes, WA 98221
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 23:42:10

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly support the Endanger Species Act section 10(J). I also support section C of the alternatives to choose from. I was involved in the initial Grizzly Bear Pan and I know that the habitat is sound. I was the Assistant Superintendent at the time.

This plan will both effectively restore grizzly bears in North Cascades National Park and give people the tools they need to thrive in and around grizzly bear country. Grizzlies belong in the North Cascades, as they enhance the park's ecological integrity and contribute to its wildness.

Grizzly bears play a vital role in maintaining ecosystem balance, cycling nutrients, dispersing seeds, and changing the behavior of species around them. Restoring them would benefit the park and the people who use it.

A restored population of grizzlies will boost the park's appeal and attract nature enthusiasts, scientists, and tourists from around the world. This would provide economic benefits to local communities and support the park's mission to protect park resources in perpetuity.

Alternative C, with the 10(j) rule, provides managers flexibility to address community concerns while protecting the grizzly population. It ensures coexistence between humans and bears.

There were two opinion polls earlier while at the Park. Both showed ver favorable support for Grizzly Bears in the ecosystem. As I recall, approximately 75 % of respondent were in fave of restoration with a vocal group of about 18% in favor with the rest undecided.

Please consider the positive ecological and economic benefits and support Alternative C. Restoring grizzly bears will secure the park's natural heritage and conserve an iconic species for current and future generations.

Thank you for your dedication to our national parks.

Correspondence ID: 14363Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98512
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 23:42:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I've taken a personal interest in the science that goes into bringing large carnivores back to portions of their historical ranges. I'm also an avid trail runner and hunter who spends as much time as I can afford in the North Cascades. I'm a poster child for someone likely to encounter a grizzly at some point, and so I've given this a lot of thought and consideration over the years. Ultimately, I feel that grizzlies belong on this landscape. It was a sin against nature to have extirpated them in the first place.

I do hope officials will allow for recreational hunting to assist in managing numbers once the state hits predetermined population targets. There is a supply and demand side to this heritage we're privileged to still enjoy, and participation feeds into a system that funds conservation work. Mandate packing out the meat and forfeiting gall bladders to state officials to maximize use of the resource without waste or exploitation.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this issue.

Correspondence ID: 14365Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98117
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 23:43:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I frequently hike and backpack in the North Cascades ecosystem. I would support proposal C for the reintroduction of grizzlies in the North Cascades with increased management options. While I recognize that the reintroduction of grizzlies may raise concerns and uncertainties, I believe that with careful planning, education, and community involvement, we can create an environment where both humans and grizzlies coexist. The benefits of a healthy, fully functioning ecosystem are far-reaching and hopefully future generations will appreciate their presence.

Correspondence ID: 14366Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Spokane, WA 99207
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 23:43:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support proposed alternative B because I believe we should do what we can to restore the grizzly bear to its former range as much as possible, both for the cultural and ecological significance of having a thriving grizzly population in the NCE.

I support alternative B over alternative C because if we are going to go through the trouble of transporting bears from Canada, Montana, or Wyoming to Washington, we should do what we can to protect them, even if it comes at the expense of livestock and/or economic activities; otherwise, what's the point? Livestock should not be grazing in public lands, so I do not consider livestock predation to be a valid concern. As for other economic concerns, such as timber and mining, I prefer restoring and protecting grizzlies over protecting market concerns. There are trees and mines elsewhere throughout the country, so if a company does not want to deal with the burdens of the ESA, they can go somewhere else.

Overall, I think NPS (and FWS) did a good job addressing the concerns that I had about preserving wilderness character. I agree with NPS' reasoning concerning wilderness impact. Restoring grizzly bears adds to wilderness character more than what a few helicopter flights year detracts from it. Certainly, the helicopters couldn't be worse than the EA-18G Growlers that the Navy regularly fly over Olympic National Park (when will they be held in violation of the wilderness act?).

Thank you for the informative draft restoration plan/EIS and for considering my comment.

Correspondence ID: 14367Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Snohomish, WA 98290-5884
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023 23:43:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: US Department of the Interior
US Fish and Wildlife Service
National Park Service

Dear Human Beings,

Regarding the Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/Environmental Impact Statement for the North Cascades Ecosystem, September 2023, I offer the following comments:

When I wore a younger man's clothes, I had the luxury of working one summer in Glacier National Park, specifically, Many Glacier. I actually considered it a paid vacation. During days off, most of the employees would typically go hiking, including myself. What memories are forever etched in my mind?

Those of encountering, experiencing, and quite simply, being in awe around GRIZ. The best memory, is encountering a sow with her two cubs, literally on the Continental Divide. Several encounters that summer as well as additional encounters on several week-long backpacks in subsequent years.

As Edward Abbey stated, "A wild place without dangers is an absurdity... we must not allow our national parks and national forests to be degraded to the status of mere public playgrounds. Open to all, yes of course. But enter at your own risk."

Restoring GRIZ is the right thing to do culturally, environmentally, ethically, as well as a legal obligation to restore this iconic, top apex predator native species. Due to the numerous threats to this species, population augmentation is the only way to recover GRIZ. The species has the second slowest reproductive rate of all North American mammals, making it all the more harder for it to rebound from threats to its survival. In addition, from a species standpoint, it's better to have more distribution in case of ecological disasters or disease breakouts.

GRIZ also is an important player in the ecosystem by providing an ecological role for what bears are famous for in the woods, which ends up distributing nutrients and seeds.

I support Alternative C but with needed changes to the proposed 10(j) rule. The proposal would bring up to 25 non-conflict grizzly bears - likely from Montana - into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade and manage them as an experimental population.

The proposed 10(j) rule as currently written fails to give grizzlies the best chance to succeed and is too permissible in allowing reintroduced bears to be killed.

Lethal removal of a grizzly bear should only be considered where there is a demonstrable threat to human safety, and, for non-immediate threats to human safety, only after non-lethal management options, including concerted use of conflict prevention methods, have been exhausted.

No grizzly bears should be hazed or relocated as a result of conflict with livestock unless demonstrable, repeated efforts have been made by the livestock producer to prevent such conflicts, using commonly-available techniques.

No grizzly bears should be killed on public lands as a result of livestock depredation.

Landowners/private citizens should not be given a permit, or otherwise authorized, to kill a grizzly bear.

No grizzly bear should be preemptively relocated if the bear is not a threat to human safety, particularly if the bear has not become habituated or food-conditioned, or when nonnatural foods/attractants have not been properly secured and made inaccessible to bears. Doing so acts as a disincentive for communities to employ conflict prevention measures, and increases the risk to the bear of injury or death from capture and relocation.

In summation, bears don't pollute, clear cut, burn or cause extinction of animal species. In fact, I believe our Wilderness areas need protection from OUR species, the most irresponsible, dangerous and destructive animal in the wilderness ain't GRIZ, it's us, and our burgeoning population.

Many thanks for the opportunity to help support these critters.

A Wilder,

Correspondence ID: 14368Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Arlington, WA 98223
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 23:44:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: This is a foolish concept with a history of well founded rebuttals. Here we are spending a huge amount of dollars ripping up perfectly serviceable culverts in Washington state to return the salmon population and simultaneously proposing introducing a species that is debatably even historically a tangible thing. Grizzlies will invariably return to the salmon grounds in valleys rather than remaining in high altitude low food ridge areas. Guess what? Human conflict. Who loses? Bears. Always.

I am a land owner in the potentially affected valley areas. The bear will lose. The bear will lose.

Relinquish these poorly procured research and public probing funds towards access road maintenance for recreational use. I have spent several thousand hours in the last 20 years maintaining FS Rd 2060 with nearly zero help from the feds.

Grow up people, and be realistic and absorptive of the needs and desires of your constituents.

Grizzlies are not compatible with the current NPS AND FS LANDS.

Correspondence ID: 14370Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 23:46:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No Action Alternative A

Grizzlies are no longer endangered and have been requested to be removed from the Endangered Species List. It is unnecessary for the redundant actions of inserting grizzlies in a more populated area of the NCE.

Grizzlies do not stay in their recovery zone. They can wander up to 1500 miles. Grizzlies are apex predators. When they awaken from hibernation, they will do what they can to get what they need for fuel. That is their instinct.

I would like to leave a few words of wisdom from the Proverbs 27:12

"The prudent see danger and take refuge, but the simple keep going and pay the penalty."

The people in and near the recovery zone are prudent. We see the danger, We are raising the flag.
Please don't make us pay the penalty.

Correspondence ID: 14372Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Marysville, WA 98271
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 23:46:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support the responsible effort to reintroduce Grizzlies to the North Cascades. Repopulating these magnificent creatures back to their original home would be a welcome victory for the species. I'd be more than happy to share a backyard with them!

Correspondence ID: 14373Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98501
United States of America

Outside Organization: self Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 23:47:52

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm for re-introduction of grizzly bear to the North Cascades. My 30 years' experience with USFWS in Lacey Office as Fish and Wildlife Biologist has shown me that grizzly re-intro will be handled with care and fairness to all. On that basis, I recommend it!

Correspondence ID: 14375Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Leavenworth, WA 98826
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 23:48:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Stop the study now and save money by letting the First Nations Tribal Council release Grizzly bears into Canada. If they migrate south naturally to habitat in the US, we won't have to pay a dime for the reintroduction process. Spend funds on trail, road, and campsite maintenance not on outrageously expensive reintroduction schemes like this.

Correspondence ID: 14376Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mountlake Terrace, WA 98043
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 23:49:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To whom it may concern,

I am writing to support the restoration of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem, their historic range for thousands of years. Where grizzly bears thrive, so does clean water, and abundant native fish and wildlife populations.

I support Alternative C but with needed changes to the proposed 10(j) rule. The proposal would bring up to 25 non-conflict grizzly bears - likely from Montana - into remote areas of the North Cascades over the next decade and manage them as an experimental population.

The proposed 10(j) rule as currently written fails to give grizzlies the best chance to succeed and is too permissible in allowing reintroduced bears to be killed.

Lethal removal of a grizzly bear should only be considered where there is a demonstrable threat to human safety, and, for non-immediate threats to human safety, only after non-lethal management options, including concerted use of conflict prevention methods, have been exhausted.

No grizzly bears should be hazed or relocated as a result of conflict with livestock unless demonstrable, repeated efforts have

been made by the livestock producer to prevent such conflicts, using commonly-available techniques.

No grizzly bears should be killed on public lands as a result of livestock depredation.

Landowners/private citizens should not be given a permit, or otherwise authorized, to kill a grizzly bear.

No grizzly bear should be preemptively relocated if the bear is not a threat to human safety, particularly if the bear has not become habituated or food-conditioned, or when nonnatural foods/attractants have not been properly secured and made inaccessible to bears. Doing so acts as a disincentive for communities to employ conflict prevention measures, and increases the risk to the bear of injury or death from capture and relocation.

These changes are crucial in providing adequate protection for grizzly bears.

Public opinion polls have shown broad support for grizzly bear restoration in Washington, including among those who live in the North Cascades. Please bring back this native species to our state through the strategy laid out in Alternative C and with appropriate changes to Section 10(j). Doing so will restore an important piece of our ecosystem, regional culture, and natural heritage.

Correspondence ID: 14377Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 23:49:55

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Restoration of the north cascade ecosystem is important. For that reason, I support bringing the grizzlies back. I recognize that fear may drive I need to oppose that restoration. But it's important for our future and for our children's future in this environment.

Correspondence ID: 14378Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Moses Lake, WA 98837
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 23:50:41

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I oppose the reintroduction. If you are going to bring in bears rather than letting nature run its course, then start in the Puget Sound where the bears once lived.

Correspondence ID: 14379Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Lynden, WA 98264
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 23:50:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I oppose grizzly reintroduction in the North Cascades. We have had two different grizzly bears on trail cams in Manning park relatively recently. Grizzlies have been observed in Ferry County, and recently one washed up on a Washington beach. They are either near the North Cascades or a small population exists there. If the North Cascades is such great habitat, let them reestablish naturally or spend the money researching and helping the small population that probably exists there. I would much rather have the chance of observing a rare grizzly bear from a natural population, than a bear that has been brought in by man from another population.

Correspondence ID: 14380Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Cle Elum, WA 98922
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 23:53:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I currently oppose this program until residents near any repopulation of Grizzly and its range of habitat are FULLY informed and prepared and can accept the hazards for both humans and animal. In our current world I am doubtful humans have a clue what to do with wildlife let alone such an animal. See Yellowstone visitors on YouTube for examples.

Correspondence ID: 14381Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ellensburg, WA 98926
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 23:54:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Grizzlies should be returned to the ecosystem. We need apex predators back where they historically roamed. The food webs depend on healthy diverse populations of bears, wolves, cougars, etc. bring them home!

Correspondence ID: 14382Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Ellensburg, WA 98926
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 23:54:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I would prefer that Grizzly Bears not be further introduced into such a highly trafficked/human populated and heavily used recreation area as the North Cascades. This will result in fatalities, both human and bear. It is not necessary, needed or wanted.

Correspondence ID: 14383Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Edmonds, WA 98020
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 23:55:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Thank you for taking comments on grizzly bear recovery in the North Cascades.

Grizzly bears are culturally and spiritually important to Indigenous people in the region, and ecologically important for the dispersal of plants and seeds, and for soil aeration.

The North Cascades is a recognized bear recovery zone and an ideal habitat for a self-sustaining bear population.

Humans have caused the steep decline of grizzly bears. We have a responsibility to restore them and an opportunity for our generation to leave the land in better, more resilient shape than we found it. An ecosystem that can support bears is a healthy ecosystem.

North Cascades National Park is my "go-to" National Park. I typically visit the North Cascades 2-3 times a year. In addition, I visit Alaska/BC almost yearly to view and photograph coastal brown bears.

I support grizzly bear recovery in the North Cascades ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 14384Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Darrington, WA 98241
United States of America

Outside Organization: Home owner Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023 23:57:52

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We have owned a home in town for about 12 years now. I have no objection at all to the plan to introduce grizzlies to the north cascades, as presented in this plan. As many as needed, in time frame needed, all figured out by the scientists, land managers, and wildlife biologists in charge of the plan.!!

Some leading citizens , long time residents in town, have decided that they know best and many follow their lead, as to what's what with what should and should not go on in the woods. The town is still very angry about what happened with the spotted owl debacle, and now other endangered species getting all this "special treatment", supposedly at the expense of hard working people like in Darrington. Rightful anger, understood. People lost their livelihoods over that owl. So I hear. So any semi controversial idea with a huge manufactured fear factor can get people riled up, and the "no stupid government official is going to tell me what's best for my woods" position is a main factor here.

For me, th north cascades is a huge place, and 3 or 7 bears in places I will never get to is not going to keep me from hiking. Whether tourists will avoid the area for fear of the bears or come hoping to see them is an open question.

Top predator species are important and necessary.

My .02.

Correspondence ID: 14385Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America

Outside Organization: Back Country Horsemen of Washington State Non-Governmental(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,17 2023

Correspondence Type: Park Form

Correspondence: The only acceptable decision is option a - no action. at the Okanogan County Historical Society Museum the records show a "cow killing" grizzly bear was shot in 1923. This bear weighing 1350 lbs was said to be the only "true grizzly" killed in the state of Washington. The bears skull and hide were mounted and sent to the Smithsonian Institute. The grizzly has been killing hundreds of cattle and 35 sheep. A state paid predatory hunter was paid to track and kill this grizzly. The very next year the same under was hired to aid in a hunt for a cougar that killed a young boy in the Chiliwist in late 1924. I have visited the monument to this boy south of Okanogan. Very clear excerpts from Lewis and Clark journals comment at Thompsons River B.C. 1851 - 11 hides brought in. At Ft. Nisqually 4 - hides near Tacoma. At Fort Colville - a higher number hides Fort Nez Pierce near Walla Walla 1846 - 32 hides by Paul Schullery. I am sending to you the Vol 54 #1 Winter 2015 Publication. Many people who see large bears in our area claim they are grizzly but without hair sample or scat or the skull proving the particular ridge of bone on the skull - they lie! I am a 4th generation McHugh family member 74 years old. We don't have grizzlies because the habitat for them is not here/ The efforts of WDFW to force Apex predator bears on us is, on top of the hybrid wolf/dogs, discontinuing spring bear hunts and cancelling permits for hunting cougars with dogs has completely descimated our local deer population. I live 4 miles from Twisp and have seen wolves in my yard 5 times in the past 10 years. Growing up - we had no wolves. I have been a camp cook for 2 wilderness outfitters for 25 years in both the Pasayten and Sawtooth Wilderness areas. I spent countless helping clean our trails. Stop the Lies! Alternative A is the only acceptal plan - please.

Correspondence ID: 14386Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98274
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,13 2023

Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent,

I would like to go on record as only supporting Alternative A (the no action alternative) regarding Grizzly Bear recovery in the NCE. I agree with the FWS conclusion that grizzly bears are extirpated (functionally extinct) in the NCE. In fact, there is no evidence grizzlies are anything but extinct in the Cascades.

For me, a fifty-year user of this wonderful resource, there is no benefit and very significant downside to any effort to attempt to put grizzly bears back into an area where they no longer exist. This is not recovering a population, this is reintroducing a population. It is a terrible idea. I disagree there is ample habitat, and whatever habitat is available is utilized entirely by black bears, whose replacement by grizzly bears would be a brutal combination of violence and starvation.

Speaking of violence; men, women and children will die as a direct result of any reintroduction of grizzly bears into the NCE. Whoever supports the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the NCE will have blood on their hands. Just a couple of days ago, a married couple and their dog were killed by a grizzly bear in the Banff National Park. Dead, torn apart, spread across the ground. I can only imagine the terror of their final moments. There are at least seven million people living within easy driving distance to day hike, backpack and climb mountains in the NCE. Judging from the cars packing trailheads and extending a mile down roads from Ruth Creek to Austin Pass to Schreiber's Meadow to Hidden Lake to Cascade Pass to Rainy Pass to Blue Lake to the Suiattle River to the North Fork Sauk River and on and on, the NCE is filled with people. This is an unprecedented amount of people living near a recovery zone, as all other recovery zones are in areas with far smaller and in most cases miniscule human populations nearby. No amount of "management" will reduce or eliminate the "conflicts" between grizzly bears and people. And let's be real, it's a "conflict" if it happens to a stranger, but it's a tragedy if it happens to a loved one.

It is time to move on, leave grizzly bear recovery to natural recovery over time if it is to be, and get the NPS and USFS focused on maintaining the crumbling, potholed and brushy roads, trailheads, and trail networks that are or were a wonderful local, national and international resource.

Correspondence ID: 14387Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Yakima, WA 98908
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,16 2023

Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent:

I am opposed to the release and management of Grizzly Bear into the State of Washington and specifically the North Cascades National Park Complex. Presently, with the active brown bear population, the predator/predation ecosystem is at a suitable balance for the predation species. Introducing the grizzly would upset that system and cause it irreparable harm. In my opinion, the Black Bear is the only bear that can fit into present and future wildlife populations.

Additionally, for more reasons that I can detail in this letter, the Grizzly Bear is not compatible with established long term and area Wide travel patterns of Washington State. A good example is the thousands of Pacific Crest Trail hikers who end their trek in the North Cascades south of the Canadian Border, having gotten there by passing over 2,000 miles of non--grizzly populations. Additionally, introducing Grizzly to Washington State will discourage families with young children, older visitors, and handicap. PLEASE, do not introduce or manage Grizzly in Washington State.

Correspondence ID: 14388Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Edgewood, WA 98372
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,02 2023

Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: Grizzly Restoration:

I love the outdoors, have camped in our national parks over my life. (I'm 84). I would not enjoy returning to the parks if you are going to reestablish the grizzly bears. Why should you endanger my life and remove my joy in the outdoors by moving grizzlies back to our parks?

Sincerely

Correspondence ID: 14389Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98106
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,17 2023

Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: Im writing about wanting to introduce Grizzlys to Washington state. I read a book about Grizzly bear attacks in the 60's at Yellowstone, the bears weren't at fault to me...

It taught me that humans and bears can live peaceably with one another. Bears aren't aggressive, looking to kill people like the stereotype has led some people to believe.

Please let the bears move here. There isn't a lot of places around which could have them here well as our state could. I hope someday to know 25 bears have been placed here.

Correspondence ID: 14390Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Snohomish, WA 98290
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,10 2023

Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: To the Superintendent:

As someone who has been hiking and backpacking in the North Cascades regularly since 1972, I am strongly opposed to the reintroduction of grizzly bears in these mountains. I suspect that many who support this reintroduction plan never set foot on a mountain trail and either have not considered or don't care that contacts between humans and an apex predator will lead to numerous deaths and serious injuries.

Correspondence ID: 14391Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98125
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,10 2023

Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: Grizzly Restoration Project,

Please reconsider introducing grizzlies to the North Cascades. The area has unrestricted access to towns and major recreation areas in addition to extensive backcountry use, including the Pacific Crest Trail. Since 1980 there have been no human deaths by black bears in Washington, and 11 by grizzlies in Yellowstone and Glacier National Parks, with more than twice the number of black bears in Yellowstone and Glacier than brown bears.

You may be able to track the bears, but you can't track all of the people. Someone will be attacked or killed and it will be because of your decision if you allow grizzlies to be introduced into the North Cascades.

██████████
Pacific Northwest Hiker

Correspondence ID: 14392Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Vashon, WA 98070
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,15 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Please bring the grizzly bears back to the northwest cascades

We should not displace all of natural wildlife, just for people We should learn to co exist with the amazing grizzly bears and all other amazing wildlife

there has got to be a place for the bears and people to share space safely.

Love them

Protect them

Let them teach about the grizzly bear weve lost so much wild life aready

Let them come home

Thanks

Correspondence ID: 14393Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Sammamish, WA 98075
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,10 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Dear National Park Service:

Please do not re-introduce grizzly bears to the North Cascades in Washington State. All you have to do is look at the recent deaths in nearby Baniff of two people and their dog from grizzly bear attacks and the other encounters in Montana and Alaska where such bears roam. These are Apex predators.

One human life is too many to lose to grizzly bears and having them in Washington State where the woods and wilderness are filled with recreating people is a terrible idea. These predators were removed in the past for good cause and should not be re-introduced.

Correspondence ID: 14394Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Auburn, WA 98002
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,06 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Re: Restore grizzly bears to the North Cascades?

Greetings,

Pursuant to an article in the September 29, 2023 Seattle Times, federal officials are floating plans to reintroduce

grizzly bears into the North Cascades of Washington State.

Enclosed is an article from October 2, 2023 Seattle Times page A2 NEWSLINE, stating, "A grizzly bear is believed to have fatally attacked two people at a national park in southwest Canada..."

In addition to being a deadly threat to deer, elk, black bear, livestock and humans; grizzlies are also known to feast on spawning salmon.

With all the efforts to "Save the salmon in order to save the Orcas", it makes no sense to introduce yet another salmon predator into the Upper Skagit and North Cascades wilderness areas.

The federal agencies also offered the option of taking no action, and instead relying on the bear's natural recovery.

I support this "no action" alternative.

Thank you,

Correspondence ID: 14395Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Puyallup, WA 98371
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,05 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Dear Sir or Madam,

Subject: Reintroduction of Grizzlies to the North Cascades

Thank you for providing the public to comment on your Environmental Impact Statement regarding the reintroduction of Grizzlies to the North Cascade region.

On one hand I support, with some trepidation, the introduction of Grizzlies. Then on the other hand I question whether Grizzlies and Humans can live harmoniously. Just recently two hikers were killed by a Grizzly in Southwestern Canada. My wife and I are avid hikers and enjoy hiking around Mt. Baker region. Knowing that one male grizzly can have a range from 150 to 500 square miles, there will be undoubtedly some encounters.

Other issues to consider are the ranchers and dairy farmers. If they incur losses, how will they be compensated? How will they impact the fledgeling salmon runs? VWI they drive out their smaller cousin, the black bear? Are there enough hooved animals in the back country to support 1,200 pound male grizzlies? All questions, and surely more, need to have sound answers, preferably by the numbers, and not by mere estimations.

Yes, I support grizzlies in the North Cascades, but only if there is sound evidence that both the grizzly, the environment, and humans can coexist. Perhaps with It century technologies the grizzly population in Washington State can be managed in a manner that makes it safe for the grizzlies, the human communities, and the environment.

I hope the above comments are found helpful.

Correspondence ID: 14396Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98103
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,05 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Re: Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Environmental impact Statement, North Cascades Ecosystem

Re: FWS--RI--ES-2023~OO74).

As someone who has hiked and backpacked in North Cascades National Park's backcountry since before the Park was established, I urge you to base your management decisions on avoiding the harmful consequences of human-bear encounters and not on symbolism, nostalgia, or emotional appeals to the grandeur and romanticism of bears in the wild. Bears and humans can and have co--existed without incident. I recently returned from several days at Hallo Bay in Katmai National Park and the encounters with coastal brown bears there were extraordinary and provided many wonderful memories. But the bears there are also extraordinary. They have plenty of food and do not perceive humans as either a threat or an opportunity. Bears in the interior of Alaska or in the Canadian or North American Rockies behave much differently.

There have been far too many violent encounters, including the September 30, 2023 incident in Banff National Park which left two hikers and one bear dead. Although bears generally do try to avoid humans, bears (like humans) make mistakes. Over the years, there have been more than enough maulings to warrant rigorous management measures to minimize the chances of adverse human--bear encounters.

Preserving the wilderness experience for backcountry visitors while also assuring public access is a tough job. I do not envy you nor do i intend to second guess you. It does seem to me, however, that more bears, and particularly more grizzlies, mean more restrictions on backcountry use, more dead or injured hikers, more dead bears, or all of the above. All of those consequences seem bad to me.

Correspondence ID: 14397Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Kirkland, WA 98033
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,04 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Dear National Park Service,

Please do not return grizzlies to the North Cascades. They are a top predator. Campers, hikers, hunters and residents who live in the area can all be threatened and killed. There is no reason to return grizzlies. Besides with global warming, they are better off in Canada.

Do not return grizzlies to the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 14398Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Kennewick, WA N/A
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,03 2023

Correspondence Type: Other
Correspondence: Fish and Wildlife Service,

There is another proposal for returning Grizzly Bears to the North Cascades. I can only say why not? High Country News Magazine also endorses returning predatory species to a natural habitat. One only needs to a discussion of wolves in the Umatilla National Forest in North East Oregon. as of late - - - fires are burning dry forests and apparent slash in Canada and the United States. One reads of Martins being released in Washington at carbon capturing, forests an large ecosystems are to be preserved all of this must be done.

In eastern Washington well over so presed of undisturbed habitat is now some. Well have deer and elk along the Columbia River. Maybe even Mountain Lions. Yes, return all assorted bears and wolves to previous terrains.

Correspondence ID: 14399Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Entiat, WA 98822
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,15 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: To Whom it may concern,

The North Cascades National Park has been doing a fine job of managing such a very spectacular wilderness of mountains and valleys. We have both grown up in the Lake Chelan Valley and so appreciate all that it offers. We especially have backpacked on almost all of the trails encompassing the Park and Pasayten Wilderness, and so enjoying the feeling of unspoiled wilderness, ice capped mountains and all that wilderness offers. Now our children and grandchildren share the same appreciation of our beloved area.

Your proposal based on the economic benefits are not the same as in Glacier, Yellowstone, etc. There are no roads where tourists can sit in their cars and see the bears. You have to walk miles in the North Cascades and may never even see a black bear.

We request that you drop the attempt to reintroduce the Grizzlies into the area. Please just accept the previous results when tried earlier. It is our opinion that the Grizzlies if they want, will return to Washington State on their own accord.

Correspondence ID: 14400Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Snohomish, WA 98296
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,11 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Superintendent
North Cascades National Park Service Complex
810 State Route 20
Sedro Woolley, WA 98284

I'm writing in support of the proposed plan to restore grizzly bears to Washington State's North Cascades Ecosystem. Grizzly bears, historically, were a native population. It's only due to human interference that their population dwindled to negligible numbers. It stands to reason that humans, then, become the catalyst to righting these wrongs and restoring that with which we tampered. The idea that grizzly bears could one day be delisted under the Endangered Species Act within the contiguous United States is a laudable goal and takes precedence over people's fear-based reactions to the proposition. As stewards for our environment, it's imperative we

recognize and support the need for the biodiversity that grizzly bear reintroduction will bring.

As a property owner in the North Cascade region, I celebrate the diverse plant and animal populations with which I'm fortunate to co-exist. Part of what makes Washington such a treasured state is the enormity of biodiversity that surrounds us. Enjoying this land comes with inherent ethical and moral responsibilities. Historically, we've neglected these responsibilities in favor of economic opportunity. This mindset must change. We are part of this world, not above it. It's shameful to note that, by "1970, grizzly bears remained in only 2% of their former range within the contiguous United States" (Rine, et al) due to predator control, fur trade, and habitat loss. Surely, we've learned and grown in our perspectives; we have the knowledge and will to make amends for prior mistakes.

"The management of protected lands is primarily focused on the conservation of extant organisms" (Rine, et al). It's clear that the North Cascade region supports a grizzly population. While I understand people's fear, we can't let our actions be driven by emotional responses. We must act with the courage to do what we know is the correct course of action.

Establishing the North Cascades as a recovery zone is the right thing to do. I applaud the Washington National Park Service and US. Fish & Wildlife Service's careful evaluation of the environmental and historical elements of this proposal and look forward to the day when I can proudly say that my home state has taken the steps to right past wrongs and return grizzly bears to their native land.

Correspondence ID: 14401Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,11 2023

Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent,

Grizzlies should be re-introduced to the North Cascades.

If successful, that would benefit the entire area.

If too successful, that could be controlled by culling the herd, if needed.

I believe the entire North Cascades ecosystem would benefit greatly.

Thank you for considering my viewpoint.

Correspondence ID: 14402Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA 98225
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,11 2023

Correspondence Type: Other

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent,

I appreciate the opportunity to offer an opinion on restoration of grizzlies in the North Cascades. This topic is of interest to me, as a hiker and naturalist who grew up in Montana and now lives in Whatcom County. My family has a long history of loving nature, with my parents and grandparents having managed Sperry and Granite Chalets in Glacier Park.

My opinion is that grizzlies should not be re-introduced to the North Cascades. I am an environmentalist, and certainly understand why this would be considered, but in my opinion the drawbacks outweigh the risks.

Per my understanding, the grizzly population is doing relatively well in Montana, Alaska, and British Columbia. These regions have vast areas for the bears to inhabit, and relatively few hikers. (see graphic on page 2) By comparison, the North Cascades is a much smaller area that has many more hikers. Re-introducing bears to the North Cascades will result in more bear-human conflict. "Bear-human conflict" is a euphemism; these conflicts are terrifying experiences which often result in the death of a nature lover in the prime of their life, and also usually the death of a bear. As a pathologist, I once reviewed an autopsy of someone who was killed by a bear, and the injuries were shocking.

Almost every year someone is killed in Montana by a grizzly. Many people who hike in Montana carry guns, in addition to pepper spray, to defend themselves against the bears. / no longer take my family on overnight backpacking trips in Glacier or the Bob Marshall Wilderness because of the growing grizzly population. I no longer feel comfortable having my daughters camping in the Bob (Bob Marhsall Wilderness).

I do feel comfortable hiking in the North Cascades because black bears are less aggressive than grizzlies. If bears are re-introduced into the North Cascades, more people will be carrying guns.

If there still were a significant grizzly population in the North Cascades, then my position would be different, because we would be protecting an existing population. But they are essentially absent from the area, and have been for decades. Thus, no bears will be harmed by not reintroducing them to the area. The bears have plenty of safer habitat in Montana, Alaska, and British Columbia.

In an area with such a high density of hikers, it is my opinion that the grizzlies should not be reintroduced. If they are, then every interaction in which someone is killed will become a political firestorm, on top of the tragedy that someone was killed. The political backlash could work against protection of current existing habitat.

It is to Nature's advantage to have people loving and enjoying the wilderness, because then they will vote to protect the forests. If you want people to love the bears, then don't move them into a small area where there are many people and conflict will be unavoidable.

Correspondence ID: 14403Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Manson, WA 98831
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,10 2023

Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: To: Office of Superintendent

Grizzly Restoration EIS

North Cascades National Park Service Complex

810 State Route 20

Sedro Woolley, Wa., 98284

Date: October 6, 2023

From: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Manson Wa., 98831

Subject: North Cascades Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/E18 (i.e., Transplanting and establishing a population of Grizzly bears in the middle of Washington State)

Washington State has a law that stipulates, " Grizzly bears shall not be transplanted or introduced into the state. Only grizzly bears that are native to Washington state may be utilized by the department for management programs" I don't believe that the us. Constitution enumerated powers to transport or install grizzly bears into Washington state, therefore, state law prevails. This is a "states rights issue".

Because Washington D.C., is not a state, The Federal Government does have the right to add Grizzly bears to any "District of Columbia" park that you see fit. Please let us know how that goes, and we can discuss it further.

I am strongly against any plan to relocate grizzly bears into Washington State. This is not the first time that this plan has been brought before the public for comment. How many times must you bring this forward?

Correspondence ID: 14404Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Camano Island, WA 98282
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,16 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Subject: Grizzly Bear Restoration

Grizzly Bears are a major contributor to the ecosystem of the North Cascades and should be returned to the area.

Correspondence ID: 14405Project:112008Document:132104
Address: East Wenatchee, WA 98802
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,16 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: SUBJECT: Proposed reintroduction of grizzly bears into North Cascades National Park

Dear Superintendent Striker,

I am writing to voice my opposition to this proposal to reintroduce grizzly bears into the state of Washington. I spent most of my career on the Kenai Peninsula in Alaska before moving to Washington State upon retirement. I know of many friends and acquaintances that carried a high caliber revolver with them when they went hiking in Alaska in the event that they came upon a brown bear threatening them. I have to say that it is nice to be able to go for a hike here in Washington State without fear of coming across a grizzly bear.

It seemed that there was at least one incident every year in Alaska where someone got mauled by a brown bear, usually with fatal results. The population of Washington State is about ten times the population of Alaska, so if grizzly bears were introduced into the state of Washington one might reasonably expect bear encounters to become more frequent than in Alaska.

In the event that someone got fatally mauled by a grizzly bear here in the state of Washington and you

were the person that made the deliberate decision to reintroduce grizzly bears, then this would morally make you an accessory to murder or manslaughter. I am not a lawyer and am not versed in personal injury law. I suspect that this is more of a moral issue than a legal issue as I would expect that the federal government would hold a person in your position harmless against all costs associated with a personal injuw lawsuit.

I see no upside to reintroducing grizzly bears into the state of Washington and I can only hope that you do not make this mistake.

Correspondence ID: 14406Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Richland, WA 99354
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,16 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Dear Sir,

I have lived, hiked, and hunted in Washington for 40 years. Putting grizzlies back into Washington is a terrible idea.

I have also hunted and hiked in grizzly country in Montana. You are in constant fear- -waking or sleeping- -that you will be attacked no matter how cautious you are and even with all the recommended precautions. This is not a great way to enjoy the out of doors.

When most people go into the wilderness, it is to commune with nature and with God. Being in constant fear for your life hinders this considerably.

If they were put back most people who are in favor of this would never see them. I guess for them it is just "knowing that they are there" is what they want. That to me does not justify their introduction to our state. The deer and elk population in the North Cascades is already pretty meager. What few animals that are there would likely be devastated by grizzlies (and wolves) as they have been in Idaho and Montana.

If a person wants to see grizzlies, he or she could try to see them in Yellowstone. It is not likely you will see them there unless you are back country hiking. Also, if grizzlies were introduced to the North Cascades, the likelihood of viewing them would be extremely low for most people.

i have greatly enjoyed my time in the North Cascades and would be extremely disappointed if grizzlies were introduced there. Please do not take this foolish action which would be detrimental to the beautiful and peaceful ambience of the North Cascades.

Thank you for reading my letter and taking it into consideration.

Correspondence ID: 14407Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Kirkland, WA 98033
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,11 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: RE: North Cascade National Park Grizzly Plan

Dear Sirs:

I am completely against restoring Grizzly bears to the North Cascade Park. I have hiked all over the Cascade mountains. I have seen just about every other animal. None worries me. None have ever bothered me. I wear a bear bell.

But Grizzly bears are unpredictable. One minute calm at a far distance, next charging. They are apex predators. Bear spray will not stop them. The only solution, carry a gun? You only have to read the news every summer about Grizzly bear attacks. This is the reason people of past generations shot all the Grizzly bears.

If introduced, the parties involved in the restoration will have a liability to anyone injured or killed by a Grizzly.

Please leave the North Cascade National Park in its current state: No Grizzly bears.

Correspondence ID: 14408Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA N/A
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,23 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: About 4 or 5 years ago, the USDOJ determined that Grizzly Bears (*Ursus arctos horribilis*) were neither threatened nor endangered in the USA. Has their population actually declined that much between then and now? Is it CRITICALLY necessary to restore them in the NCE? How many times must the decision-makers, as specified in the NEPA regulations, make decisions about GB's status and reintroduction plans?

The EIS Alternative B&C do not provide any convincing grounds to move forward with this reintroduction; it only mentions questionable spiritual or otherwise intangible benefits, such as "Seek to support Tribal, cultural, and spiritual values related to the grizzly bear," that are subjective and cannot be definitively demonstrated.

I join the individuals who are submitting their comments who are also not persuaded by the arguments that grizzly bears NEED to be reintroduced to the NCE simply because this area is suitable habitat and that they used to live in it. Mention is made in the EIS regarding "ecological resilience" and for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations of people. So EVERYBODY will be educated and therefore enjoy GB? Will this "ecological resilience" be gauged strictly by GB populations alone? Is there some demonstrable deficiency in the NCE or is there harm that is occurring to this ecosystem that can be traced to their absence? Is there valid proof that this ecosystem benefitted or was in better condition as a direct result of their presence prior to their population decline? Has there been any tangible harm or significant departure from historical variability in the NCE that can be unquestionably trace ONLY to the bear's population decline (- - - - than the bear's population decline itself?) Have other species declined concurrently with the GBs?

These newly released bears will uncontrollably stray from or not remain in place on federal lands (or any other public lands in the NCE) which will inevitably result in confrontation with people. The results of these confrontations will almost always be detrimental to these bears (when taking place in the USA). This is eerily similar to the reintroduction of wolves in Idaho in 1993 which has since resulted in more than one "take" primarily due to their interference with livestock activities (cattle, sheep, etc.). If Alternative B or C is implemented, are we morally and ethically OK with the inevitable "takes" of these artificially introduced grizzly bears (which are presumably reluctant participants) that were non- - - - - NCE from the time of their decline until this plan? Apparently so, according to Alternative B, "This - - - allows grizzly bears to be taken under specific circumstances as long as such take is reported promptly to the FWS. These circumstances include defense of life; federal, state, or Tribal scientific or research activities; or removal of grizzly bears involved in conflicts by authorized federal, state, or Tribal authorities." No GB have been killed in Washington because there have been - - - - - "trigger" a self-defense reaction. However, some of these reintroduced bears or their offspring - - - - - killed because of self defense or protection in and around the NCE as a DIRECT result of this proposed reintroduction of this aggressive species. Why introduce a species that has no value to hunters knowing that an unknown number - - - - - killed in self defense or protection? As stated in the "Background" section: "As human population density increases the frequency of encounters between humans and grizzly bears also increases, resulting in more human-caused grizzly bear mortalities because of a perceived or real threat to human life or property." Are we also OK - - - - - accepting - - - casualties or injuries from unexpected surprise encounters? Casualties that would NOT occur - - - - -.

Have cumulative - - - - been considered? Some parts within and many areas around the NCE are populated (with people) and well - - - - percentage of these GB are likely to stray from the NCE to these lands. Most, if not all, animal species - - - are

native to Washington flee when they detect people (outside of their mating seasons): grizzly bears don't. - - - - - this - - - - -
- - - - - grizzly bears and people in danger of one another? Is this "collateral damage" worth it? It's as if some of these bears
are going to be sent to their deaths as a result of Alternative B or C.

Grizzly bears are present in Alaska, Montana, and western Canada where they have always been, even though government
agencies consider them to be threatened or endangered. People in these area see or encounter them with regularity. - - - - -
- - - - they have always been (there) is why people indigenous to these areas have learned to (more or less) live with them.
Reintroducing a notoriously ornery apex predator to an area (NCE) whose culture has changed considerably - - - they were
last seen or detected centuries ago will be an unnecessarily brutal upheaval.

While injuries to and, God forbid, deaths of people who inadvertently startle or suddenly encounter a GB in the NCE, where
there use to be none, will take place, an equal or greater toll on these newly introduced GB will also take place. In other
words, releasing GB into the NCE is an UNNECESSARY plan for their deaths, for human tragedies, and for renewed
conflicts in an ecosystem (that includes people) which never lamented the absence of GB.

While I absolutely do NOT pretend to express or share the collective opinions of Tribal Members in and near the NCE, I
have worked with a number of "them" for the better part of the past 20 to 40 years. Most of the individuals whom I have met
during this span are avid outdoorsmen who take advantage of their "Treaty Rights." Approximately zero of these individuals
have expressed a desire to see GB "reintroduced" into Washington State. Some have claimed to witness the species here in
Washington, and these claims are eventually followed with "what I would do" if they had an encounter with one. What these
individuals "would do" would not benefit the GB.

Has any thought been given to other possible reasons why GB are no longer extant in this area? Other than they "have been
functionally extirpated?" Perhaps they do not inhabit the NCE for other reasons? (EIS p.6: "Therefore, it is unlikely that
grizzly bears from areas within British Columbia would naturally emigrate to the NCE.") When they are released at the
strategic locations, will those people who are present be armed just in case? Will these bears eventually migrate north across
the border to the better habitat? Perhaps extensive use by people in the NCE who partake in hiking, food gathering, hunting,
driving, skiing, fishing, ORV use, snowshoeing, snowmobiling, equestrian, swimming, camping, mountain climbing, boating,
rafting, etc. might just drive them away again over the years? Not to mention higher road densities and human habitation?
This Alaskan and BC GB "habitats" which effectively extends into Montana, are incomparably more vas and do not
experience the relatively heavy concentration of use that the smaller NCE does.

Notice - - - - there are currently no berries between the NCE and the BC GB habitat. So what factors are preventing BC GB
from migrating of their own cognition to the NCE? Will the GB reintroduced into the NCE just ignore these factors and carry
on with their proliferation because Alternatives B and C said that they are supposed to? Or are the proponents of Alternatives
A and B counting on recreation (and human habitation) in the NCE to nosedive after news of the GB reintroduction becomes
widespread?

I am bias because making my living working outside in eastern Washington forests year-round. My "bias" is well supported
by the points made above. I understand that the purpose of an RIS is to analyze a proposal and report its impact in the
environment the protect area and its surroundings (cumulative effects). It is suppose to be objective and science-based. To
me, the facts presented in the 100+ pages of this EIS support Alternative A. The majority of the US population does NOT get
out into American forests on a day to day basis. In eastern Washington, the presence of cougars, bobcats, rattlesnakes, moose
in the north, hornets from August until the snow flies, and even black bears during the spring and fall (and to a lesser extent,
the rate badgers and wolverines) already make these forests an unsettling environment. However, these species have always
been there and we therefore know what we are dealing with. When I stumbled upon a black bear, or when they detect me and
feel threatened, they may hiss, stand on their hind legs, and sometimes charge. BUT their charges are just a brief warning
which eventually ceases (this typically occurs during their "rutting" seasons) if they notice me altering my course away from
them. I have hear enough true stories and seen - - - - - to conclude that GB do NOT cease or back off. When wildlife
biologists who are in favor of this reintroduction desperately try to persuade the American public that the many unpleasant
accounts of aggressive GB encounters are not to be believed - - - - of us who make out living "in the land" know better (many
from personal experiences - - - - to be misled by these advocates of Alternatives B and C.

PLEASE, I beg you, select Alternative A (no action) for the sakes of both the people AND the GB!!

Here is my token sarcastic comment about Alternatives B and C: Malaria used to be native to the USA, so why not reintroduce it so that people can experience this unique disease domestically?

P.S. I know that the - - - for comment submission states that I am supposed to divulge all my PII. If I was to do so, and this comment was circulated, I would lose my job. I cannot afford to allow that to happen.

Correspondence ID: 14409Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98105
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,17 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Dear Sir:

I strongly oppose active grizzly reintroduction in the North Cascades. If grizzlies are to reenter the North Cascades by nature migration and natural expansion of their territory, that is rational. Grizzlies have endangered species protection from hunting so they can naturally expand their range if the ecosystem conditions permit. I believe grizzlies are protected from hunting in southern adjacent British Columbia which arguably facilitates natural expansion of grizzly range.

Too many people who advocate ACTIVE reintroduction of grizzlies live in their comfortable urban and suburban homes far from the on the ground consequences of reintroduction. They do not live in the north-central Washington counties whose citizens will be endangered by the grizzlies. And only a fraction of those advocates will ever visit the grizzly areas via camping and backpacking and thus put themselves in the temporary danger that local residents and local backpackers and hikers would have as a constant danger.

We know all too well the danger of grizzlies to humans--- -look at the recent deaths and injuries in Idaho/Montana/Wyoming! Natural expansion of range of grizzlies is acceptable. Active reintroduction clearly endangers humans. I mean, California has a grizzly bear on its state flag. Would California activists accept a few grizzlies reintroduced there?

Correspondence ID: 14410Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Marysville, WA 98270
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,17 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: ---Please respond to the citizen threat!

Grizzly bears are NOT vital to the Washington N. Cascades.

The U S National Park Service and the U S Fish and Wildlife Service are individually collecting public comment on their proposed 3--option Plan, two parts of which would reintroduce Grizzly bears forceful" W into the Washington State North Cascades (NC).

This proposed reintroduction interference in the natural progression of the N. C. bear population is not only unnecessary, it threatens the black and brown bear populations which would be killed and displaced by the stronger and more territorial grizzly. There is already a scarcity of food supply for native brown and black bear in the N. C.

Don't believe the rhetoric presented by the Grizzly Bear and USFW proponents. There is little evidence

that historically Grizzlies roamed the N. C. Reliance on Hudson Bay records proves to be sketchy at best, and non-specific as to the actual trapping and kill locations. Being huge omnivores, Grizzly require a lot of food energy. Grizzlies do kill; livestock and humans. A lot of folks are getting tired of hearing those human deaths referred to as "tragic accidents," allowing them to continue until the next encounter.

The grizzly range is stated in hundreds of miles. It is simply wrong to assume that over the last 100 years the Canadian grizzly population has passed up the opportunity to settle in a suitable N. C. habitat. Were the "grass greener" on the U. S. side of the border, the grizzly would have migrated south into the N. Cascades. There has been no human predation in the N. C. for over a hundred years...no human threat! No hunting. An estimated 691 grizzly bear live in Alberta, 65 of them in Banff National Park. The existing black and brown bear perform the ecological need of "apex predators" (omnivores) through weak species management (killing weaker species), scat dissemination, and improving forest health. The smaller bear do that, essentially without the distinct threat to cattle, goats, sheep, and people (public safety) who enjoy the N.C. backcountry.

Farmers and ranchers, already assaulted by Wolves, dread the presence of Grizzlies in their grazing pasturelands. This Plan for forced reintroduction encourages farmers, hikers, home owners and campers to "haze and annoy" bear that they come into contact with. That very interaction is incredibly risky for humans. Grizzlies attack and kill humans with non-specific provocation. People often carry food, and people are attacked as food. it could be your granola bar...or your butt...that is a meal for the taking. And, your nylon tent and bear spray are not adequate deterrents. Unless you own a Anatolian-bred dog, your family pet is Grizzly food. The couple killed in Banff emptied their can of bear spray, and then were attacked by the annoyed angry bear. Grizzly are far more often going to stand their ground, or attack.

Do not think that you are protected by park boundaries or NPS personnel. Your death or injury can occur before Fish and Wildlife and park department personnel can apprehend a rogue Grizzly. A recent killer Grizzly journeyed through the mountainous states of Montana and Idaho, avoiding several attempts to trap it. That trapping failure resulted in the death in Yellowstone of school teacher Amie Anderson on July 22, 2023. That same Grizzly was responsible for an earlier attack in Idaho...two years earlier...when it broke through a kitchen window.

Being omnivores (flesh eaters), Grizzlies are far more likely to attack anything protein, including defenseless farm animals and humans. Humans are another form of "fast food" for grizzlies. Earlier this month a man and woman, both experienced backcountry travelers, emptied a can of bear spray, and then were mauled to death by a Grizzly in Banff National Park. Also this year, Montana officials euthanized a grizzly, likely stressed and hungry, who had broken into a home and fatally attacked a woman earlier in the summer. In 2018, a grizzly bear, which authorities described as starving, killed a woman and her baby in Yukon, Canada. In Yellowstone, 8 visitors have been killed, and hundreds have been attacked.

Since being protected by the Endangered Species Act in 1970, the U S population of Grizzlies has dramatically recovered. As Grizzly bear populations increase, and inadequate local food supply remains static or is reduced by global warming, human killings and injury events will only increase...as they have. Animals in general will not move away from a food source until it is gone. Once the food supply is exhausted, territorial bear (particularly mother bear and their cubs) will strike out for a new hunting ground. By then they are hungry, malnourished, defensive, and more aggressive, as their bodies tell them that they and their cubs need to store more body fat for the upcoming hyperphagia (hibernation) period. The act of breaking into a human home in the fall often represents a starving bear trying to provide food for their cubs, and being willing to take extreme measures to get at the food that they smell. This is a dangerous animal!

Alaska averages four fatal bear attacks per year. Why would the residents of Washington State promote or allow this kind of unprovoked animal violence toward humans, which is usually fatal to the Grizzly bear (death by game officials)?

In the Rocky Mountains, grizzly are increasingly moving into the valleys and prairies, wandering onto golf courses, breaking into homes, stalking chicken coops, and raiding cornfields. Montana and Wyoming are home to over 2100 grizzlies, with a population also in Idaho. Containing grizzlies will inevitably result in more powerful preventive measures. This NPS Plan for forced reintroduction will lead to taller and stronger fence lines, electric fences, and other measures that will lead to travel restrictions of other wildlife populations. Out of necessity, the NPS will develop its own "permitted areas" restricting recreationalists and preventing access into popular areas of the MC. Family dogs, often thought of as family protection, will be restricted in wilderness areas even further. It has been found that bear spray (5'-10') does not prevent close-up encounters, and is an unreliable defense against a powerful and aggressive Grizzly.

Preventive conflict approaches will include human use restrictions on bear attractants such as garbage, dumpsters, compost, bee hives, fruit and vegetable gardens, free-roaming chickens, and family pets. Some say that "a fed bear is a dead bear." Secure storage of bird seed, pet food, putting electric fences around school facilities and adding playground guards are only deterrents to breaking-and-entering bears. Bears have Missoula, Montana hemmed in and are making forays around the edges, says Russel Talmo, a specialist in bear conflict resolution with Defenders of Wildlife.

Grizzly proponents hope that as the grizzly population expands, the areas between the five island ecosystems established by the Endangered Species Act will allow grizzlies to move between them. The N. C. is but one of the five large ecosystem areas. Much of this territory is crisscrossed with private property, roads, and is crowded with people, towns, cities, cattle, sheep, beehives, fruit and vegetable gardens, and...recreation. These human uses are inconsistent with a large, foraging, aggressive grizzly population...a bear population opposed to turf sharing. After a human fatality, it is not uncommon for authorities to close those recreational areas to human use.

An adult Grizzly can weigh several hundred pounds, can stand more than 8 feet tall, can run up to 35 miles per hour for a prolonged time, and is no match for unarmed human beings. If you plan on being in a known Grizzly territory:

Carry and know how to use a suitable firearm

Carry and know how to use bear spray

Wear bear bells, and make noise

Travel in groups, even as hunters of other game

Have a strong dog breed (Anatolian-type) which is extremely loyal and highly protective

Plan to be out in daylight hours

Do not rely on a tent at night

Never keep food sources near your person

If fishing or hunting, immediately wash the smell of your kill from your hands and body

If you have been cooking or eating, wash the smell from your face and hands

Avoid sites and concentrations of ravens and other scavengers

The NPS and the USFWS are both now proposing EIS alternatives that include the forced capture and release of out-of-state

grizzlies--catch and release programs with "zoo-like" monitoring. Once begun, these programs will likely morph into feeding programs to sustain the starving transplants, and expensive and ongoing monitoring programs to keep the migrating Grizzlies away from domestic farm animals and local communities. So, why another expensive, unnecessary, and unwanted "zoo" monitoring experiment? Vow: vote (letter) could count!

Currently, the Canadian Grizzlies could walk across the unmanned border into the Washington North Cascades...but they have not. Why? Because the grass is greener where they are! Leave the Grizzlies where they are successful. Vote to eliminate the N. Cascades Ecosystem from the US Fish and Wildlife Recovery Zones, and vote for the no-action alternative in this EIS!

This grizzly program, if implemented, is guaranteed to result in MORE Federal and State government intrusion into your everyday lives. And you will pay the extraordinary costs of this ill-conceived and unnecessary program.

Vote to eliminate the N. Cascades Ecosystem from the US Fish and Wildlife Recovery Zones, and vote for the no-action alternative in this EIS!

Along with responding to this call for public comment, contact your W.S. representatives with your opinions.

[List of congressmen contact information.]

Your opinion is being requested by two Federal agencies. Write your letter opposing this unnatural and consequential interference

Please take the time to respond to, and object to, all but the "No Action" alternative being offered in this EIS.

Correspondence ID: 14411Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98274
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,23 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent,

I would urge you to resend the draft EIS and the proposed 10j rule. The introduction of grizzlies into the North Cascades would be devastating for our North Central communities. At the present time, the wolves are being sufficient predators to the game population and livestock in these areas.

The threat grizzlies would bring to hikers, campers, and people enjoying the beauty of the park would be alarming.

The potential loss and damage for livestock producers certainly needs to be considered.

When reading that the majority of comments concerning this matter were from outside our state of Washington seems unfair. These people would not experience the possible devastation that local people would face.

Again, please do not consider moving forward with the introduction of grizzlies in this area.

Correspondence ID: 14412Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Issaquah, WA 98029
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: I have been hiking and camping in the North Cascades for 60+ yrs. I have always felt the grizzly could live there if they wanted to but have not found the area desirable. I do not see the point of us artificially forcing this!

Correspondence ID: 14413Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98105
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,16 2023

Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: No! to grizzly bears restoration in the North Cascades! We have property about 15 minutes up the So. Yorkshire Rd of Lake Chloe. I have been going there since 1939. My family has always felt privileged to be on the edge of the wilderness. We share our fruit with the birds, deer, black bears, and many other creatures. We all - - - - on surveillance cameras. Luckily, we have not - - - - had to because of grizzly bears. Please do not introduce them to the wilderness at the head of the lake for they will find their way to the more populated areas and threaten the wilderness that has - - - - - to be in balance for the 85 years I have been living near it.

PS Our daughter lives on a ford in Oad WA, in the - - - - - of the No. Cascades on the west side. Grizzlies are not wanted there either!

Correspondence ID: 14414Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Newcastle, WA 98056
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,06 2023

Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: No grizzly bears!

I am strongly against introducing grizzly bears into the north cascades range - or anywhere in Washington State. I know so many people who hike and camp in Washington. It is too dangerous for hikers and campers and the rest of us to have grizzly bears in our state. As it is, I get black bears in my yard in New Castle! They eat things in my garden - not trash, so far - but I worry about surprising them! Please do not bring back grizzly bears to Washington State.

Correspondence ID: 14415Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, WA N/A
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023

Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent,

We, the undersigned, strongly and vehemently object to the reintroduction of grizzly bears into Washington State or any State, and Canada. They are an unnecessary danger, particularly to our hikers and outdoor enthusiasts and animals. It serves no common sense purpose to reintroduce these predators. There is great danger and negligible good to the populace.

Correspondence ID: 14416Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Yakima, WA 98907
United States of America

Outside Organization: Yakima Valley Audubon Society Conservation/Preservation(Official Rep.)

Received: Oct,11 2023

Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Striker:

The Yakima Valley Audubon Society (YVAS) Board of Directors met on October 10, 2023, and discussed the Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Environmental Impact Statement, North Cascades Ecosystem (Draft Restoration Plan).

Our YVAS Board voted on October 10, 2023, to support either of the two Action Alternatives described in the Draft Restoration Plan, either Alternative B, or Alternative C. YVAS will support implementation of either of these two Action Alternatives to restore Grizzly Bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem, and we are content to leave the choice of which alternative to implement (Alternative B or Alternative C) up to the discretion and judgment of the National Park Service and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

YVAS believes it is imperative that Grizzly Bears be restored to the North Cascades Ecosystem. We at YVAS absolutely do not support the no action alternative.

I intend to go to your Draft Restoration Plan comment webpage right now and submit these YVAS comments online. I'm redundantly writing you this letter to emphasize our YVAS position in support of either Action Alternative B or Action Alternative C to restore Grizzly Bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan. And thank you for taking this initiative.

Sincerely,

████████████████████ Conservation Committee Chair
Yakima Valley Audubon Society

████████████████████

Correspondence ID: 14417Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Centennial, CO 80112
United States of America
Outside Organization: Friends of Animals Conservation/Preservation(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,07 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: November 7, 2023

Submitted via U.S. Mail and/ or electronically at <https://parkplanning.nps.gov>.
Superintendent

North Cascades National Park Service Complex
810 State Route 20
Sedro Woolley, WA 98284

Re: Friends of Animals' Comment on Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration
Plan/Environmental Impact Statement North Cascades Ecosystem -
September 2023

To Superintendent Striker:

Friends of Animals submits this comment in response to the National Park Service (NPS) and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's (FWS) (collectively, "Federal Agencies") joint notice seeking comments on the Draft Restoration Plan and Environmental Impact Statement for the North Cascades Ecosystem in Washington State.

Friends of Animals is a non-profit, international animal advocacy organization incorporated in the state of New York since 1957. Friends of Animals has nearly 200,000 members worldwide. Friends of Animals and its members seek to free animals from cruelty and exploitation around the world, and to promote a respectful view of non- human, free-living and domestic

animals. Friends of Animals' activities include educating its members on current threats to many species' abilities to live in ecosystems free from human manipulation, exploitation, and abuse; and monitoring federal agency actions to ensure that laws enacted to protect the environment and wildlife are properly implemented and enforced.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

For thousands of years, "[g]rizzly bears roamed across the North Cascades . . . as an essential part of the ecosystem, distributing native plant seeds and keeping other wildlife populations in balance."¹ At one point, there was an estimated 50,000 grizzly bears inhabiting a large contiguous portion of the United States, comprised primarily of eighteen western states, including the State of Washington.² As with many wildlife species, the grizzly bears of the North Cascades suffered catastrophic depredation resulting from interactions with humans, hunted nearly to extinction during the 19th and 20th centuries, losing critical habitat to logging, development, indiscriminate hunting, the ranching industry, and bounty programs funded by the U.S. government. Despite thriving in the North Cascades for centuries, there have been no confirmed grizzly bear sightings in the U.S. portion of the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE) since 1996.³ The last photographed grizzly bear in the U.S. portion of the NCE is depicted in a 1967 photograph in the Draft Restoration Plan, presumably killed by the armed man proudly posing next to his kill.⁴

Under the Federal Agencies' 2023 Candidate Notice of Review (CNOR), it was determined that the NCE no longer holds any population of grizzly bears, supported by a lack of evidence and an absence of detections of grizzly bears in the region.⁵ FWS, therefore, considers Grizzly Bears to be "functionally extirpated in the NCE."⁶ While grizzly bears are not known to presently inhabit the U.S. portion of the NCE, five studies have concluded that the U.S. portion of the NCE has sufficient habitat resources essential for the maintenance of grizzly bear populations and confirm that the U.S. portion of the NCE can support a viable population of 200 to 400 grizzly bear individuals.⁷

Due to the historically declining populations, grizzly bears were listed as "threatened" under the Endangered Species Act in 1975 (for the lower 48 states) and as "endangered" in Washington in 1980. In 2004, a grizzly bear recovery plan was completed for the British Columbia portion of the NCE to reestablish the population of grizzly bears in the region. However, the Washington State portion of the NCE is without a restoration plan, as the EIS process commenced in 2014 was terminated in 2020.⁸

On November 14, 2022, the Federal Agencies published notice in the Federal Register seeking scoping comments from the public to assist their joint preparation of a North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan (the "Restoration Plan") and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) in the North Cascades.⁹ The Federal Agencies' stated goal at that time was to restore the biodiversity of the NCE and support the recovery of grizzly bear populations to facilitate removal from the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife.¹⁰ In drafting the proposed Restoration Plan, the Federal Agencies explored three preliminary alternatives to achieve restoration of grizzly bear populations in the NCE.¹¹ Alternative A was the "no action" alternative; Alternative B would restore grizzly bears in the NCE with the existing protections under the BSA; and Alternative C, in which grizzly bear populations would be restored in the NCE through translocation from another GB population and designated as a Rule 100) nonessential Population under the ESA.¹² Each "action alternative" has as a goal "to restore a self-sustaining population through the capture and release of grizzly bears into the NCE."¹³ Each preliminary alternative promotes public education and outreach, establishing guidelines for managing conflict, sustainable habitat management, and improved sanitation on public lands." Ultimately, the Federal Agencies seek to release 3 to 7 bears per year for 5 to 10 years to establish an initial population of 25 bears to serve as a foundation to allow reproduction and an eventual population of 200 bears in 60 - 100 years.¹⁵

On September 28, 2023, the Federal Agencies, through the NPS, commenced a period for public comment on the Draft Restoration Plan and Environmental Impact Statement regarding the reintroduction of grizzly bears into the NCE.¹⁶ The goal is to restore grizzly bears to the NCE, contribute to the restoration of the NCE's biodiversity, and enhance the long-term survival of grizzly bears for multiple populations to the point

that the species can be removed from the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife.¹⁷ As a result, the Federal Agencies hope to achieve the objective of restoring bears to their natural and cultural heritage in the NCE, support environmental and natural resource goals in the NCE, and provide a source of outreach to inform and educate the public on grizzly bears in their natural habitat.¹⁸

While the Restoration Plan addresses three alternatives, the Federal Agencies chose Alternative C as the preferred alternative. In Alternative C, a Nonessential Experimental Population (NEP) of grizzly bears would be established in the U.S. portion of the NCE under section 100) of the ESA. "Establishment of the NEP is intended to support reintroduction and recovery of grizzly bears within the NCE and provide the prohibitions and exceptions under the [ESA] necessary and appropriate to conserve the species within a defined NEP area."¹⁹ FWS almost simultaneously published in the Federal Register the proposed rule under section 100), essentially seeking comment on Alternative C before issuing a final Restoration Plan and EIS.

Friends of Animals supports the restoration of grizzly bears in the NCE. As noted in the Draft Restoration Plan, a "habitat evaluation and a report by the Interagency Grizzly Bear Committee (IGBC) NCE Subcommittee, concluded that the U.S. portion of the NCE contains sufficient habitat quality to maintain and recover a grizzly bear population."²⁰ Restoring bears to an area they inhabited for centuries is necessary for the sustainability of the endangered grizzly bear species and critical for nurturing a healthy ecosystem in the U.S. portion of the NCE. Friends of Animals supports the reintroduction of grizzly bears to their native ecosystem with the most protections available under the ESA, not as a nonessential experimental population as outlined under Alternative C. While Alternative C is the Federal Agencies' preferred alternative to establishing and protecting grizzly bear populations, this alternative allows for "taking" and "management" of grizzly bears outside the scope of the full protections of the ESA, including through lethal means. This type of lethal management would comprise the goals of restoration and inhibit the recovery of grizzly bear populations.

Federal Agencies must implement "management" techniques that prioritize the preservation and protection of the grizzly bears reintroduced to the NCE. Friends of Animals is concerned that use of 100) rule for a nonexperimental population may give a louder voice not to the bears protected by the ESA, but to the ranchers and hunters who believe that management of bears should allow for unfettered removal of any bears reintroduced.

DISCUSSION

Friends of Animals supports restoring grizzly bears to their native habitat in the NCE as an initial step to establishing sustainable grizzly bear populations. Grizzly bears are an apex predator and a keystone species in the NCE, vital to a healthy and thriving ecosystem. In selecting a proposed alternative, Friends of Animals encourages the Federal Agencies to consider the positive effects reintroduction of grizzly bears will have on the NCE, as well as the positive socioeconomic benefits of a thriving population, such as a thriving recreation and tourism industry based on a thriving ecosystem. The Federal Agencies should prioritize minimizing management and human contact with bears, as each will lead to using lethal means justified as "management." Friends of Animals encourages the Federal Agencies to select an alternative that will lead to the recovery of grizzly bears. Federal agencies should reject lethal "management" methods to resolve perceived conflicts with farmers and ranching industry because such methods are unethical and comprise the recovery of grizzly bears.

A. The Federal Agencies should follow the ESA in the way that offers the most protection for the Grizzly Bears in the NCE.

Congress enacted the ESA to protect and preserve endangered and threatened species, their respective habitats, and the ecosystems on which these species and habitats depend.²¹ The goal of the ESA is to recover listed species to the point where they no longer need legal protection.²² The grizzly bear is presently listed as a threatened species under the ESA, being first listed in 1975.²³ Section 7 of the ESA "provides . . . valuable and powerful tools to conserve listed species, assist with species recovery, and help protect critical habitat."²⁴ Section 7 also requires federal agencies to consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and proposed actions that may affect a listed species." To facilitate reintroduction of a threatened or endangered species, ESA section 100) allows for the reintroduction of experimental populations of threatened or endangered species into historical ranges and habitats in which the species is no longer found. Section 100) was placed into the ESA to allow for the reintroduction of displaced species through experimental populations with management of the reintroduced species through regulatory measures. Section 100) was implemented to ease the concerns of private landowners, other federal agencies, Tribes, and state and local governments regarding management of the reintroduced species.²⁶ As the Federal Agencies note, "[a]n experimental population is a group of reintroduced [species] that is geographically isolated from other populations of the species and is typically considered nonessential to the survival of the species as a whole."²⁷ In establishing an NEP under section 10 (j), the agency must "treat any population determined by the Secretary to be an experimental population as if we had listed it as a threatened species for the purposes of establishing protective regulations under section 4(d) of the Act with respect to that population."²⁸

In the draft Restoration Plan, the Federal Agencies considered Alternatives B and C with reference to restoring grizzly bears to the NCE with existing protections under Section 7 of the ESA (Alternative B) and restoration with a 100) nonessential experimental population under the ESA (Alternative C).²⁹ Friends of Animals encourages the Federal Agencies to craft the final Restoration Plan so that grizzly bears receive the most protections available as listed species under the ESA.

B. The Final Restoration Plan should account for the positive effects grizzly bear reintroduction will have on wildlife in the NCE.

Grizzly bears were present in the NCE for thousands of years, an apex predator and vital species playing a critical role in a thriving ecosystem, before suffering near complete population loss in the 19th and 20th centuries. Development, logging, hunting, and other forms of human activity decimated the grizzly bear and its habitat as human populations spread into the natural ecosystems in which grizzly bears formerly thrived for millennia. As a result of hunting, logging and population and development expansion, grizzly bears were rendered extinct from the U.S. portion of the NCE.

As a keystone species in the historical boundaries of the NCE, grizzly bears provided a positive impact and played a critical role in a thriving NCE before removal from the ecosystem. Complete removal from the ecosystem damages the delicate and critical balance of the ecosystem. Reintroduction of grizzly bears will benefit the NCE by returning the ecosystem to a condition more like the thriving ecosystem that existed for thousands of years, before human intervention proved grave to yet another keystone species.

The Federal Agencies acknowledge the critical importance of grizzly bears in a thriving NCE and must explore alternatives that return grizzly bears to their natural place within the ecosystem. As a predator, grizzly bears play a role in managing the populations of the species upon which they prey, maintaining a healthy balance of wildlife within the NCE. However, 90% of a grizzly bear's diet consists of vegetable and insect matter, as opposed to livestock or other sources of meat." The impact on existing

wildlife populations, while positive for management of population levels, would not be detrimental or beyond what the ecosystem can tolerate. Affording grizzly bears the full protection of the ESA would allow grizzly bear populations, and the NCE, to thrive while minimizing the impact of humans and management methods that could be potentially lethal.

Grizzly bears further enhance the ecosystems they inhabit by spreading seeds through their eating and traveling patterns, and help aerate the soil while rooting for sustenance, thereby playing a critical role in the ecological health of the NCE plant life. Spreading seeds and assisting in health plant ecology assists not only the grizzly bear population, but also the wildlife that relies on that plant life. The Federal Agencies should ensure that the final Restoration Plan protects and encourages the conservation of grizzly bears, maximizing their beneficial role in improving the ecological diversity necessary for a thriving ecosystem, rather than placing as a primary emphasis the management of grizzly bears for the benefit of humans. Affording grizzly bears the full protections of the ESA will promote the Federal Agencies' stated goal of increasing the biodiversity of the NCE.

C. The Federal Agencies should craft the final Restoration Plan to account for the role humans play in minimizing human-grizzly bear interactions.

In the draft Restoration Plan, the Federal Agencies considered the "Visitor Use and Recreation Experience" in the NCE.³¹ Hiking, camping, wildlife viewing, and boating are just a few of the many recreational activities people pursue in the region.³² Grizzly bear reintroduction into the NCE should not limit the ability of people to engage in these activities, as the limited number of bears slowly introduced should not lead to significant encounters, as the NCE is comprised of roughly 10,000 square miles and includes vast areas in which the difficult terrain limits the ease with which humans may participate in recreational opportunities. However, recreational activities should be permitted only to the extent the activities do not adversely affect the wildlife in the NCE or will not increase the possibility of human-wildlife conflict. The final Restoration Plan must include measures to educate the public on how to enjoy outdoor activities in areas where interaction with bears may occur and measures to enforce responsible human

behavior. While grizzly bears generally seek to avoid interaction with humans, people should still be required to carry bear spray, and groups should be limited in size through a permit system. People should also be educated on minimizing interactions with grizzly bears and how to respond if encountering a grizzly bear. Importantly, while people are encouraged to enjoy recreational activities in and around the NCE, the Restoration Plan should also include severe restrictions on hunting and encourage people to use non-lethal means to respond to and to deescalate interactions. The best way to realize this vision is to select an alternative and craft the Restoration Plan in a way that gives grizzly bears the full protections of the ESA.

Notably, in the draft Restoration Plan, the Federal Agencies compare Alternatives B and C in the category of "Incidental Take and Section 7 Consultation." In Alternative B, incidental takes must be pre-authorized through consultation with the FWS and "[p]ersons may not intentionally take a grizzly bear, unless . . . necessary for defense of life."³³ On the contrary, Alternative C, in which a 10 (j) NEP would be established, incidental takes would be allowed without pre-authorization or consultation with FWS.³⁴ Such a "kill first, ask permission later" approach will surely lead to incidents in which grizzly bears will be needlessly killed, but later permitted through justifications developed after the fact. The Federal Agencies should place as paramount the protection of grizzly bears and afford the species the full protections of BSA section 7.

The Federal Agencies should also consider the cultural and socioeconomic effects of reintroducing grizzly bears in the NCE. Grizzly bears thrived for thousands of years in the region and are of great significance to the culture and traditions of Indigenous communities in and around the NCE.³⁵ A thriving grizzly bear population will draw people from around the United States, as well as internationally, for the opportunity to see a thriving ecosystem in which grizzly bears play a critical role. An increase in people traveling to the region to view the wildlife and participate in other recreational activities will, inevitably, benefit the economy of the local communities in the region.

The Federal Agencies should consider these positive impacts when finalizing the Restoration Plan and select an alternative that best outlines measures to limit interactions with bears when engaging in recreational activities. The Federal Agencies must include limitations specifically requiring recreational users to be diligent in preventing human-bear incidents and to be prepared to deescalate or minimize effects when encountering a bear, whether the interaction is intentional or inadvertent.

D. The Federal Agencies should prioritize protections for grizzly bears over livestock grazing.

It is to be expected that ranching and farming interests in the region generally oppose the reintroduction of grizzly bears because of the belief that grizzly bears could kill livestock and reduce their profits. These industries often claim that grizzly bears harass livestock, threaten humans, and consume significant orchard products. But ranchers and farmers face these same concerns from other species wherever non-native livestock populations are raised for human consumption, including regions in which populations of grizzlies and other bears presently thrive.

Contrary to the "sky-is-falling" protests by ranchers and farmers, the Federal Agencies have previously noted that a U.S. Department of Interior formula indicates that there could be just three livestock deaths per year when the grizzly bear population reaches 200 bears in 60 to 100 years.³⁶ In the draft Restoration Plan, the Federal Agencies stated "the total number of cattle and sheep depredated within the NCE would result in minimal, adverse impacts on agriculture and the livestock grazing industry, contributing to less than 0.01% of the total number of cattle and sheep" in the region.³⁷ The extent of this projected depredation would be impacted by the size of the grazing operation, the extent to which there is overlap with grizzly bears, and the presence of rancher--based attractants, such as orchards, beehives, livestock boneyards, and cattle and sheep calving areas. Further, the impacts are "less likely to occur given that no staging or release areas would overlap active grazing allotments."³⁸ And to the extent any ranching operation may suffer depredation of livestock "units," such ranching operation would possibly enjoy compensation for any loss, either through insurance or as authorized under Washington State law.

The Federal Agencies should include in the Restoration Plan provisions to educate ranchers and farmers on methods to minimize interactions with grizzly bears, including electric fences, bear-proof trash receptacles, bear-proof food canisters, and non-lethal methods of managing and deescalating interactions between humans and domestic animals (including livestock), and grizzly bears. Friends of Animals also urges the Federal Agencies to take a hard look at how ranchers and landowners will use an "experimental population" designation under section 100] of the BSA and ensure "more flexible" management methods will not lead to escalated deterrence methods or lethal means of "management." The draft Restoration Plan allows for deterrence of grizzly bears "from the immediate vicinity 600 feet (200 yards) of a human-occupied residence

or potential conflict area with humans, such as a barn, livestock corral, chicken coop, grain bin, or schoolyard."³⁹ However, there should also be requirements regarding control of attractants to preemptively avoid a situation that may lead to use of deterrence methods.⁴⁰ Requiring ranchers and landowners to minimize attractants would also potentially negate the need for the lethal control authorization or permits contemplated by Alternative C with a 10(j) designation, making it easier to implement Alternative B and afford grizzly bears the full protections of the ESA.

Alternative C, with a 100) NEP, allows for hazing and other deterrence methods based only on the reported location of the grizzly bear, not taking into consideration the actual level of threat, if any, presented by the bear and the presence of attractants placed by the human landowner. Further, when specifically addressing livestock, the draft Restoration Plan and proposed 10(j) rule allow for lethal taking of a grizzly bear within 100 yards of livestock, subject to various conditions.⁴¹ But, there is little to indicate that farmers and ranchers are required to minimize attractants or better defines when lethal methods may be employed, beyond stating "when necessary for public safety or to protect public property."⁴² The best way to avoid potential "management" issues is to restore grizzly bears to their native ecosystem as fully protected species under the BSA and require that ranchers and landowners minimize attractants on their property.

At the end of the day, provisions to accommodate "management" of grizzly bears for the benefit of the livestock industry are not necessary, considering the insignificant depredation rate of 0.01%. Additionally, 2.6 million acres of the NCE is considered wilderness, identified as "untrammelled, natural, undeveloped, providing opportunities for solitude or primitive and unconfined recreation, and other features of value."⁴³ Wilderness is not characterized by residential communities or livestock grazing, and the amount of interaction humans will have with bears in 2.6 million acres with 200--400 bears in 60 years will likely be minimal.

The better approach, rather than allowing for unmonitored hazing and the use of lethal measures to prevent insignificant levels of livestock depredation, is to restore grizzly bear populations with the existing protections of the ESA. To minimize any negative effects grizzly bear restoration may have on livestock in the tiny portion of the NCE in which livestock and bears populations may overlap, Friends of Animals urges the Federal Agencies to evaluate what measures have been taken in similar situations in similar environments to minimize and avoid conflict. Efforts such as electric fences, minimizing attractants, and non-lethal methods of responding to interactions must be considered in the final Restoration Plan, rather than allowing for immediate action to be taken against grizzly bears with permission being sought after the fact.

CONCLUSION

Friends of Animals supports the Federal Agencies' efforts to facilitate the reintroduction of grizzly bears into the us. portion of the NCE. Friends of Animals encourages the Federal Agencies to select the alternative that provides grizzly bears with the greatest amount of protection under the ESA to allow for a successful reintroduction and a viable population for the future. While the Federal Agencies appear to believe the reintroduced populations must be managed to achieve success for the future, Friends of Animals requests the Federal Agencies select the alternative that minimizes the amount of human interaction with the grizzly bear populations, negating the need for "management" under section 100'). Friends of Animals encourages the Federal Agencies to select a path forward that promotes the positive impacts and effects of grizzly bear reintroduction and considers the minimal threat to farming and ranching interests that may result, requiring the public to be educated on how to coexist with grizzly bears as protected species under the ESA and without short-sighted, lethal methods of "management."

Thank you for the opportunity to comment, and please contact me if you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

1 National Park Service, U. S. Fish & Wildlife Service to evaluate options for restoring grizzly bears to the North Cascades, 2022; accessed October 24,2023).

2 National Park Service and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Establishment of a Nonessential Experimental Population of Grizzly Bear in the North Cascades Econ/stem, Washington State, 88 Fed. Reg. 67193, 67195 (September 29, 2023).

3 U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Park Service, Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/Environmental Impact Statement, p. 5 (September 2023).

4 Id.

5 88 Fed. Reg. at 67195 [citing 88 FR 41560, June 27, 2023).

6 Draft Restoration Plan at pp. i-ii.

7 88 Fed. Reg. at 67205.

8 National Park Service, FAQs/Background (last updated November 15, 2022).

9 National Park Service and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Notice of Intent to Prepare North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/Environmental Impact Statement, Washington, 87 Fed. Reg. 68190 (November 14, 2022).

10 87 Fed. Reg. at 68191.

11 87 Fed. Reg. at 68191.

12 Draft Restoration Plan at p. iv.

13 87 Fed. Reg. at 68191.

14 87 Fed. Reg. at 68191.

15 Draft Restoration Plan at p. iii. and p. 40, Table 2

16 See generally, Draft Restoration Plan.

17 Draft Restoration Plan at p. ii.

18 Draft Restoration Plan at p. ii.

19 88 Fed. Reg. at 67193.

20 Draft Restoration Plan at p. i.

21 15 U.S.C. § 1531(b).

22 16 U.S.C. §§ 1531(b)-[c], 1532(3), 1533(1).

23 Draft Restoration Plan at p. 19.

24 Draft Restoration Plan at p. 19.

25 Draft Restoration Plan at p. 19.

26 Draft Restoration Plan at pp. 19-20.

27 Draft Restoration Plan at pp. 19--20.

28 88 Fed. Reg. at 67200.

29 Draft Restoration Plan at pp. 23--47.

30 National Park Service, FAQs/Background, at p. 4 and 5. [last updated November 15, 2022).

31 Restoration Plan at p. 11.

32 Restoration Plan at p. 11.

33 Restoration Plan at p. 45.

34 Restoration Plan at p. 45.

35 Restoration Plan at pp. 137-138.

36 National Park Service, FAQs/Background at p. 5, (last updated November 15, 2022).

37 Draft Restoration Plan at p. 144.; 88 Fed. Reg. at 67213

38 Draft Restoration Plan at p. 14-4; 88 Fed. Reg. at 67214.

39 Draft Restoration Plan at p. 43.

40 Draft Restoration Plan at p. 43.

41 Draft Restoration plan at p. 44; 88 Fed. Reg. at 67216.

42 Draft Restoration Plan at p. 44; 88 Fed. Reg. at 67216.

43 Draft Restoration Plan at p. vi.

Correspondence ID: 14418Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wenatchee, WA 98807
United States of America

Outside Organization: North Central Washington Audubon Society Conservation/Preservation(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,03 2023

Correspondence Type:Letter

Correspondence: Superintendent Don Striker and Supervisor Brad Thompson

810 State Route 20

Sad

ro-Woolley, WA 98284

Re: Draft North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Environmental impact Statement

Dear Superintendent Striker and Supervisor Thompson,

North Central Washington Audubon Society (NCWAS), with approximately 500 members in Chelan, Okanogan, Douglas, and Ferry counties in Washington State, is submitting the following comments to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades Ecosystem.

One of the core principles of our organization's mission is to enhance, protect, and restore healthy natural ecosystems within our chapter's boundaries. Given this, we strongly support the reintroduction of native species to ecosystems that historically hosted them. And particularly so for keystone species like the grizzly bear.

The North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE) is one of the few wild and healthy ecosystems remaining in the United States outside of Alaska. Over 3,100,000 acres, it overlies areas within our chapter's boundaries. In recent years, keystone species such as wolves and wolverines have begun to filter back into the NCE, and Fisher reintroduction has been underway there for several years. Still missing, however, is the grizzly bear.

NCWAS is aware of the concerns some have expressed for public safety if grizzly bears become once again a functional part of the NCE. However, even where grizzly bears are still common, truly negative outcomes between them and people are very rare. In fact, many of the risks most people accept on a regular basis are far more likely to result in harm than would be posed by grizzly bears once again roaming the NCE.

We understand that both options B and C of the Draft EIS contain many of the same components but differ on the rules under which any resulting bear/human conflict occurrences will be handled. Regarding this, we believe that the 100) rule makes the most sense, as it will assure that any such incidences will be addressed by wildlife professionals, rather than private individuals.

NCWAS believes there is substantial value in having a few areas in our country that contain the full range of species that were present when settlers first arrived and where people need to be aware of their circumstances. The NCE can become one of those few places again. We, therefore, fully support reintroduction of the grizzly bear to the NCE and have a strong preference for Option C of the Draft EIS.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on this important issue.

Correspondence ID: 14419Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Salem, OR 97301
United States of America
Outside Organization: Oregon Cattlemen's Association Non-Governmental(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,15 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: Dear Mr. Striker:
Oregon Cattlemen's Association offers these comments on the North Cascades Grizzly Bear Restoration DEIS. We commented on previous analyses of North Cascades Grizzly Restoration, and we write to support our counterparts in Washington. Because this proposal fails to manage grizzly bear expansion, it could result in grizzly bear conflicts for our members' operations in Oregon. We represent multi-generational family-owned operations with plans to continue livestock operations throughout the life of this proposal. We have a stake in this, and our input is substantive and deserves close consideration.
Grizzly Bear Dispersal

We strongly disagree that restoration of grizzlies should result in 200 (or more) bears dispersing to any environment of their choosing. Experience from grizzly expansion in Idaho and Montana shows that when populations expand, grizzlies move from home territories in search of food and are lured to readily available sources, such as livestock herds, municipal dumps, orchards, and grain stockpiles. Grizzly expansion in Montana is close to reaching the Dakotas. Based on this, we anticipate that the North Cascades proposal will ultimately bring grizzly bears to Oregon.

We appreciate the information presented in Figure 4, which shows that wildlife managers anticipate grizzlies dispersing throughout Zones 1, 2, and 3 in Washington.

[Figure 4 - Alternative C Management Zones]

Earlier versions of this grizzly restoration effort argued that bears would stay within 10 miles of the release site. Experience with other grizzly populations discounts this and verifies that grizzlies can disperse for hundreds of miles from initial placement.

We also appreciate the following information on Page 66 of the DEIS:

Home ranges of translocated bears could initially be several times larger than typical home ranges of resident bears, and some homing or exploratory behavior may occur where bears move long distances from their release site. Based on CYE data between 1990 and 2021, approximately three--quarters of grizzly bears are expected to remain in the NOE after translocation, and one--quarter, or an estimated 6 bears, could move out of the NOE (FWS, Kasworm pers. comm. 20230).

The current DEIS improves on past analyses in predicting grizzly dispersal. Since the DEIS doesn't address measures for ultimately maintaining a cap on the 200--grizzly population, unlimited expansion is expected,

which only increases our concerns about the effects of Alternatives B and C on our membership. As we reviewed the DEIS, however, we noticed measures (on Page 168) for residents, landowners, ranchers, and farmers to protect themselves, crops, and livestock from grizzlies that disperse into Zones 1, 2, or 3. Described as effective, one of these measures is installing electric fencing around houses, crops, and livestock. This measure inspired our proposal for a grizzly restoration effort we are naming Alternative D.

Alternative D

We request that the FEIS include in-detail analysis of Alternative D, which would introduce a population of 25 grizzly bears over 5 to 10 years into fenced blocks of core habitat within the confines of the North Cascades National Park. With core habitat surrounded by electric fencing, wildlife managers can readily monitor and support grizzly populations while minimizing risks to bears from human conflicts. This population, capped at 25 bears, would be maintained over the long term.

We believe Alternative D would benefit all grizzly populations because it requires fewer transplants from source populations while minimizing mortality from conflicts in communities throughout Washington or beyond. When genetic mixing is needed for grizzly health, a contained environment would ensure replacement bears from other populations would mix with the NOE population rather than leaving it to chance encounters by dispersing bears.

Alternative D would be more compatible with plans and policies of state, local and other jurisdictions. Washington state legislation makes grizzly introduction illegal in Washington. While Alternative D would technically conflict with this legislation, we believe the legislature's intent would be honored by confining grizzlies to federally managed lands. Grizzly bears dispersed beyond national park boundaries would certainly conflict with the legislature's intent.

We've already experienced the effects of unfettered dispersal with the Canadian wolf. The Oregon Wolf Plan's management strategies and compensation efforts haven't begun to address the losses we've suffered. Compensation requires an inspected carcass. After encounters with wolves, our livestock also suffer from wolf kills where the carcass can't be found or the specific predator confirmed, aborted calves, lowered rates of calf production, defensive behavior that makes livestock difficult to handle, and countless hours spent on nonlethal prevention measures. Alternative D would avoid this same experience from grizzly predation.

Diversity Equity and Inclusion

We believe the grizzly restoration proposal would improve with stronger engagement of the Hispanic community. Washington state has a strong and growing Hispanic community with a stake in federal actions, especially long--term projects like grizzly restoration. We acknowledge coordination accomplished between the agencies and Native American tribes. Still, we're certain that the NPS and FWS obligation to address diversity, equity, and inclusion doesn't stop when your proposal might be opposed.

According to the November 2019 NPS report on the racial and ethnic diversity of park Visitors, Hispanic visitors continue to be underrepresented in the national parks. It reports that Hispanic Americans are disinclined to visit National Parks because of cost, transportation, or they don't know much about what there is to do in national parks. The report is at a loss on recommendations because previous efforts over the past two decades haven't changed the disparity.

It's time for the agencies to try a different approach to accomplishing DEI goals. Hispanic communities associated with orchards, farms, vineyards, and ranches may not have experience with traditional agency public involvement efforts. Have you considered releasing the DEIS in Spanish? Do you have a Spanish--speaking member on your interdisciplinary team? Might Alternative D provide an opportunity to engage Hispanic communities to learn more about grizzly restoration without placing their members who work outdoors in danger? Doing the work and being an ally can't be accomplished with traditional approaches.

Environmental Justice

On Page 16 of the DEIS, the environmental justice analysis states:

It was determined that while a small number of communities adjacent to the NOE grizzly bear recovery zone may qualify as minority and/or low-income populations, these communities would not be disproportionately affected by grizzly bear restoration because restoration activities would not be focused in these areas. Therefore, this topic was dismissed from further analysis. (Page 16)

This analysis is inaccurate because these minority and/ or low-income populations will be disproportionately affected due to their strong representation in the agriculture and grazing industries. Grizzlies will be drawn to orchards, vineyards, grain fields, and livestock herds for the easy food source, increasing the likelihood of conflicts between grizzlies and members of these communities as they live, work, and recreate. Landowners will incur the cost of fencing to protect their homes, crops, and animals. This issue needs to be analyzed in detail. Alternative D would resolve environmental justice concerns by fencing the grizzlies within park boundaries, protecting these communities from disproportionate effects.

Ecological Benefits

The DEIS fails to disclose how Alternatives B or C provide any ecological benefit of grizzlies being reintroduced throughout Washington. For example, salmon restoration efforts generally bring benefits to the whole system as food sources for other species and nutrients from their post-spawning carcasses. No evidence is presented that introducing the apex predator grizzly bear fills any missing link in the complex web of an ecosystem. If anything, the analysis shows multiple examples of anticipated adverse effects on other ESA listed and unlisted species.

Does the DEIS analyze the impact of an expanding population of grizzly bears on other large carnivore predators (i.e., Mountain Lions, Black Bear, Gray Wolf) or the cumulative effects of expanding large carnivore populations on ungulate wildlife populations (i.e., Elk, Deer, Bighorn Sheep, Mountain Goats)? In some areas, these wildlife populations are already being negatively impacted by current populations of large carnivore predators. As these populations decline, increased predation of livestock and encounters with humans can be expected.

The ecosystem obviously has been working effectively without grizzlies for a long time. Since there's no compelling ecological reason to introduce grizzlies, the proposal is driven only by social and cultural issues. Alternative D does the best job of addressing those because it also minimizes conflicts with nearby communities.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The DEIS underestimates helicopter usage throughout the life of the proposal. While initial transfer of grizzlies is accounted for, additional helicopter time will be needed over time for removing problem bears, replacing collars, or tending injured or sick animals. We appreciated the analysis of site-specific effects of helicopter downwash on birds and other animals on Page 89 of the DEIS. We ask for similar specificity in the FEIS to quantify the greenhouse gas emissions from aviation gas or jet fuel that would be burned throughout the life of the project.

Alternatives B and C would produce more greenhouse gas emissions because the grizzly population would become larger and uncontained as it dispersed throughout the state (and beyond). Alternative D would result in minimal greenhouse gas emissions because the grizzly population would be smaller and contained, minimizing the use of greenhouse gas emitting aircraft or vehicles. Federal agencies will soon be limited to electric vehicles. Agency proposals need to reflect this upcoming change.

In 2020, Washington State passed legislation to limit greenhouse gas emissions to 45% below 1990 levels by 2030, 70% below 1990 levels by 2040 and 95% below 1990 levels with net-zero emissions by 2050. Eventually, helicopters will no longer be available for introducing and maintaining grizzly populations,

making it increasingly likely that problem grizzlies will be killed instead of relocated. These adverse long-term effects on grizzlies from Alternatives B and C are not addressed in the DEIS.

Effects on Listed Fish

Effects on ESA listed fish species consumed by grizzlies are incorrectly analyzed on Pages 89-90 of the DEIS. There could be impacts to a small number of fish consumed by grizzly bears, including bull trout, anadromous salmon, and steelhead listed under the ESA. However, the relatively small number of grizzly bears released to form an initial population of 25 bears are unlikely to affect the population viability of any fish. While there is the potential for increased adverse impacts with a restored grizzly bear population of 200 bears after 60 to 100 years, the impacts would still be limited due to the abundance of fish relative to the number of grizzly bears, even if certain individual bears were to prey on fish when seasonably abundant.

Even though grizzlies are expected to directly kill listed fish species (many of which are declining in numbers), Alternative B and C are considered Not Likely to Adversely Affect listed fish. Yet, if livestock have potential to step on one red, the determination for a livestock grazing operation is Likely to Adversely Affect. The FWS and NCAA Fisheries findings for Alternatives B and C violate ESA consultation regulations. The loss of even one fish from grizzly consumption constitutes a direct impact and warrants a Likely to Adversely Affect determination for Alternatives B and C, and a take permit must be issued.

Monitoring and action plans normally accompany Likely to Adversely Affect determinations to avoid further damage once initial take of a listed species is observed. The grizzly restoration alternatives need a monitoring and action plan to minimize grizzly effects on listed fish. Efforts might need to include hazing the grizzlies or relocating them from fish-bearing streams.

Agency Capabilities and Responsibilities

While WDFW has a program for managing black bear conflicts on private land, the FWS does not seem equipped to provide the same for managing grizzly bear conflicts. Does FWS have the necessary ground-oriented personnel and transportation methods to quickly address problem grizzlies on private land? If not, Alternatives B and C would be detrimental to grizzly survival because the public would intervene on behalf of their own safety. In small towns and suburbs, the public typically relies on local law enforcement to address safety threats. Considering the multiple demands already placed on Washington's law enforcement, it's likely that problem bears will be quickly killed if public safety is at risk. Analysis of Alternatives B and C doesn't acknowledge the mortality risk to grizzlies when dispersed throughout adjacent communities. Under Alternative D, grizzlies would be within a fenced core habitat area within the National Park and would avoid this risk. National park employees could assist FWS with management and monitoring under Alternative D.

ID Team Qualifications

We notice that the ID team are employed by WSP USA Solutions Inc, one of the largest consulting groups in the world. From social media, we understand the members work in cities such as Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Oakland, California; Asheville, North Carolina; New York City, New York; Calgary, Canada, and Raleigh, North Carolina. We believe that their appreciation for Alternative D and their ability to analyze the alternatives would improve with personal experience of communities in the analysis area. Perhaps the contract would allow for a visit to the area by these far-flung team members so they know what they're writing about.

Canadian Translocations

We suggest a more thorough analysis of this information on Page 62:

Canadian translocation efforts have not started, and it is unclear how any Canadian efforts would impact the US portion of the NOE. Should reintroduction efforts occur in British Columbia, it is likely _ that some grizzly bears reintroduced into the Canadian portion of the ecosystem may move into the US portion of the NOE, either as a transient and return to Canada or may ultimately remain in the US.

Stating that effects are unclear is not a substitute for a thorough disclosure and discussion of what is known. Because of Canadian introduction efforts, grizzlies could enter the North Cascades Park under any of the alternatives. These effects must be investigated and disclosed in the FEIS rather than dismissed as unclear. Have the Canadians been consulted about bears that have been introduced to the US portion of NC NP moving into their portion of the park?

Interactions With Livestock

The DEIS underestimates potential livestock kill under Alternatives B and C. On Page 83 it states: More recent studies estimate that an individual grizzly bear kills 19 calves per year on the northern range of Yellowstone National Park (Barber-Meyer, Mech, and White 2008) and 7 calves per year within the Yellowstone Lake watershed, (Fortin et al. 2013).

And on Page 61, we read:

Grizzly bears are highly adaptable omnivores and are considered both habitat and food generalists that can adapt to changing food sources;

While the DEIS states livestock losses in the North Cascades might be less frequent than Yellowstone grizzlies, it doesn't acknowledge that Yellowstone is one of the proposed source areas for North Cascades grizzlies. Considering how adaptable grizzlies are to available food sources, we could anticipate the same or even larger calf losses from the North Cascades grizzly population.

The analysis on pages 143-146 of the DEIS considers only a portion of the potential effects on agriculture and livestock grazing from Alternatives B and C. Direct losses from grizzly depredation are patterned after "Montana Livestock Board numbers. However, livestock board numbers are confirmed or probable losses, which exclude a large number of losses where the predator is inconclusive or the carcass is missing. The analysis also fails to estimate losses due to reduced livestock health and reproduction from grizzly harassment, along with long hours operators would need to invest in fencing and non--lethal measures.

The DEIS estimates about 1.8 million acres of agricultural lands among the counties in and around the National Park. Many of those acres include crops and livestock that would be susceptible to grizzly damage. Why isn't the cost to landowners from fencing 1.8 million acres considered in Alternatives B and C? The cost would be extremely high, particularly since landowners only have the authority to fence their own individual parcels. Under Alternative D, fencing of core grizzly habitat within the National Park could be accomplished in large blocks and would be more amenable to maintenance. The analysis of direct, indirect, and cumulative effects on livestock co-using habitat with an expanding population of grizzly bears does not consider the full range of effects from other relevant federal actions and programs. For example, depredation from Canadian wolves is already adversely affecting livestock operations and is not considered in the cumulative effects.

Other DEIS Insufficiencies

We noticed several insufficiencies in the DEIS that insufficiently address the Council on Environmental Quality NEPA regulations, both the current version and the proposed version that recently closed the public comment period.

The Purpose and Need does not answer the questions of why here and why now. No compelling or timely

reason is provided to introduce grizzlies into the North Cascades. Similar to previous versions of this proposal, the DEIS proposes 200 grizzlies, a target number developed decades ago by a team of government employees who have probably long since retired. Wildlife managers and the public have learned a lot about grizzly and human interactions in the meantime, and the purpose and need for grizzly restoration in Washington needs to be updated.

The document's 'effects analyses. for Alternatives B and C does not match the alternative description. While effects of the next 5 to 10 years are analyzed, most long-term effects are absent or dismissed as unknowable. Yet, these alternatives describe ongoing grizzly release efforts over the next 60 to 100 years. The project length and effects analysis periods need better coordination. At a minimum, adaptive management steps and measures must be discussed for long-term projects. Since predicting effects 100 years from now is meaningless, we suggest developing and adopting Alternative D. This would allow a discrete project period of 5 to 10 years for reaching a population of 25 bears to be managed at that level over time.

The effects analysis lacks site--specificity. For almost all issues or resources, the effects of Alternatives B and C are the same, indicating a limited range of alternatives that does not address the key issues. Including Alternative D in the FEIS would improve this range, although much greater site-specific analysis would be needed for all alternatives. Inviting the team members to visit the state would also help them provide site-specific analysis.

This effort has a history of poorly staged decision--making from the start. While the DEIS recognizes that grizzly restoration will trigger future decisions by the Forest Service, it does not address the effects of those decisions in any detail. Any known effects of an action must be disclosed instead of deferred to a future decision. This staging issue would be properly handled by including the Forest Service as a cooperating agency with a new Notice of Intent. Then a new DEIS could be released to disclose the effects of grizzly restoration on the national forest. The current DEIS is very weak on this point and is a point for successful administrative objection and litigation. Please notice that Alternative D avoids this procedural weakness as grizzlies would be physically confined to the national park.

Conclusion

Finally, we ask you to consider how much public trust of federal government and its contractors has eroded in the last four years. Although public health agencies stated the vaccine would stay in the arm, we are learning its contents are now found in every organ of the body. Safe and effective has proven to be more a slogan than a reality. Stating that grizzlies will mostly stay in the park or that problem grizzly encounters will be rare is eerily similar to recent public health messaging. You might reflect on the growing public unrest with government decisions made in the name of science that result in unfortunate consequences to public safety. We've never seen mistrust of government this high. If the agencies want to repair their reputation, we suggest they carefully consider the temporal and spatial consequences of their proposals and clearly share those with the public before decisions are made.

Thank you for considering our input, and we look forward to an FEIS that values grizzly survival and community engagement and safety. If you have any questions about our input, please contact Tammy Dennee, Executive Director at 503--361-3941.

Sincerely,
OREGON CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION

Correspondence ID: 14420Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Snohomish, WA 98290
United States of America
Outside Organization: Pilchuck Audubon Society Conservation/Preservation(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,15 2023

Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: SUBJECT: Pilchuck Audubon Society comments on the Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/Environmental Impact Statement for the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE)

Dear Superintendent Striker:

Pilchuck Audubon Society represents 1500 members in Snohomish County and Camano Island, Washington State. We support the purpose and need of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and the 101' Rule to restore the grizzly bear to the North Cascade Ecosystem (NCE), as proposed by the National Park Service (NPS) and the US Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS).

In this proposal, the North Cascades National Park Complex would anchor the recovery area.

It has been 48 years since the Endangered Species Act (ESA) of 1975 established a list of species to be restored. The grizzly bear is among those species.

Support for Recovery

We support reintroduction of grizzly bears into remote areas with grizzly bear habitat on federal lands adjacent to and encompassing the North Cascades National Park Complex.

We support Alternative C. The NPS and USFWS would implement an ecosystem evaluation approach to grizzly bear restoration, wherein three to seven grizzly bears would be released into the NCE over five to 10 years. We support the goal of establishing an initial population of 25 grizzly bears before switching to adaptive management. It is an expectation this small, nonessential experimental population will reproduce over the 60-100 years, achieving a self-sustaining population of 200 grizzly bears over the six million acres of the NCE.

Ideally, that population will lead to a delisting of the grizzly bear from its current threatened ESA status.

The benefit in starting slow with Alternative C's significant emphasis upon monitoring and evaluation is to learn how this small number of bears behaves in the NCE.

The 100' Rule enables significant flexibility in managing a population toward restoration. This important provision in the ESA allows considerable flexibility in managing a species being restored. For example, grizzlies that get into conflict situations can be hazed, captured, moved, or killed. However, the 10j Rule applies only with a species believed to no longer be present when restoration efforts begin. That is not a qualifying problem with the NCE. There is no evidence of a sustainable grizzly bear population now present.

Caution for Marbled Murrelet and Northern Spotted Owl Areas

We are concerned about the inevitable use of helicopters in transporting grizzly bears and NPS and USFWS personnel to remote release sites.

Pilchuck Audubon Society's primary concern is potential adverse impacts to both the Marbled Murrelet and Northern Spotted Owl populations. These impacts could result in disturbance from helicopter flights near nesting chicks and fledglings occupying forests located near the flight operations bases. This also would affect where some grizzlies may subsequently be relocated within the NEC.

Without knowing the specific sites to be used for landings, approaches to same, and travel routes between the sites, we must assume some of the routes will be over or near sites occupied by these birds. It is imperative the NPS and USFWS consult with USFS wildlife biologists as to presumed areas of occupancy on National Forest System lands. This would be especially important regarding Marbled Murrelets' seasons of occupancy and travel between chicks, fledglings, and the Puget Sound food sources.

Northern Spotted Owl nesting generally occurs from about February to August, and parental care can extend into September. Although based on observations of the Mexican Spotted Owl, as a precaution here in the PNW, it is assumed owlets are particularly vulnerable to disturbance by helicopter noise if the distance is less

than 105 meters (344 feet) from helicopter to owl (Delaney et al, 1999). As the likely relocation work of the bears won't occur until early summer, possible interactions are not likely until late May into the fall months. Marbled Murrelets use mature forest stands for nesting. There are known nesting areas in the western Washington areas considered for your operations. The typical nesting season is thought to start in April and fledgling occupancy run into late August, although predominately reported to end in early August. However, the habits observed 20 years ago (Hammer et al, 1995) may be changing.

We recommend helicopter flights be a minimum 345 feet above known nesting areas, and that flight plans be altered to avoid nesting by using a minimum buffer of 300-600 feet. We ask that feeding flight paths be avoided during early morning and early evenings, usually designated as being two hours before and after sunrise and sunset, as these are the times when Marbled Murrelets are most actively feeding their offspring with flights between the mountains and Puget Sound.

We think more should be specifically stipulated in the subsequent flight operations manual about avoiding adverse impacts upon these species' occupancies and travel routes. This includes especially the lower elevation landing zones where bears will load into helicopters and be flown to and from the field release sites. US Forest Service wildlife biologists should be consulted to determine areas to avoid.

Conclusion

We wholly agree upon the importance of restoring grizzly bears to at least some of the North Cascades Ecosystem in which they were once abundant, and now, it seems, are entirely absent with no evidence of residential occupancy except by a rare, solitary roaming bear.

Pilchuck Audubon Society joins with fellow conservationists whose focus is on wildlife beyond birds to support restoring a too-long absent sustainable species in the North Cascades. it makes for good stewardship that at least some of the North Cascades Ecosystem regains more natural and cultural diversity and wildness!

We welcome the ample opportunities for public information and comment during this particular round of public workshops, and appreciate the previous engagements to determine attitudes and values of the highly diverse stakeholders.

Correspondence ID: 14421Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Sedro Woolley, WA 98284
United States of America
Outside Organization: Upper Skagit Indian Tribe Tribal Government(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,15 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Public Comments Processing, Attn: FWS--RI--ES--2023--0074
Division of Policy, Performance, and Management Programs, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
MS: PRB/3W
5275 Leesburg Pike
Falls Church, VA 22041--3 803

In response to the National Park Service (NPS) news release (9/28/2023) seeking comments on the NPS draft EIS and the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service proposed 10(i) rule for restoration of grizzly bears in the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE), I write today on behalf of the federally recognized Upper Skagit Indian Tribe (Tribe) of Sedro Woolley, Washington, in support of EIS Alternative C and the Endangered Species Act proposed Section 100) designation with special consideration.

The people of our Tribe have resided in the North Cascades since Time Irnmemorial and we advocate the hereditary Indigenous perspective of a People nurtured in the very landscape in question. As such, we encourage restoration of species that have traditionally contributed to the native ecosystem's health and our wellbeing. We will- continue to speak out on behalf of those creatures who themselves cannot. In our culture, we teach our children to leave our environment in a better condition than we inherited--we know

that we borrow the present from our future generations. Today, the chain which binds all living things together in nature is broken, as so much that once was is now lost. We respect the Grizzly Bear's right to coexist, just as it did with our ancestors for thousands of years before contact with the first Europeans to enter our homeland. If we challenge the Grizzly's right to exist out of fear then we challenge our own rightful place in the landscape. In a not so distant time in our history we were once feared and many failed attempts were made to remove our people from our historical territory. Fortunately, our people endured as has our cultural responsibility and determination to protect mother nature from the collective failings of human abuse.

Upper Skagit Indian cultural affiliation to Grizzly Bear is as great as its cultural affiliation to the North Cascades, the bear's natural habitat. A large body of ethnohistoric, ethnographic, and archaeological evidence demonstrates that the Upper Skagit People represent the original precontact occupants of the Upper Skagit River Valley (Blukis Onat 1990; Collins 1974; Lane and Lane 1977; Miller 2023; Miller et al. 2019; Smith 1988). The Upper Skagit is the tribe that historically occupied, and is most culturally affiliated with, the northern portion of the area that is designated Management Zone 1 of the proposed 10(j) rule. The Tribe's ancestral villages and camps extended along the length of the Skagit River and all its tributaries, where Upper Skagits hunted Grizzly Bear (Collins 1974:52).

The Tribe's history, culture, and identity is so intertwined with Grizzly Bears and the NCE landscape that it is impossible to separate them. In the Lushootseed language spoken by Upper Skagit People, Grizzly Bear is called *tebtabol'* (Bates et al. 1994:1219, 317) and this word origin exists today in the North Cascades place names, such as the "Stetattle" River, where Upper Skagit Indian elder Charlie Moses lived seasonally until 1898 (see Fig. 1 below; Shone 2005; USIT 2019). This map name first appeared in the notes and sketches of explorer George Gibbs about 1858 and later in the U.S. Boundary Commission's 1866 map of "The Western Section", where the entire northern reach of the Skagit River is labeled as the "Steh--tatl Valley" (see Fig. 2 and U.S. Boundary Commission 1866). Not only was Grizzly Bear traditionally hunted, it was also a spiritual being who conferred hunting prowess on those individuals who possessed Grizzly Bear guardian spirit (Collins 1974:150).

It is the wish of the Tribe that in exercising their federal trust responsibility, that the NPS and USFWS consider the wisdom embedded in Upper Skagit Indian traditional ecological knowledge of bears as expressed in its legends. As told to pioneering anthropologist and ethnographer June Collins by Upper Skagit elder informants eighty years ago, bears could become people, and vice versa. Based on the bear encounters and stories told to her, Collins (1974: 150) emphasized that "These folktales point to the close relations that the Upper Skagit [People] saw between human beings and bears, although they did not encourage the intimacy, which they regarded as potentially dangerous." The discouragement of intimacy with bears highlights a practical application of Upper Skagit Indian traditional ecological wisdom that respects the presence of bears and learning to coexist with them. For the Tribe, the agencies, and any others who have read the proposed EIS alternatives, Alternative C is clearly most aligned with the USIT's ancestral history and traditional knowledge.

In consideration of the above, special deference should be given to the perspective of the Upper Skagit Indian Tribe. The additional special consideration the tribe is requesting is for continued consultation throughout implementation of Alternative C.

The Upper Skagit Tribe respects the rights of others to hold viewpoints differing from ours but we will continue to stand on the side of the environment.

Scott Schuyler the Natural & Cultural Policy Representative for the Tribe will be the point of contact and can be reached at [sschuyler\(a\)upperskagit.com](mailto:sschuyler(a)upperskagit.com). The Tribe looks forward to continued consultation regarding these plans and thanks you for considering these comments.

[Figure I. Stetattle Creek near its junction with the Skagit River, located just upstream from the original home of Upper

Skagit Indian elder [REDACTED] (2023 Photo by [REDACTED]).]

[Figure 2. 1866 US. Boundary Commission Map. Note map designation of "Steh--tatl Valley" in the location of present-day Ross Lake Reservoir.]

References

Bates, Dawn, Thom Hess, and Vi Hilbert

1994 Lushootseed Dictionary. Dawn Bates, Editor. University of Washington Press, Seattle.

Blukis Onat, Astrida R.

1990 Skagit Hydroelectric Project Relicensing Survey and Evaluation of Traditional Cultural Values, Properties, and Significance of the Project Area to Indian Tribes. Report submitted to Seattle City Light, Seattle.

Collins, June M.

1974 Valley of the Spirits. University of Washington Press, Seattle.

Lane, Robert B. and Barbara Lane

1977 Indians and Indian Fisheries of the Skagit River System. In Skagit Salmon Study. Volume One: Archeological Background. Upper Skagit Indian Tribe, Sedro-Woolley, WA.

Miller, Bruce Granville, Bill Angelbeck, Molly Sue Malone, Robert R. Mierendorf, and Jan Perrier, Eds.

2019 The Upper Skagit Indian Tribe Historical Atlas. Upper Skagit Indian Tribe, Sedro--Woolley, WA, 98284.

Miller, Bruce

2023 Upper Skagit Historical Overview. Accessed 11/2/2023 at <https://upperskagittlibe--nsn.gov/who-we-are/>

Shone kba Kwi Dah Cheed, Carmen

2005 A Linguistic Study of Place Names within: the North Cascade National Park Service Complex. Prepared for National Park Service, Contract # P9475 035 144, North Cascades National Park Service Complex, Marblemount Ranger Station, Marblemount, WA.

Smith, Allan '

1988 Ethnography of the North Cascades. Center for Northwest Anthropology, Washington State University, Project Report No. 7, Pullman, WA.

USIT

2019 The Skagit River Gorge and Canyons T

CP District. National Register of Historic Places

Registration Form for 45WH450. On file, Upper Skagit Indian Tribe, Sedro-Woolley, WA.

Correspondence ID:	14422Project:112008Document:132104
Address:	Little Rock, WA 98556 United States of America
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual
Received:	Nov, 15 2023
Correspondence Type:	Letter
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent,

I say YES to restoring the grizzly bear to the North Cascades.

The phrase used on the NPS website uses the phrase "options for managing bears to reduce or avoid conflicts while focusing on recovery."

The term "management" has, in the case of reintroduction of wolves and cougars has really meant "eradication" of any animal that happens to eat a wealthy landowner's cattle (grazing on public land, mind you). You can't have it both ways. Either the human encroaching on wildlife habitat must accept that they might lose some animals, or we don't have any wildlife left. The FWS has acted as taxpayer paid exterminators in the past.

This must stop. Now. Wolves, cougars and bears of all species belong in the North Cascades.

I fully endorse and support the reintroduction of grizzlies in the North Cascades, but with the following caveats:

Do not collar them. Don't think poachers, ranchers and other yahoos with an axe to grind and a rifle to settle it don't know how to use radio tracking. The number of grizzlies in the North Cascades is currently zero. If you see one after release, it's a good bet it's one of the released ones.

Yes, collars will help to locate them, and indicate when one has been killed. But finding the shooter is impossible and even when the shooter IS caught, the punishment is nothing. I do think ear tags are a good idea.

Take initial data: DNA, scat and hair samples for identification, blood samples, and then leave them alone. They don't need to be darted every six months just to see how they're doing. Sedatives do wierd things to animals, and habituating bears to being darted merely makes the possibility of an encounter with a human in their habitat all the more likely. If possible, make any contact with humans as slight as possible, after release. I realize it will take time to get them used to their new environment.

Using bear dogs to put the fear in them will help a great deal.

Punishment for anyone caught poaching or willfully killing a grizzly should be far more punitive than Is the current case (where a poacher Is usually slapped on the wrist and told he can't "hunt" there anymore. It doesn't stop anyone.)

If someone is caught killing a grizzly for any other reason than self defense, that person should be be punished to the full extent of the law, to include prison time.

I dearly hope releasing grizzlies into the N. Cascades works. They belong there

Correspondence ID: 14423Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Cleehum, WA 98922
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,15 2023

Correspondence Type:Letter

Correspondence: Please NO grizzly bears!!

Let them be. Do NOT bring in more bears.

Thank you

Correspondence ID: 14424Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, UN N/A
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,15 2023
Correspondence Type: Park Form
Correspondence: To whom is may concern:

Due to the fact that the introduction of out of state grizzly's into the state of WA would be illegal according to RCW's that are already on the state books and thus making that introduction unlawful, I see no need to comment on any EIS analysis.

What you need to hear clearly, once again, is that the citizens of WA state DO NOT WANT GRIZZLY BEARS BROUGHT INTO THE NORTH CASCADES IN ANY WAY SHAPE OR FORM!

If you persist in doing so, when the first mauling and/or death occurs, that mauling or death will be at the hands of the US Fish and Wildlife service and The National Park Service. Are you ready to have that on your conscience, let alone be criminally liable for that mailing and/or death?

Do the right thing. Back down. We the people have spoken. We don't want any more grizzly bears here other than the ones that are already here.

Correspondence ID: 14425Project:112008Document:132104
Address: N/A, UN N/A
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,15 2023
Correspondence Type: Park Form
Correspondence: To whom is may concern:

Due to the fact that the introduction of out of state grizzly's into the state of WA would be illegal according to RCW's that are already on the state books and thus making that introduction unlawful, I see no need to comment on any EIS analysis.

What you need to hear clearly, once again, is that the citizens of WA state DO NOT WANT GRIZZLY BEARS BROUGHT INTO THE NORTH CASCADES IN ANY WAY SHAPE OR FORM!

If you persist in doing so, when the first mauling and/or death occurs, that mauling or death will be at the hands of the US Fish and Wildlife service and The National Park Service. Are you ready to have that on your conscience, let alone be criminally liable for that mailing and/or death?

Do the right thing. Back down. We the people have spoken. We don't want any more grizzly bears here other than the ones that are already here.

Correspondence ID: 14426Project:112008Document:132104
Address: n/a, UN n/a
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,15 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: To whom it may concern,

I am writing to weigh in on the Grizzly Bear Restoration issue. We live in the Mt. Baker foothills on a very peaceful tree farm. My husband is the fifth generation of his family living here. We frequently have educational tours of our land and one consistent piece of feedback we get is how serene and peaceful it is here. I have worked a high stress job for years and have always been able to de-stress by meditating in nature, and walking and hiking our little piece of paradise. All that would change if we had to be constantly on guard for grizzly bears.

Also, I have my doubts that grizzly bears were ever in this area to begin with. I know most environmentalists really want to believe they were but I have seen no hard data to support this belief. Why not let nature take its course and if they are meant to be here, it will eventually happen. Either way, we can't go back and make the country as perfect as it was before man arrived, which often seems to be the hidden agenda of many environmentalists in our area. It often feels that salmon and grizzly bears are a priority over people who actually work on and live on the land. Shouldn't our safety and peace of mind be a priority, too?

I am strongly opposed to relocating grizzlies to the North Cascades. What we need now is practical, reasonable and logical leadership on this issue. We need to slow down and take the time to make sound decisions on an issue that will impact us all. I hope you will give serious thought to my comments and I thank you for your time.

Correspondence ID: 14427Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA 98862
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,15 2023

Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: I am strongly opposed to the re-introduction of grizzly bears into the North Cascades Ecosystem. Although grizzly bears were once part of this environment, much has changed since the 19005. The area in which the grizzly bears would be placed, including the Methow Ranger Station area, has increased in permanent population, visitors, hikers, and hunters. Not only does this increase the opportunity for conflicts, the thousands of hunters who come to the area have replaced the grizzly bear population as the apex predator. The need for grizzlies no longer exists as we have a healthy black bear population and the state has re-introduced wolves, which continue to flourish.

I live in the Methow Valley and am quite comfortable living among wolves, bears and cougars. But I have no desire to share my living and recreational spaces with grizzly bears.

Thank you,

Correspondence ID: 14428Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, UN N/A
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,15 2023

Correspondence Type: Park Form

Correspondence: I am totally against introduction of grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 14429Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Arlington, WA 98223
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,15 2023

Correspondence Type: Park Form

Correspondence: I am totally opposed to introducing grizzlies into the north cascades.

I feel it is totally unsafe for people and livestock, and that their isn't enough natural food for them to - - - them from encroaching upon people and livestock.

Also I feel it will further diminish our salmon industry.

Correspondence ID: 14430Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tulisp, WA 98856
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,15 2023

Correspondence Type:Park Form

Correspondence: Alternative A No Bears

Correspondence ID: 14431Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,15 2023

Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: Superintendent

North Cascades National Park

810 State Route 20

Sedro Woolley, WA 98284

November 9, 2023

RE: Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/Environmental Impact Statement

Thank you in advance for consideration of my thoughts regarding the proposal to re-introduce grizzly bears into the North Cascades ecosystem here in Washington state.

I am FIRMLY OPPOSED TO THE REINTRODUCTION of grizzly bears, as I believe the negatives far outweigh any positives.

1. The National Park Service and Forest Service are, sadly, chronically underfunded. The artificial re-introduction of grizzlies will be a costly affair, not only on the front end, but continuously as issues with the bears will need to be addressed. The money spent on the artificial introduction of grizzly bears, and the inevitable issues that will result, would be much better used to maintain trails, upkeep infrastructure and improve pay for park and forest service staff.

2. I question whether it would actually be a positive for our ecosystem to have grizzly bears present. Is the science truly settled? I think not. I will add that I do have an undergraduate degree in Zoology and studied ecosystems back in my university days, though admittedly not as a career.

3. The Cascade mountain range, as the crow flies, is not very wide and, with the amount of settled areas in the foothills on both sides of the range, human-bear conflicts will inevitably occur, both to the detriment of the bears and to the detriment of humans.

4. Areas with grizzly bears will need to be periodically closed to recreation due to various bear issues. This happens in areas such as Yellowstone. This will limit the public's use of potentially large tracts of wilderness. Why would we wish to do this when our outdoor areas are more and more crowded?

5. The Pacific Crest trail is one of America's premier hiking routes, enjoyed not only by our citizens but by outdoor adventurers from around the globe. Through-hikers travel as light as possible. The presence of grizzlies would necessitate bear proof containers and other cumbersome changes, such as the need to carry bear spray.

6. Solo hiking in areas with grizzly bears is sometimes forbidden, depending on the jurisdiction, and, even in the best circumstances, often unwise. As an experienced backpacker and mountaineer, I have greatly enjoyed the occasional solo trip into the mountains. This would no longer be possible.

7. Grizzly bears ARE dangerous. As a surgeon, I have personally provided follow-up care to survivors of bear attacks. The risk can be cited as "low" but the risk IS very real. When in the mountains, I most certainly do not wish to be continually nervous and looking over my shoulder worried about attacks either on myself, my friends, my children or my grandchildren, whom I am now introducing to the outdoors.

8. Grizzly bears are common in Canada, yet they have not repopulated here on their own. The areas north and south of our borders is remote territory and I do not think civilized barriers are enough to prevent natural in-migration. I suggest the best approach is a "no action" approach to see if grizzlies will naturally relocate to the Cascades on their own.

9. Aside from the direct cost of bringing in grizzly bears and the ongoing cost of dealing with all the problems which will subsequently follow, the artificial re-introduction of grizzly bears will result in damage to the local economies. The Cascade mountains are NOT Yellowstone where tourists drive the many roads and are thrilled at the chance to see a grizzly . . . from the safety of their car. Access to the Cascades is limited and difficult. It is not an area that can be readily enjoyed from roads or even by short hikes. Thus, having grizzly bears will not induce additional tourism. I believe the opposite would occur. Most users of the Cascades are hikers, trail runners, backpackers and/or climbers, and the presence of grizzly bears will be a deterrent to visit. Also, as stated above, the inevitable need to periodically close off areas to humans will further diminish visitation. Less visitors will cause damages to local economies which depend on those who now adventure in the area.

I am not anti-predator. I fervently wish for the grizzly bears, in locations where they currently live, to thrive and be protected. BUT speaking as someone who has roamed mountain areas all over western US and Canada, in areas both with and without grizzly bears, I am firmly opposed to the artificial re-introduction of grizzlies and thus I vote for NO ACTION - ALTERNATIVE A.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 14432Project:112008Document:132104
Address: N/A, UN N/A
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,15 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: North Cascade Ecosystem Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan EIS
Public Comment

Dear Mr. or Mrs.,

My name is Charlee Trueman and I am writing to tell you my opinion on the Grizzly Bear situation.

I believe that the bears should stay wherever they are. If you move the bears to the North Cascades Mountains, you would jeopardize the lives of the wildlife and the people in that area.

The wildlife would be in danger because they don't know how to hide or out maneuver a Grizzly bear. The deer, elk, and other animal populations would be greatly effected for the worst. And that would effect the hunters. Which would effect

people's diet. And that would make people, like me, very annoyed.

The people would be effected by the far of dying. People like to hike, hunt, and horse-back riding around the mountains. Also, animals don't know boundaries, so if the bears are moved, they might wander down into people's property and wreck havoc on the people. Also people aren't save because there are so many unnecessary gun hinderments. Lastly, the pets of the people wouldn't be safe.

This is just the tip of the iceberg. I could go on and on. But this is all for now.

Signed, a concerned [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 14433Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Marysville, WA 98270
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,15 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Grizzly Relocation Not Favored in the N Cascades Nov. 7, 2023

The U S National Park Service and the U S Fish and Wildlife Service have AGAIN collected public comment on their proposed 3--option Plan, two parts of which would reintroduce Grizzly bears forcefully D)! catch and release into the Washington State North Cascades (NC). And ONCE AGAIN public comment is AGAINST any "recovery" effort! When will these agencies abandon this gravely flawed, publicly unwanted effort?

This proposed reintroduction interference in the natural progression of the N. C. bear population is not only unnecessary, it threatens the black and brown bear populations which would be killed and displaced by the stronger and more territorial grizzly. There is already a scarcity of food supply for native brown and black bear in the N. C. Seasonal berries are not that abundant, and fish stocks, highly prized by the native tribes, have been severely depleted.

The grizzly range is stated in hundreds of miles. It is simply wrong to assume that over the last 100 years the Canadian grizzly population has passed up the opportunity to settle in a suitable N. C. habitat. Were the "grass greener" on the U. S. side of the border, the grizzly would have migrated south into the N. Cascades. There has been NO human predation in the N. C. for over a hundred years...no human threat! No hunting. An estimated 691 grizzly bear live in Alberta, 65 of them in Banff National Park.

The existing black and brown bear perform the ecological need of "apex predators" (omnivores) through weak species management (killing weaker species), scat dissemination, and improving forest health. The smaller bear do that, essentially without the distinct threat to cattle, goats, sheep, and people (public safety) who enjoy the MC. backcountry.

Farmers and ranchers, already assaulted by Wolves, dread the presence of Grizzlies in their grazing pasturelands. This Plan for forced reintroduction encourages farmers, hikers, home owners and campers to "haze and annoy" bear that they come into contact with. That very interaction is incredibly risky for humans. Grizzlies attack and kill humans with non-specific provocation. People often carry food, and people are attacked as food. It could be your granola bar...or your butt...that is a meal for the taking. And, your nylon tent and bear spray are not adequate deterrents. Unless you own an Anatolian--bred dog, your family pet is Grizzly food. Grizzly are far more often going to stand their ground, and/or attack.

Grizzlies are far more likely to attack anything edible, including defenseless farm animals and humans. Humans are another form of "fast food" for grizzlies. Earlier this month a man and woman, both

experienced backcountry travelers, emptied a can of bear spray, and then were mauled to death by a Grizzly in Banff National Park. Montana officials euthanized a grizzly, likely stressed and hungry, who had broken into a home and fatally attacked a woman earlier in the summer. In 2018, a grizzly bear, which authorities described as starving, killed a woman and her baby in Yukon, Canada. In Yellowstone, 8 visitors have been killed, and hundreds have been attacked. Most recently, in Yellowstone, school teacher Amie Anderson was killed by a Grizzly on July 22, 2023, after which that Grizzly and her cub broke into a cabin searching for food (dog food). The act of breaking into a human home in the fall represents a starving bear and cub desperate to build up body fat prior to entering hyperphagia (hibernation).

Alaska averages four fatal bear attacks per year. Why would the residents of Washington State promote or allow this kind of unprovoked animal violence toward humans, which is usually fatal to the Grizzly bear (death by park officials)?

In the Rocky Mountains, grizzlies are increasingly moving into the valleys and prairies, wandering onto golf courses, breaking into homes, stalking chicken coops, and raiding cornfields. Montana and Wyoming are home to over 2100 grizzlies, with a population also in Idaho. Containing grizzlies will inevitably result in more powerful preventive measures. This NPS Plan for forced reintroduction will lead to taller and stronger fence lines, and other measures that will lead to travel restrictions of other wildlife populations. Out of necessity, the NPS will develop its own 'permitted areas' for recreationalists, preventing access into popular areas of the N.C.. Family dogs, often thought of as family protection, will be restricted to wilderness access even further. It has been found that bear spray (5'-10') does not prevent close-up encounters, and is an unreliable defense against a powerful and defensive Grizzly.

Preventative conflict approaches may then include human use restrictions on bear attractants, such as garbage, dumpsters, compost, bee hives, fruit and vegetable gardens, free-roaming chickens, and family pets. Some say "a fed bear is a dead bear." Secure storage of bird seed, pet food, and putting electric fences around school facilities, and playground guards are only deterrents to breaking-and-entering bears. Bears have Missoula, Montana hemmed in and are making forays around the edges, says Russel Talmo, a specialist in bear conflict resolution with Defenders of Wildlife.

Grizzly proponents hope that as the grizzly population expands, the areas between the five island ecosystems established by the Endangered Species Act will allow grizzlies to move between them. The N. C. is but one of the five large ecosystem areas. Much of this territory is crisscrossed with private property, roads, and is crowded with people, towns, cities, cattle, sheep, beehives, fruit and vegetable gardens, and...recreation. These human uses are inconsistent with a large, foraging, aggressive grizzly population... a bear population genetically opposed to turf sharing. After a human fatality, it is not uncommon for authorities to close those recreational areas to human use.

And NO, the tribes are not in support of this proposal. The Stillaguamish Tribe former chair told the agencies that the bear would diminish already--threatened Chinook salmon populations. The weak counter to the tribes that the CHOSEN grizzly bear would come-from berry-eating Glacier Park stock was PATHETIC--as if the Grizzlies would not recognize a fat--rich source of food and quickly learn how to fish!

The NPS and the USFWS are both proposing alternatives that include the forced capture and release of out-of-state Grizzlies--catch and release programs with "zoo-like" monitoring. Once begun, these programs will likely morph into feeding programs to sustain the starving transplants, and expensive and ongoing monitoring programs to keep the migrating Grizzlies away from domestic farm animals and local communities. 50, why another expensive, unnecessary, and unwanted 'zoo' monitoring experiment?

Currently, the Canadian Grizzlies could walk across the unmanned border into the Washington North Cascades...but they have not. Why? Because the grass is greener where they are! Leave the Grizzlies where they are successful.

This Grizzly program, if implemented, is guaranteed to result in MORE federal and State government intrusion into everyday lives. And, taxpayers will pay the extraordinary costs of this ill-conceived and unnecessary program.

Eliminate and remove the N. Cascades Ecosystem from the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Grizzly Recovery Zones!

During brief public comment periods (3), where only chosen a "lottery" can speak, and only for two minutes, does NOT represent adequate and open necessary public EIS review! It does represent a concerted effort by public agencies to attempt to muzzle true public opinion! The net effect of ignoring the public opinion will be the elimination of transplanted Grizzly bear by the hunting public. They will become the "game of choice" for the rural hunters. "HELL NO TO GRIZZLIES" must be heard by these supporting government agendas!

A steady stream of anti-grizzly sentiment has been once a in shown to National Park and US Fish and Wildlife Personnel. I personal will seek thro FOIA channels the results of this latest study, and I will attack every misrepresentation presented therein. Co-existence with transplanted grizzly bear in the North Cascades is out of the question!

Correspondence ID: 14434Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Colton, WA 98814
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,15 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: I am completely against putting grizzly bears into parks.

Parks and wilderness!!

I ride horses on trips up there and camp and do not want bears.

Correspondence ID: 14435Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Arlington, WA 98223
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,15 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: RE: Comments on the Reintroduction of Grizzly Bears in the North Cascades

Dear Office of the Superintendent:

Grizzly bears should not be reintroduced into the North Cascades. We enjoy hiking in the back country and do not want to fear for our lives every time we go hiking. As land owners in Snohomish County Washington and Chelan County Washington, we are opposed to the reintroduction of grizzly bears into the North Cascades. The federal officials need to be reminded that Washington law forbids grizzlies from being introduced into the state.

The eco system is trying to survive with wolves and to add large carnivores i.e. grizzly bears that can roam 100 - 600 Square miles is not acceptable. Grizzly bears need to find enough food, water, shelter and space to survive. Grizzly bears will travel to find that space which means grizzly bears are mobile and migrate into new wilderness areas. What will happen to the wildlife that depend on summer berries and other vegetation to survive? When the grizzly bear can't sustain their diet on berries and vegetation, since grizzly bears are known to prey on large mammals, when available, such as moose, elk, white tailed deer, mule deer what will happen to those animals?

Grizzly bears have attacked and killed humans and can prey on livestock. The fact that grizzly bears have attacked and killed humans and can prey on livestock proves that grizzly bears are predators. Furthermore, having a tracking collar to monitor the grizzly bears won't prevent grizzly bears from attacking and killing humans.

Grizzly bears are carnivore predators and should not be reintroduced to the North Cascades. We need to protect our eco system including large animals, vegetation, fish and humans.

Correspondence ID: 14436Project:112008Document:132104
Address: N/A, UN N/A
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,15 2023
Correspondence Type: Park Form
Correspondence: I am totally against releasing grizzly bears in the North Cascades.

Correspondence ID: 14437Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,15 2023
Correspondence Type: Park Form
Correspondence: No action.

I support rule 1 of the 10j rule.

Us local citizen do not want any of the bears re-located to our area.

We have - - - - it - - - - - that the people that live in the ecosystem do not want - - - - - here in this area.

Washington State has a few ===== to have the bears reintroduced in our state. Are you just planning on going over our state - - - - laws?

We have had many forest fires in our area that would really - - - - - for the area to suggest them without - - - bears coming down in our - - - - -.

Again, Rule 1 of the 10j rule is very supported - - No reintroducing bears.

Correspondence ID: 14438Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Sedro Woolley, WA 98284
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,15 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: I am opposed to the introduction of Grizzly Bears into the North Cascades National Park ecosystem. I believe the region has a population of bears, both Grizzly and Black, that can handle the numbers as they are.

The Ursus arctos horribilis is a highly evolved apex predator, magnificent in its element. And, in my opinion, no longer has its element. The North American Continent has provided habitat for

all manner of creatures, of which the Grizzly stands alone, with no other controls other than other Grizzlies. The North American Continent was the land providing habitat and darkened skies of the largest swarm of the world's locusts, the Rocky Mountain Locust. The larvae and spent insects were an endless resource of highly nutritious food supply for the bears. The locusts are now extinct.

The artificial increase in Grizzly populations will have a profound effect on what resources remain, driving bears to fulfill their instinct of calorie intake into lands with homes and farmland occupied by legally and permitted uses of people getting on with their lives.

in my opinion, introducing increased Grizzly Bear numbers into North Cascade National Park ecosystem, with protection, will drive human activity away and eliminate ranching, farming on private lands as we know it.

Correspondence ID: 14439Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sedro Woolley, WA 98254
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,15 2023

Correspondence Type:Letter

Correspondence: Superintendent
North Cascades National Park

I am opposed to any Grizzly Bears being introduced into the North Cascades. There are already Grizzly Bears in this area. A male Grizzly Bear requires 600 square miles and a female requires at least 150 square miles. The North Cascade Park at 788.4 square miles will not support increased bear populations. They will not find enough to eat and will encroach into lower elevations, causing havoc on people and livestock.

I live and farm with cattle and 7 grandchildren in the Cascade region. I am not a hunter. Any Grizzly Bear on my farm will meet its demise.

I had a Grizzly Bear encounter in Alaska in 1971. I learned first hand that they are not Teddy Bears. *Ursus arctos horribilis* are very dangerous apex predators.

Correspondence ID: 14440Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mount Vernon, WA 98273
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,17 2023

Correspondence Type: Other

Correspondence: To whom it may concern,

I was going to write a note, but this writer describes my sentiments perfectly. I vote to bring the grizzlies back.

Correspondence ID: 14441Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Renton, WA 98058
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,04 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: This letter is in response to an article in the Seattle Times on Sept 29 about Grizzly Bears in Washington State.

My name is Frank Harshfield. I live in assisted living at Village Concepts. 17010-140th S.E. Renton, WA 98058 #333.
the grizz@wavecable.com
360-387-1600

I am 81 years old. I have hunted in WA about 2 weeks a year since 1955 until 2020. I hunted mostly in Oranogan CO for deer and Yakama CO for elk.

Now lets get down to the facts. 2023 is not the same as 1955 when I saw my first bear in Maple Valley. The last time I hunted deer was near Newport WA. I hunted a good looking woods for deer and saw one deer in a week, but I could see all kinds of deer in town.

In the last 5 years, I have seen 5 bears, 3 in campgrounds and 2 on roads. The last one was a cinamine Black bear. I my life and my Dog were walking down the gravel road near the Rock Creek Campground. The dog saw it first and just stayed clam then I saw it we all stayed calm and just seemed we were all friends.

About the last 25 years, I have hunted the Toates Couilly Creek area where lots of rouge cattle summered into hunting season. The cows always run when I would see them but last few years, they look mean and I would stay away from them. Again, it is not 1955.

So I met the old farmer one day and asked him if his cows were meaner or if they I was just old. Yes, he said I was right, the wolves were biting the cows on the heels.

Also up Toates Couilly Creek an old man needs a light gun and I was carrying a 243 rifle when I walked into a nice field of red berries. After, I counted 17 Big piles of Grizz poop. I realized I was at bear lunch counter and got the heck out of there.

On a whole different subject, Take a drive over the North Cascades Highway. Stop at a trail head people everywhere.

Back to the Cinamine Bear. We were sleeping in our camping tent when the bear came to give us a message we were in his territory be ripping up a stump. We slept the rest of the night in the truck.

So now we get down to the facts. Spend a bunch of money to get some bears. You spend to get the bears out into the North Cascades. The bears move where ever with people following them at more expense. Someone gets killed by a bear, you get sued for millions the bear lovers and the bear haters and farmers get into it. Then there is the shoot and shovel folks get into. People go to jail. All because you cant admit this is a state that highly populated state that doesn't have any need for more bears and wolves.

Correspondence ID: 14442Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Sequim, WA 98382
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,06 2023
Correspondence Type: Park Form
Correspondence: Please don't even consider reintroducing grizzlies into the N Cascades or expend \$ on such a project. Let them come over on their own accord from Canada or whatever.

Use the \$ for improving infrastructure or trails please.

Thank you

Correspondence ID: 14443Project:112008Document:132104
Address: shoreline, WA 98177
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,01 2023
Correspondence Type: Park Form
Correspondence: I support Alternative: C Restoration with Section 10(j) Designation for grizzly bears in the North Cascades.

A restored population of grizzlies will boost the park's appeal and attract nature enthusiasts, scientists, and tourists from around the world. Alternative C addresses safety concerns while protecting the grizzly population. It ensures coexistence between humans and bears.

Correspondence ID: 14445Project:112008Document:132104
Address: N/A, UN N/A
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,02 2023
Correspondence Type:Letter
Correspondence: Do NOT bring in grizzly bears!!

Correspondence ID: 14446Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bainbridge Island, WA 98110
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,11 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Please know that I deeply appreciate your teams work on restoring our grizzly bears. We humans are just one part of this gorgeous ecosystem. Please keep the restoration alive and making progress.

Correspondence ID: 14447Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98125
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,04 2023
Correspondence Type:Letter
Correspondence: I read the article in the Seattle- - -
about the Grizzly Bear Restoration Project
and would like vote in favor of
"safe zones" where the bears would- - -
- - - sufficiently removed from- - -
farms, ranches, and small - - - - . We- - - -
really play hell on wild habitat- - -

the larger predators and need to get- - -
then space to - - - - -.

Correspondence ID: 14448Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,11 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Friends of the North Cascades grizzly bears - -

Hey, I think its neat to see grizzly bears too. But, I am concerned about human safety.

Are you willing to be responsible for any maiming or killing by grizzlies?

I worry about all the Washingtonians who love to explore our mountains and wilderness. There will eventually be incidents such as the one I enclose. Oddly, it was in the same newspaper as the announcement of your restoration of grizzly plan.

Correspondence ID: 14449Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Wenatchee, WA 98807
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,15 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: To: Superintendent Don Striker North Cascades National Park (NCNP) Complex and Brad Thompson, US Fish & Wildlife Service, State Supervisor

POSITION STATEMENT:

o I support Alternative A "No Action" to the 3 choices given in the most recent draft EIS; current management would continue.

o I also support a 10j rule if grizzly bears naturally show up in the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE) as stated in my 12/14/2022 comments. I recognize that we were not given this option this time around.

PAST SUBSTANTIVE COMMENTS

o Grizzly bears are dangerous animals; Grizzly bears have killed people in Wyoming and Montana, and most recently (10/2023) in Banff, Canada. The Stehekin valley no longer has access to daily seaplane service. There is no longer a road that goes to Cottonwood Camp. Why doesn't the draft EIS address the health and safety of residents in remote areas like the Stehekin valley?

o Transplanted grizzly bears often wander far from their release sites and end up in undesirable locations where they are incompatible with human activities. Grizzly bears go to where the food is. In the North Cascade Ecosystem, grizzly bears should be expected to be a problem in the valley bottoms, along salmon spawning waters and orchard areas where they will regularly frequent fruit orchards.

o There is a huge potential of pushing more black bears into the Stehekin valley. Why doesn't the draft EIS address this?

o Washington state's population is approaching 8 million, as of April 2023. Where is the detailed and in depth data showing the potential increased safety risk to hikers, campers and outfitters done by extrapolating data from the smaller populations of Montana and Wyoming?

NEW SUBSTANTIVE COMMENTS:

o The current draft EIS seems to be short on data driven analysis.

After attending the Wenatchee meeting of the North Cascades Ecosystem Fall Subcommittee meeting on October 10, 2023, and learning about the predictive modeling done by Sara Sells, US Geological Survey, Montana

Cooperative Wildlife Research Unit, Wildlife Biology Program, Ecology & Evolution Program, University of Montana, Cecily Costello, Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks and others, I conclude that more peer review research should be done before transporting bears into the North Cascade Ecosystem. The predictive modeling shown in this twenty year study shows that the bears will also move to more populated areas. This study states that grizzly bears select habitat based on food availability to maximize fitness.

1. "Where is the data that proves that bears that would be transported around Glacier National Park or Northwestern Montana, 3 population chosen for their berry-based diets , won't learn how to fish or look for live salmon if the rivers (and I am thinking of the Stehekin river) IF they are hungry right before the hibernating season?

2. At the November 2021 public hearing in Darrington, members of the Stillaguamish and Sauk--Suiattle tribes voiced concern that grizzly bears in the North Cascades would diminish the already threatened salmon population. It took years for the Lake Chelan Sportsmen organization which my late father was part of, to create a sockeye fishery in Lake Chelan. Thinking long term, would this fishery become extinct because of the bears eating the spawning salmon in the Stehekin river and other tributaries?

CONCLUSION OF COMMENTS:

This is at least my 5th or 6th time commenting on this issue, some while in office; some after retiring from public service.

In all of the public comment periods over the years, I have never heard county commissioners support bringing grizzly bears into the North Cascade National Park. It doesn't make any sense to me why anyone would want to put the health and safety of their constituents at risk.

It is so frustrating that their repeated comments are ignored.

Correspondence ID: 14450Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Coquille, OR 97423
United States of America
Outside Organization: Retired Forest Service Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,20 2023
Correspondence Type: Other
Correspondence: Restoring Grizzly Bears 10(j)

Dear Superintendent

Introductions of apex predators like of Grizzly Bears and Wolves in a human environment has been an issue to safety for communities and Forest users.

Currently, there is not enough suitable habitat for reintroduction Grizzly Bears can not be contained in an introduction sight. There is an expectation that Grizzly Bears will seek areas that provide more abundant foraging, entering areas near ranch lands, and forest communities near the introduction sites.

Communities and farmers are expected to defend their properties from Grizzlys that drift off site of the introduction site. The State and Federal Governments have not provided an equitable

remedy or financial restoration for Grizzly or Wolf damage. Many Forest users or recreationists avoid areas where Grizzly and Wolf have been introduced because of the possibility of conflict encounters and the reduction of huntable deer and elk in the area.

There have been no introduction success stories when there is expectation the human environment will be threatened by apex predators.

Correspondence ID: 14451Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Walla Walla, WA 99362
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,11 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: To whom it concerns

RE Grizzly restoration EIS

You are sooo wrong to introduce more grizzly bears to Wash State. Nuts is the correct statement.

A man just had his jaw ripped right out of his body. 7 people have been killed after using bear spray - most in the last 6 years.

The elk herds are nearly gone in the high mountains.

I Larry Jentz have been bluff charged within the last 24 months.

I have been part of a contributor to 170 near attacks stopped by pistols in ammoland.com. Author of pistols N bears in Larry Kanuits 467 page book Author in Ammoland.com expensive methods of testing ammunition penetration.

Have you looked at how many bear attacks are documented? How we might get 107 documented?

Over and over peoples lives are destroyed. It is not that rare.

Why introduce TRex. Seems wild. The bears are not cuddle bears. Sooner or later they are old near neat by another predator or even guided by hunger or natural instinct. A human must pay.

You wouldn't put rattle snakes in your house. Why put dangerous bears in the woods.

Right now, the locals say there are no- - few elk in the high mountains. I had to rise up.


Why go to the expense?

Look up and read about over 400 bear attacks.

You can study all you want. The agenda you give in the woods is dangerous to all forms of wildlife. Annual humans. Common sense. Common sense. Tragedy attack tragedy. Death after death. Horrible injuries lasting a lifetime a sure thing.

Do you want your husband, wife, child, son, daughter, to run into a grizzly???????

The human population in Wa State is expanding. Grizzly population in the lower 48 is between 1000 and 2000. Those bears are not always in parks or high mountains. There are many calls to reduce this population. Falling off on deaf ears.

Who will benefit from this.
Who will pay?

Note: CBS news Quote - 14% of grizzly attack victims are killed source???

I talked to Dean W- - - - today. Her hes studied and written more statistics of any person I knew. Grizzly bears are the most dangerous bears in the world. Quote.

Dear told me about the attack in Canada. I looked it up. A couple and their dogs were killed about- - - - - Friday, Sept 29, 2023. The cost to go in ?????

People in the mountains are told to carry bear spray. Butt when game dept. staff go to a trap there armed dept personnel have a shotgun and a .44 magnum pistol. Plus, they send in a drone to see if there are bears in the area. from Dean W- - - - -

Todd - - -, - - - - attack quickly - - - - a friend of mine now carries two pistols with him when elk hunting. .44 magnum - - - - and a 10MM. Bear spray too. A man with experience.

You can bet the average hiker from the city will not be this well prepared.

Call me if you want to contact F- - - - - author of 6 bear books.

Dean Weingater: Keeps track of all bear attacks. Been in contact with all know bear experts from Tow Smith to Stephen Heno. Many studies. Note they have redacted much of what they wrote. Goat studies.

Year another attack - Grizz heard about today

██████

Correspondence ID: 14452Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,04 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: As a person who has spent many years hiking and climbing in the North Cascades and now a part time resident of Montana, I am opposed to the reintroduction of grizzly bears into the North Cascades. If they wandered into the park, ok, but to actively court and promote their presence is not a positive development.

Correspondence ID: 14453Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Unknown, UN Unknown
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,27 2023
Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Thank you. Yeah, I live in Winthrop, Washington, and yeah, I just want to express my strong support for the recovery of grizzly bears in the North Cascades. It was something I was really excited about when we were at this stage seven years ago, and I'm glad to see it resurface, and yeah, I really want to support 10-J.

You know, I think that, you know, having grizzly bears back in this ecosystem not only ensures the ecosystem functions, that grizzly bears perform in such environments. You know, I think there's clearly also the value that grizzlies bring in terms of being an umbrella species and knowing that if we're conserving the land that's necessary for grizzly habitat, that there's so

many hosts of species that fall under that umbrella.

And so I think in terms of ecosystem health, restoring grizzly bears in an ecosystem just represents a much more holistic sense of health overall. Beyond the scientific aspects of those values, I just think the primary reason is the intrinsic value that grizzly bears have.

You know, I think that, you know, certainly there are the things that humans learn from grizzly bears and beyond just the spiritual dimension of having - - having them present in the landscape. They just have their own right to exist and, you know, I think having the benefit of living and working in Alaska for many years, I mean, I've done - - Yeah. I just - - I feel like there are very safe ways of cohabitating in the mountains, and I've done that with students, done that with fieldwork and field biology, and yeah, I think the one last thing that I would really encourage is, you know, really, really focusing on the connectivity between the North Cascades as a core area with other areas for bears to emigrate and immigrate from, so it's not so reliant just on the introductory efforts.

Correspondence ID: 14454Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Mazama, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: My name's Kevin, and I live in Mazama. I own two recreation businesses in - - in this area, so - - and I've been here for 30 years, so I have a strong pulse, I think, of what goes on. And I've seen the area grow and grow and grow with more recreation users. And although I'm completely supportive of recreation, I think that the rec users have started to overstep their boundaries and how they use the land and expect that the land is just there for them.

And I am supportive of grizzly bears, and I feel that there with the 10-J rule, we can put stipulations in so that the ranchers can be compensated. We'll have collars on the bears. We can use the technology that we have so that rec users who want to hike with no bells and - - and want to be safe and go run solo at night, they can, because they could get an app, and they could find out if there's a bear at that particular pass.

The ranchers can say, yeah, my cattle were killed by cows, and we can see that it was, and we can compensate them quickly, and there should be no drama there. So I feel that there's lots of ways that we can incorporate these bears, and I feel that it's time that the humans don't think that they're always the apex, and that they can start to understand that they may have to adjust how they are using the land.

And right now, they are just - - with all the apps and all the electronics, they're just overrunning the land at will.

Correspondence ID: 14455Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Unknown, UN Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: My name is Wayne Stevie, and I'd like to discuss this grizzly bear issue. Anyhow, I want to know what type of habitat. I've been all through these mountains. I've lived here my whole life. I've known people that were here in the 1800s. They're gone now. There was no grizzly bears in these mountains to speak of. There were no mule deer here in the early 1900s.

I want to know what these big bears are going to eat. They take X amount of protein to survive. They're not going to live off of a few plants and berries. What are they going to eat, a few skinny black bears that live there? There is no food source for these bears.

And if we get bears, what are they going to get, the troubled bears from Yellowstone? It's - - to me, it's ridiculous that they even think of having them here. It's not fair to us, and it's not fair to the bear.

Correspondence ID: 14456Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Unknown, UN Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: I'm in favor of option A because the grizzly bears are currently reintroducing themselves into the Olympic National - - the Okanogan National Forest. My career was doing GIS here on the Okanogan, and 2015 was the first verifiable identification of grizzly bears on our forest by a wildlife biologist.

They were coming in from Manning Park. And if they want to reintroduce naturally, that's fine. But to reintroduce them artificially in the habitat, it is questionable at best because of our fire management practices of letting things burn in the park and the habitat changes so rapidly. I am not in favor of that.

I know that the - - from having relatives in the Kenmore area where grizzly bears are - - are - - I don't - -there's a large number of grizzly bears in that area. The community has had to take action to prevent the human bear interface by requiring all - -By requiring all the residents to have bearproof garbage cans, if you're camping in that area, most of the campgrounds are electrified to eliminate the grizzly human contact. And eventually if we've introduced grizzly bears in not naturally where they're wondering around and not - - not the correct habitat, they will be coming down into the valley floor and having more interaction with the human population.

And the loss of one human life to a species that is introduced not naturally is not acceptable to me. I think that's it. Thank you so much.

Correspondence ID: 14457Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America

Outside Organization: 4th District of Washington State Government(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Good Evening, everybody. I'm [REDACTED] Does this feel like DVU all over again? I'm here to support option A and I'm extremely opposed to option C, which is the location introduction. You called it the nonessential experimental population of grizzly bear to the North Cascades. Don and Brad, we're very grateful to have this opportunity. We absolutely are. But it seems to me in my humble opinion that with the concurrent introduction of the environmental impact statement along with the 10(j) proposal, that tells me that this is on a fast track and that in my humble opinion you've already made up your minds as to the plan to bring grizzlies into our communities. I also take tremendous exception to your desire to not listen to or ignore those things that you say are non-substantive comments. Anybody in this room or anybody in North Central Washington that says they either do or do not support the introduction of grizzlies is not being considered a substantive comment, and to me that silences a good number of people in our communities. We don't all have science degrees and then the ability to tell you whether or not ecosystems are - - are - - are perfect or not perfect, but we do know what we want threatening our communities, whether we want an apex predator in our backyards. Those are the kind of things that we can definitively say yes or no to. So I think that is a very concerning position for you to take. As a farmer myself, I'm worried when I'm on the farm about my own safety. I worry about my family's safety. I worry about my employees' safety. Plus, a crop devastation, a livestock predation that we all know is going to occur. Even though all of these things are apparent to us and I think apparent to you as well that these bears will move out of the zone from where you propose putting them, it seems to go contrary to common sense that we continue down this path. My two minutes are up. Just two more things I want to say. What's very concerning is the - - the position you've been taking that we have to move before Canada brings bears down south and they might move into our area. When me and my staff have talked to the Canadian Fish and Wildlife Agency, there is no pending plan. There's discussion but no imminent plan to move bears into Southern DC. So in order to move and utilize that pending action, I think that is disingenuous to be using that as an excuse. So I have three - - three questions. What's the Agency's plan for dealing with crop loss and livestock depredation, which I think is inevitable? What is the timeline for issuing lethal permits? And how much will citizens have to lose before they can defend themselves from a predator in their backyard? And what is even more concerning, when will you listen - - I know you're going to hear - - but when will you listen to the majority of the people who will have to be directly impacted by - - by your decisions? They've made it clear time and time again, they do not want these bears here, and that was loud and clear four years ago, and I think that message is loud and clear today. So, please, listen to the people of Northern Central Washington. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14458Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America

Outside Organization: 7th District of Washington State State Government(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,27 2023
Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: That's okay. So just to have it for the record, I'm State Senator Shelly Short for the 7th District. All of Okanogan County is located in the 7th District. It does feel like dvu. I'm not going to repeat Congressman Newhouse's comments because they are right on and I support what he said. What I really want to talk about is if this ever was really serious about dealing with impacts to local residents, to agriculture, to orchards, to safety, to outfitting and guiding all of that, you would have put it in the document. The only one that recognizes that is option A, which is the do nothing. We have been here several times before. We were here back in 2019, and I know that you're all working on this, but it's offensive. It's offensive not to take the comments of the local citizens seriously. Those bears are not going to stay there. We know that. And we know that where they're going to end up is in fields and farms and orchards, and just having dealt with wolverine introduction in the 7th District, in Okanogan County we have great people working together but the impacts have been huge. And in an area here where they're listed as endangered and you cannot take that kind of action, we're really looking at the same kind of thing. You know, you need to - - you need to be - - so my comments will be if you are doing this, which I hope you are not, and I advocate for not, then you need to look and you need to talk to folks and you need to get an understanding of the kind of impacts to their local operations and what this is going to do to them. Because without that, without that you do not care about the local communities and the impact if this is happening. So, again, I'm State Senator Shelly Short, and I support option A. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14459Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Twisp, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Good evening, everyone. My name's [REDACTED] (phonetic.) I live here in Twisp, Washington. When they asked me would I like a number when I came in, I'm like, sure, I'll take a number in case I - - I want to say something, and of course my number's the first one that comes up. Okay. Oh, my gosh. I'll keep it brief. I don't need two minutes. First of all, I got a master's degree in ecology and spent the bulk of my career working as an - - as an ecologist, and even participated in writing a few EAs, which is like a mini EIS.

And my hat's off to these people who dedicated their lives to carrying out the laws governing this aspect of our life and also just preserving and protecting the wildlife that we all value because it's because of them that we still have it versus - - I mean, that's what actually spawned the Fish and Wildlife Service and wildlife management in North America was because wildlife was being so decimated because it wasn't being managed properly. So anyway, my hats off to - - to those folks who dedicate their life to it.

I was just looking up - - I'm a - - as a scientist, I'm a data person. And so I was just looking up, and I quickly pulled up a survey from the University of Montana. Let me preface this by saying change is horrible. I'm a teacher. Any time I change the rules in my classroom, it's always met with protest and upset and - - and so - - but as I explain the reasons why we're doing it and why - - okay, yes. Okay. Anyway, let me get to the point.

University of Montana survey, an overwhelming majority of Montanans, 92 percent agree or strongly agree that grizzlies have a right to exist in the state, and nearly three out of five Montanans, 57 percent, disagree or strongly disagree that grizzlies will limit their recreational opportunities.

My point is that those folks in Montana are more like us than folks in DC, and they live peacefully with grizzly bears. Thank you very much. Thank you for being here.

Correspondence ID: 14460Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, WA N/A
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: [REDACTED]

My name is [REDACTED]. My given

name is (speaking native language), which means grizzly bear, and the bear is definitely a big part of all our culture here in the Indian country, as all the animals are. But as time has moved on, and as a lot of you know, things have changed, and a lot of things have affected our culture in a way.

Some of the things that we face right now is a lot of the (indiscernible) listings that's affecting our (indiscernible) that affects our opportunity to gather food, federal law that changes our access to get to traditional areas of food. So it causes a lot of conflict amongst our own membership and amongst our own tribes on how we deal with these issues.

And we really appreciate everybody coming out here tonight for this very controversial issue. And we wanted to welcome you on behalf of Stillaguamish and Sauk-Suiattle into our traditional homelands here. Our relatives and us share this area up and down the Snohomish River, and we have Draft EIS Meeting 1 November 2, 2023 NDT Assgn # 69368 Page 3 since time immemorial.

And we face declining salmon, and we have to fight with the seals. We have to fight with the killer whale. The federal government, they come in and try to fix it when they've got other problems that they've got to fix, fix our salmon. And it's really tough to go back to our people and - - and tell them that our tribe is opposing bringing bears in. It's pushing back on our culture. And it's a tough - - tough discussions we had back home.

And some of the things that the state, the feds, and the counties need to realize, just trying to protect our salmon, our way of life. We're fighting with landowners; we're fighting with farmers. We've got elk that sustain our life as well and we've got landowners that don't want the elk around.

We're always put in the middle of fighting with our neighbors, and that's not what we want to do, do we? We don't want to fight with you. We need to sustain our culture; we need to sustain our way of life. So we understand the emotion that a lot of you are feeling and - - and we understand that.

But it's like the wolves, we just don't have the territory for it. Times have changed. We're not surviving off the wolf and the bear. All through the process, we told the state and feds as soon as we get the wolves inside our Draft EIS Meeting 1 November 2, 2023 NDT Assgn # 69368 Page 4 territory, we're writing tags. We can - - our elk, our deer. The same thing we did with black bear. The black bears will be eating cows and fawns of deer.

So I also want to thank the feds and the state for putting on this public meeting. I know because you guys are definitely taking heat for it sometimes. But I just wanted to say thank you for giving this opportunity for us to welcome folks on behalf of the Snohomish and me to say a few words. I'll hold my public - - public comment, but we do ask

that we have government to government with the feds as soon as possible.

Before any moving of bears should happen, we should have all the tribes on board. And that's not dismissing the public. Please don't get me wrong. But they have a government-to-government responsibility with us. And to move forward without the bears without all the tribes on board, I think it's a big mistake.

So anyway, thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14461Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, WA N/A
United States of America

Outside Organization: Sauk-Suiattle Tribe Tribal Government(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,02 2023

Correspondence Type:Transcript

Correspondence: [REDACTED]

Thanks, everybody, for coming out here. Friends, neighbors, we adamantly oppose this, so we -
- I assume you're here in support of that. The state, I know, is just following orders. And park service, I'm going to - -

[REDACTED]
I am [REDACTED] Sauk-Suiattle tribal council member.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:

Okay.

[REDACTED]
So welcome to our homelands. This is our home. And this is the third time we're battling this, a predator being introduced into our homelands. And we don't have the salmon populations to support. Originally it was 400 animals, and then they reduced it the second time around to 200 animals. Now it's two to three a year for the next 100 years. We're just as opposed to that. Like Shawn said, we're going to cut tags for them. And I've said this in the past, we're going to hunt them, we're going to kill them, they're going to go. That's how opposed we are to them. I'm sure there's some rules they can get me on that I can't do that, that's illegal. But the big thing with this bear is not only does it put our salmon at a threat and risk, I was a tour guide in Alaska. I - - I brought people to watch the grizzlies kill salmon in Haines, Alaska. And they kill just, you know, indiscriminately, just for the fun of it, especially the two-year-olds. They just love killing. They're having fun.

We don't have those runs to sustain that in Washington and it will be devastating for the salmon runs if they're allowed to get into them. They say well they eat

plants and they're from the highland and they don't know what salmon are, but they can sure smell them once they get into our spawning grounds. I've had a talk with the state previously. That's our red line in the sand.

When they get to the spawning grounds that's it, they've got to go because they're not going to leave until they go to hibernate. And here sometimes the winters are so mild they don't hibernate. Well, they might for a few weeks or something. So they're going to be feasting as long as there is food to eat. When the salmon run out, then what? Well, deer and elk.

And we have horses, we have pigs, we have chickens. I'm not going to allow them to get in after our animals. If that happens, they die. There is no calling the state, can you shoot this - - this bear - - that bear out of here. They're the kind of animal that you don't want to And when I see the tribe folks trying to introduce this species, these people don't give two cents about any of your human lives. Okay? Because I've told them already, you're going to get people killed in the North Cascades backpacking. Well, that's just nature, was the answer I got

back. And I disagree.

We hike in the North Cascades with our children and - - and elderly. They have no defense against an animal, a mama with cubs. You know, there's - - there's - - there's no defense for it. So I'm glad you're here for support. And we're going to fight this thing one more time. And I hope this is the last time because this is the third time around. So thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14462Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Unknown, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Other

Correspondence: Well, thank you. I - - I'm like you. I - - they asked me. I go, I don't know my number. I'm number two. So first of all, if I go past red, is Sherriff Budreaux (phonetic) going to tackle me and, you know, pull me out of here?

So we just went through this a few years ago, and we said, no, we didn't - - we didn't want the grizzlies. I'm a local. I live in Methow Valley. So why are we going through this again? Is the government really listening to us? It seems like they aren't. So why should we trust you, you know? We're going through this again.

Number two, I'm a Lewis and Clark buff, and why Lewis and Clark? Well, they lived back in the grizzlies, and when you read about what they did with the grizzlies, they'd send out five to six soldiers when they were taking on the grizzlies, so it's - - it's pretty dangerous. The Native Americans talked to them about the grizzlies. They send out seven to eight men, and were expecting to lose one or two of them when they went up against the grizzlies. These are people that lived with the grizzlies. Horseback riding and hikers. I spent - - I see a couple of hands here. I spent about ten years with a buddy of mine, up in the hills, up in the mountains, going out in the middle of nowhere. And what you have to realize is - -30 seconds - - there's no cell phone coverage up there. If something happens, it could be dangerous. It could be, you know, hours, days to get you out of there.

The option is to defend ourselves. We had that with the wolves. We were promised that with the wolves, but we got - - what we got was a bunch of lawsuits, so I'm not sure that's going to happen. And the liability is - - if we do lose a loved one, who's

liable? Is the government going to be liable? Is the state going to be liable, the feds? You know, who's going to be liable and, you know, and there's my red sign.

Correspondence ID: 14463Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Methow Valley, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Well, I'm a Methow Valley boy here. I'm about fourth generation. I've backpacked in these old mountains, led backstreams and put many hunters back in the sawtooth and the (inaudible) and I've yet to hear of any hunter that's seen a grizzly. Back in '62, my dad saw one as he was coming down through the state airport here, and there was one across the airport there. The same year Tom Graves saw one in '62, probably the same one. The grizzly bear, the habitat is not back there for the grizzly bear to stay there. If it was, they would be there. I haven't heard of anybody killing grizzly bears up there, so if there was habitat for them, which is a key issue in this right here, now. If they start putting grizzly bears in the area, where are they going to go for food? It takes X amount of protein for that grizzly bear just to get ready to hibernate. And then when they come out of hibernation, they're hungry, and there's no berries out there by the end of the spring. So where are they going to go? Where are they going to go for food? They're going to come down, and they're going to be eating on the - - whoever they - - whatever they come up against here. So I'm opposed to grizzly bears being in the area. I'm for - - our first option is no grizzly bear. So - - my time's about up? Thirty seconds, okay. Well, let me see here. I - - I don't want to waste your 30 seconds here. Well, like I say, it's - - it's - - I think it's a shame that we keep going through this and through this process here and trying to get grizzly bears put into a place where they're not going to stay, so - -

Correspondence ID: 14464Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Loomis, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: I'm [REDACTED] (phonetic.) I live over in Loomis. It seems like a long ways to come for a grizzly bear meeting, but I actually run cows about 15 miles from here in the summer, so it's very important to me that not only I keep my family and I safe, but I also keep my livestock safe. And once grizzly bears add into the ecosystem, it's not going to be a safe situation for my family, my crew, or my livestock. There's - - when grizzly bears were extirpated or however they want to say it back on their fancy signs back there, that was back in, you know, the early 1900s. There was a very less - - less population in this area than what there is now. And so by introducing grizzly bears into this area now, I don't see how we can avoid human conflict when they had human conflict then. That's why they got rid of them. They didn't just think they were cute and cuddly, want to take one home. They got rid of them because they couldn't live with them. And so we're just setting ourselves up for a disaster, and like was mentioned before, there is not enough wildlife in the higher elevations of this area to support a grizzly bear population, so grizzly bears will be in the valleys. That's where the food is. I'm a (inaudible) deer hunter. In the last ten years the mule deer population is basically half or less than what it was ten years ago. So what are they going to eat? Not nuts and berries. They're going to come down to the valleys and - - and eat the deer that are down there and the livestock. So - - and the 10-J threat, we had that same promise with wolves. Just because something is in their toolbox does not mean they have to use it. It's still up to a bureaucrat whether or not they're going to use what's in a toolbox. And with wolves, they chose not to use it, and we know how that ended up. So that's - - that's my thoughts.

Correspondence ID: 14465Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, WA N/A
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: 115 SPEAKER:

I'm 115, and my concern is that I sometimes go hiking. I don't want to come upon a bear. I don't want to come upon a wolf. I just want to be in a peaceful place. And I feel like if you add these bears, you're going to take away from the people. You're going to take away from people who have cattle because when a bear gets hungry, it's going to get to eating. And we do have salmon. We didn't even talk about our salmon, but bear like to eat salmon. The rivers here have salmon. Are we going to protect that? What are we going to do when a little kid gets attacked by a bear? I just want to know how we can protect ourselves. And I'm done.

Correspondence ID: 14466Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Unknown, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: I'm 142. I guess I was jumping the gun a little. I'm for the no bear option, and I'm for no wolf option. That didn't work well either. And I - - I don't think the bears affect everyone, but eventually I think it's going to affect everyone that eats food because they're going to mess with our farmers and ranchers that are making their food for you. So eventually it'll come down to that.

And some people want grizzly bears, and I want those people to have bears, as long as I don't have the bears. So I think I have a solution. If whoever wants bears will just build a great, big, tall, tough fence around their property and bring in a dozen of them, and have them for your pets, man, I think it'd be great. And your neighbors will like it so much, they'll want some, and you can help them build a fence. You can sell them bears. It'll be great.

But seriously, this is going to affect everyone. It's even going to affect these game department people, when they can't eat either because we've brought in all these predators. We're screwing with our ranchers and our farmers, and we can't do that. So that - - that's my opinion. I raise cattle, and I - - I don't want any bears.

We have enough black bears. We have enough predators already that are messing with us all the time. Orchard - - the bears screw with our orchards, and they mess with our cattle. It's just all a downside. I - - I can't find the good part of a grizzly bear, but that's my opinion. Like he said, change is hard. It's going to be really hard if we have to change to no food, so thanks.

Correspondence ID: 14467Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, WA N/A
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: [REDACTED]:

I'm number 130. Hi, folks, my name is Jack. I first want to thank the agencies for their resilience and - - and pursuing this process. They are here doing the work that they are required of them by the laws of the land, the Endangered Species Act. In this case, to recover the grizzly bears in North Cascade's ecosystem. So I thank them for that.

In my mind, the biggest issue here is - - is coming to terms with human and grizzly coexistence. There's no doubt that conflict can and will occur, whether it's safety for humans, livestock, hobby farms, recreationalists, whatever. It's clear from data from other places, however, that where - - that where grizzlies and humans coexist, most notably in Yellowstone and the northern Rocky Mountains, Glacier National Park area, over 1,000 bears in each of those ecosystems, that humans and grizzlies can coexist.

Draft EIS Meeting 1 November 2, 2023 NDT Assgn # 69368 Page 20
There's ample conflict avoidance information out there and there are agencies and nonprofit groups that can work with folks to minimize those conflicts. There's only one reason that grizzly bear populations continue to rise in those ecosystems back to the east, because humans and grizzlies are coexisting together. I have lived, worked and recreated in grizzly country since I was a teenager and I continue to do that to this day.

Again, should be no expectation by anyone that you can have a risk-free environment, especially in a mountainous wilderness landscape like the North Cascades. But the risks associated with grizzly bears can be significantly diminished. There's a saying that I - - I like to refer to. It goes like this, wilderness without wildlife is just scenery. The North Cascades ecosystem is missing grizzly bears. In my opinion, it's a diminished the ecosystem and I fully support restoring grizzly bears to the North Cascades. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14468Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, WA N/A
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023

Correspondence Type:Transcript

Correspondence: [REDACTED]
(phonetic): Hello, my number is 131.

My name is [REDACTED] (phonetic). I just moved out here last year, started hunting three years ago. I'm totally opposed to bringing in grizzly bears. There's a lot of issues I see with it. I don't see we have the proper acreage out here. There's too many people. We have too many folks from like Seattle and everything, people who aren't used to being out in the woods coming up into our area.

And I see a lot of conflict happening and people dying. I don't want us to be like Montana where we have issues and people are dying pretty frequently by grizzly bears. And I'm sorry to say it, but our commissioner isn't helping us with predator management at all. We're having hard times with black bears and cougars. We're having a lot of conflicts, and just adding another predator is just going to be more detrimental to our ungulates by a long shot.

And we're not maintaining our predators right now very well either. I think there needs to be a lot of things addressed before we try bringing in grizzlies. And that's all I have to say.

Correspondence ID: 14469Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America

Outside Organization: Okanogan Cattlemen's Association Non-Governmental(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: My name is [REDACTED]. I'm a (inaudible) and secretary of the local county cattlemen's association, and how many times we've used the word dvu tonight, but not only is this dvu as a grizzly bear meeting and us making known our sentiments, this whole (j) proposed rule is also something that has been used in our communities before to bring in wolves. Why are we trying to introduce an additional apex predator into a state that cannot handle the apex predators that it has? Our (inaudible) populations have already been impacted, not just ranchers' livestock, and it might be colloquialisms, but there is no official ongoing data that I'm aware of, but those of us that live on the land have not seen the moose paths and have not seen the deer that we used to see, and you can't tell whether that is because we don't have any large wolf population. In the proposed areas that they would like to put in those grizzly bears, what about the wildlife that already exists there that are vulnerable? I have heard comments before the wolverine population is a concern. Why are we not focusing on species that are already there that need assistance versus bringing in a large predator that will take up limited resources that are already in that vicinity? All of the producers that I have spoken with in areas that have both wolves and grizzly bears tell me tenfold they will take the wolves over the damn bears. They are an easier thing to manage. I can't afford to put a Jurassic Park type fence around my livestock to keep out a large predator like a grizzly bear. So I would urge that the agencies involved take heed in what we have to say. Please, no action. We'll take the ones that come. Don't damn bring 'em in a trailer. Thank you for this opportunity to speak, and we hope that you would go with option A, no action.

Correspondence ID: 14470Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America

Outside Organization: Non-Governmental(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: My name is [REDACTED]. I'm the president of Okanogan County Farm Bureau. What our entire membership is proposing is no action under alternative A. I have a whole list of things that I was supposed to say here. I know that it's going to come out. We live with these predators every day. I live up in the (inaudible) area. We've been privileged just like the rest of our entire county with major fires due to mismanagement of public lands by public agencies. I have had the entire fringing mountain come down on me multiple times, and I am trying to raise young kids on my own with a husband who is a paraplegic. Agriculture is under attack. You guys are worried about food security, and yet, public agencies are doing it themselves. We are (inaudible) the security. Secretary of the Interior Bernhardt terminated the introduction of grizzly bears at our last meeting. Why is our presidential administration overturning that, and I'd like to know what authority they have, our president, to ignore us. We do not want these bears. You guys do not have the right to dump it upon us and our children. I'm going to let it go at that because I'm going to get pretty emotional and I get pretty ticked at that point, and that's not fair to my membership. We do not want any action on grizzly bears. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14471Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: I would urge no to grizzlies in the North Cascades. Concern is the dangers to employees and friends and residents alike. And what is the caring capacity to determine on food that those bears will have and once they're done with that, they'll be into domestic animals, and those are our livelihoods. We - - we don't get paid to have hurting things out there. We get paid to do our job. The migratory herd I see is an issue. The most deer that come out of the North Cascades, they come into the lowlands. Those bears are going to be hungry. They're either going to - - either coming when they come down in the fall and when they come out in the spring and those fawns are young and they're easy to prey on. And have we ever had an experimental population under the (j) plan (inaudible) bear and be eliminated or do we just build from there? Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14472Project:112008Document:132104
Address: na, WA na
United States of America
Outside Organization: Washington State Representative State Government(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,27 2023
Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Well, I'll let you restart the clock or I'll take his seconds. I'm [REDACTED]. I grew up here. I have a century of family farming and ranching in the area. But I do want to take a note and kind of respond to the beginning here. I don't think the most important people in the room are the ones taking the notes. I think it's the people who constantly suffer from federal policies from people back in D.C. while we scrape together a living when they're constantly making policies that affect every one of us. So that's first of all on the first issue. Second of all, when we have good policies that help us, that help us in farming and ranching and do the things that we need to do, it seems like it takes years to get passed. We suffer as we wait for our politicians - - by the way, I'm a new politician so I can say this, I guess - - to finally get the job done and agree for those us back here to help us. And yet, when there's policies that affect us greatly that burden our agriculture and our ranching way of life and our culture, they seem to be pushed through pretty quickly, and they use key words and (j) s and A, B, C, and D, and we get to pick one, as we suffer as they make decisions back in D.C. and Olympia. I am absolutely opposed. I would like to have another generation of my family on our ranch. I would like my children to continue to enjoy our community and be able to go outside safely. By the way, the states that do have grizzlies have alert systems to protect their children. They have training. They know that their children would suffer if they go out into the mountains. And, once again, we'll be making policies with predators without those safeties hoping that maybe when our cattle and our animals are killed, maybe even our families, that they will respond, give us little trinkets of money to keep us going over here as we continue to try to survive. I am Jacquelin Maycumber and I am absolutely opposed to this policy to continue to be brought down by the people who are not living here and trying to continue in our way of life. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14473Project:112008Document:132104
Address: na, WA na
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,27 2023
Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Hi, my name is [REDACTED]. I'm sorry that we're back here. I'd like to just kind of follow up on that last statement. Is there anyone here out in the audience in favor of bringing or introducing grizzly bear, raise your hand. One, two, three, four, five, six. All opposed? Gentlemen. I realize these two gentlemen here are under a lot of pressure from other interest groups and particular environmental groups like the Sierra Club to reintroduce grizzly bear. I see the Sierra Club is based in the great state of California and their national flag or their state flag is a grizzly bear. Let's start with California reintroducing grizzly bears down there. I think it's a little (inaudible). I think differently than most people. I think liability. I think legally. Everyone here that walks about in the room has a duty, a common law duty not to commit negligence or intentional torts by criminal actions. If I drive drunk and hit somebody and kill 'em, I can expect this man here, this sheriff, to arrest me for vehicular homicide, and goddamn, I would deserve it. Now, it is foreseeable if you reintroduce grizzly bear that sooner or later they will come in conflict. It is a proximate causation from that, and people will die and be maimed. And, gentlemen, I have seen a young woman who ran across a grizzly bear in the wrong place at the wrong time in Montana, and she's still undergoing plastic surgery, but I digress. It is not a matter of whether people will die or be maimed but when and how many, and that's why you are here today, because you know you could be one of those people that walks around the trail and runs right up against a momma grizzly bear and her cub, and when you do, I submit you will lose every time. When these

gentlemen are out in the woods collaring grizzly bears, they're comfortable around them, but let me tell you, there are armed to the teeth. They will carry magnums. They will carry sawed-off shotguns with a solid shot because they should, because grizzly bears are a dangerous animal. NICOLE SHERBERT: Thank you, sir. NORMAN STANSFIELD: So my time is up. I thank you for your time here. But I will tell you confidently, if these gentlemen stick their necks out and put up a bond or make themselves civilly and criminally liable for what happens to those people that are killed and maimed, I'd be more than willing - - I'd be more than willing to revise my opinion on that, but right now they have no responsibility at all.

Correspondence ID: 14474Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Good evening. I am [REDACTED]. I'm a member of the Okanagan County Farm Bureau. I also work with ranchers and farmers on some of these issues that we are facing with environmental things that actually inhibit the ability of ranchers and farmers to do their job for us. I also live in Methow and am equated with how agriculture has disappeared from Methow for various reasons. So we're already in a declining position in reference to our agricultural community. One of the things that I noticed reading the EIS is that the scope of work has been violated because this EIS covers the fact and informs us that we now have three zones where the grizzly bears will migrate into rather than the North Cascades Ecosystem. So what this means is that was not covered in the scope of work and the people who are in the other two zones have no opportunity to comment on the trajectory of this EIS, and therefore, I call it an invalid process. The other thing that's important to understand is that the original designation of the North Cascades Ecosystem was the only designation made out of six for the state of Washington, not other zones. So that is the designated recovery zone. It even states this in the grizzly bear annual report and that the introduction of bears into the North Cascade would be based upon their ability to support a sustainable population over the other challenges which they may face being in the North Cascades Ecosystem. So three zones is for your information include the territory from south of I- , back and by and the I- corridor down through the Columbia River. So I'd like to enforce the fact that this is - - my position is alternative , no action.

Correspondence ID: 14475Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: My name is [REDACTED]. I live in Wenatchee. Unlike Montana where grizzlies were never completely exterminated, most of us here have never seen a grizzly in the North Cascades. It's unlikely that our fathers or even our grandfathers saw a grizzly in the North Cascades because they disappeared long ago. By the early s, the number of grizzlies in the North Cascades was very low. The grizzlies disappeared because we shot them, we trapped them, we poisoned them. Throughout the West, we tried to exterminate grizzly bears, black bears, wolves, coyotes, even hawks and eagles. We thought that was the right thing to do, maybe even the heroic thing to do. Old man Cool (phonetic) lived at Domke Lake near the head of Lake Chelan from to . He was a trapper, hunter, and fishing guy. Old man Cool killed bears. I do not know how many grizzlies and how many black bears, but certainly some of both. He was disappointed that he didn't reach his goal of killing bears. That is why at least in part that there are no grizzlies in the North Cascades today. We wiped 'em out before we really even knew much about them, before we even understood the concept of ecosystems and the balance of nature, predators and prey. We know better now. We know that grizzlies - - where grizzlies prosper, so do all of the other native species in a region. We have an opportunity to correct mistakes that we made in the past. There are not many places we can do that. The North Cascades is one of six places in the United States that's big enough and wild enough to support a viable population of grizzly bears. I think that we have a tremendous opportunity here to restore the species, and I am supporting this alternative . I hope we can get this done. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14476Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,27 2023
Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Good evening, everybody. My name is [REDACTED]. I'm from Winthrop. I live there with my wife, Kit McLean Cramer. Our family goes back five generations in Methow Valley. I'm a retired soldier. My wife is a horsewoman who raises a herd of about horses every year for the kids' camps all in the Pacific Northwest. We have children and we have grandchildren. Option A. Do not introduce grizzly bears to the North Cascade mountains. I don't hate grizzly bears, I love them, but they thrive where they are and I presume they're happy there. We thrive where we are, and I guarantee we're happy here. But an introduction of an apex predator into a recreation area which is heavily used by hikers, bikers, campers, outfitters, hunters, and visitors from all over the world on the Pacific Crest Trail would lead to death and maiming. People will die and we know it. So don't pretend it's not going to happen. Of all the rest of us all this evening, bear attacks have surfaced over the last six months here in the American west. One of my good friends in Winthrop lost both her parents when she was a young child to grizzly bear attacks. Not only will there be attacks and not only will there be injury, but a whole way of life will suffer. Outfitters will lose permits. Trails and camping areas will be shut down at certain times of the year not to adversely affect the grizzlies, so keep them where they're happy. They love the Selkirks. They love Yellowstone. They love Montana. Not in Methow Valley and Okanagan County. Thank you very much.

Correspondence ID: 14477Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,27 2023
Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Hi, my name is [REDACTED]. I am the Professor of Natural Resources at Wenatchee Valley College, and I have years of experience as a natural resource manager at Timber Fish and Wildlife. I vote for option A, to not introduce grizzlies, but I have an alternative. It pains me to see the North Cascades Ecosystem in the state that it's in. It's decadent. It's dying. Why do we put out the fire? I was in Yellowstone in the eighties. It's forever wild. Let it burn. Fire is part of the ecosystem. I do not believe that the habitat in North Cascades can support a viable population of bears, grizzlies, but someone mentioned we have wolverines. I've seen wolverines on Highway . Take your good intelligence - - I know everyone, I've worked for the federal government. My last gig was the Bureau of Reclamation. There's intelligent people there. Take an effort to manage that. If you really want to introduce something to this area, introduce a sawmill into Okanagan County and start harvesting dying decadent timber. As a private citizen and owner of that resource, it pains me to the point that I puke that I see that resource burn. And since we have no more extraction of resources because the Forest Service has no foresters, we have to pay excess taxes because their PILT payment, payment in lieu of taxes, is almost nonexistent. We have to just vote to pass O&M increased levies every year because that resource from extracted resources is earmarked from public roads and education and we suffer because the management is not there. So if you want an alternative A, you can introduce a sawmill into Okanagan County. I will - - I will literally work for free to set up timber sales for the good people here to get back on their feet and have a higher standard of living that was once here in the seventies. My time is up.

Correspondence ID: 14478Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, WA N/A
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,02 2023
Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: 114 SPEAKER:
I'm number 114, and I moved here 22
years ago, and I went hunting one time here. You never see
no deer in this state. I take my grandson shooting from
Arlington to Darrington every weekend, spring to fall.

You're lucky to see three or four deer. In New York State, I hunt back there every year for a month. Their average kill is 220,000 deer a year. Washington state is bigger, 26,000 deer a year.

Pennsylvania is bigger - - smaller than New York State. Their kill is 330,000 deer a year. You got way too

many predators here. New York - - back in New York and Pennsylvania, they don't have coyotes - - or they don't have cougars, they don't have wolves, which are the main killers that kill one deer a week for every animal - - wolf or You can't go hunting here and be successful. You probably have one percent success rate hunting in this state. I'm totally against any kind of predator out there whatsoever. They did a study on coyotes, coyotes will kill 26 deer fawns per year to feed the puppies. They put trail cameras on the dens in - - I think it was Nevada. One pair of coyotes killed 46 deer fawns out of the system. And that's a small predator.

Bobcats are killing the deer fawns, black bears kill deer fawns. There's no room to have hunting and predators in any state. Get rid of them. Don't - - don't install more predators to kill our game and fish. Once they get a taste of something, they're going to be there every day until that source is gone. I'm totally against any predators. I'll - - I'll let someone else speak.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:

No. I'll let somebody else speak, but I'm totally against predators here, any kind.

Correspondence ID: 14479Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, WA N/A
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: [REDACTED]:

Okay. My name is [REDACTED]. I need

to apologize to everybody here who came thinking you were going to get your questions answered in a forum where you ask the questions and the panel will answer them. That was the impression I got. That's what I sent out to all of you people, and it's not going to be that way, so I apologize for that.

And I want to just - - three or four years ago, the Skagit County commissioners had a meeting up in Mount Vernon. They brought in a former biologist in the state of Washington, I believe he was, and he was now working some in Montana. And I think it was back in the Kalispell mountains, they put collars on all the grizzlies to where they could monitor them 24/7. And wherever the bears went, they left a yellow trail. And he showed that there were

only like two or three trails up high. And that's where supposedly all these bears are going to stay, up in the crests of the Cascades.

He showed another photograph of where the bears actually were. And then the river - - the bottom - - the valley bottom floors were just covered with yellow, so that's where they were. And you know - - you and I both know, you know, it's only 50 miles from the crest of the Cascades to here, you know. They said - - they said that the bears can travel 150 to 300 miles.

Well, they're going to go to the valley floors and they're going to eat the salmon and they're going to eat you - - your cattle, they're going to eat elk and the deer. And to say that that's not going to happen is foolishness because this - - this biologist proved it. The bears don't stay up high. They go where the easiest food is, which is in the valley floors. So that's it.

Correspondence ID: 14480Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, WA N/A
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: 110 SPEAKER:

Okay. I'm 110. I do at least 65 days a year of hiking, off-trail hiking. I run typically 30 cameras and I really keep an eye on, specifically in this area of the predator population and the decline of our deer population. Love to talk to the tribe guys. I got pictures of wolves in here, tons of lions.

But what I really want to share is this is a warning from my best friend in Kodiak. And he flies for Fish and Game, he does all their surveys. And he says "we have bears that walk through our streets, eat our trash and dog food. Bears are opportunistic feeders and will find the easiest, laziest place to eat, usually where people are.

Our bears are able to open car doors and they will kill livestock, a different one every night."

And on opening the doors, they have videos of them. They will literally go around to every door, and they will open the door and if there's a piece of gum in the glove box, they will absolutely shred the inside of the car to get to it. "We have relocated bears 40 miles away on a different island and they've returned in two weeks." They have the same type of climate that we have here. Their bears don't hibernate that are in town because once they get on a food source, they know that's a viable food source that stays, and so they just stay in and around the towns and they keep feeding and going through and killing the things that are there that are easily accessible to them.

And what happens is he said eventually those bears all get shot. I've had a good friend up there that got

mauled by a bear and they - - the bear actually scalped him. It grabbed him by the head and ripped his hair off. He was within a quarter mile of the airport in town. You guys need to realize what's going to happen when these things get down in the valley floor. It's not just eating the deer and elk. It's eating your pets, it's coming into town, your kids at the bus stops. Those are the real issues you have to deal with.

Draft EIS Meeting 1 November 2, 2023 NDT Assgn # 69368 Page 25

Correspondence ID: 14481Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, WA N/A
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: [REDACTED]

I'm number 120 and my name is [REDACTED] A

couple of things. When these things happen, somebody didn't just wake up one morning and decide that we're going to introduce bears to the North Cascades. There was some data presumably, some studies. And what I found over the years, somebody funds that stuff. So what I would encourage everybody to review, when they look at the environmental impact statement, find out where the money is that's proposing this. It's coming from somewhere. People just didn't wake up - - these fine people in the government services didn't just wake up one day and say let's put some bears in the - - in the North Cascades.

The environmental - - the Endangered Species Act has been around for 50 years. Where were they 50 years ago when they needed bears in the North Cascades? Somebody woke up, decided we're going to pay for a study from somewhere, some consultant - - consultants, and come up with some rationale to support putting bears back in the North Cascades. Somebody paid for that. Ask yourself who paid for it. Where did the money come from? Who is proposing this? Who is really behind it? That's all I have.

Draft EIS Meeting 1 November 2, 2023 NDT Assgn # 69368 Page 26

Correspondence ID: 14482Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, WA N/A
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: [REDACTED]:

Well, I'm just going to reiterate - - my

name is [REDACTED] I just want to reiterate some of the things that other people have said. This is an emotional issue. It's not based on common sense. Anybody that has any

modicum of common sense at all knows this is not a good idea. People are going to die. People are going to die. Just like the elk. People have died in car accidents with the elk now. And the elk was a good idea maybe, but now people have died. And you're going to lose - you're going to lose the loss of your access to the North Cascades because, you know, the incidents will take away high mountain hunting. Then they're going to take away hiking access in certain areas and pretty soon this area is going to be off limits. Pretty soon that area is going to be off limits. Pretty soon there won't be any place for all those people in Seattle and that gigantic population that wasn't here last time they had bears in the North Cascade, for them to hike. That's all I've got to say. Thank you.

Draft EIS Meeting 1 November 2, 2023 NDT Assgn # 69368 Page 27

Correspondence ID: 14483Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, WA N/A
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:

Like everybody else up here, I am totally against the grizzly bears being reintroduced or introduced. My wife, she hikes - - goes up on a lot of these trails that you have, you know, the Cascades, that type of thing. She's up there by herself. I can't go.

Part of the reason why I'm wearing this is because I stepped on a bear. He wasn't dead. Yeah, it didn't work out so well. It's not the total reason. But anyhow, if that had been a grizzly bear, I wouldn't be here, right? I mean, it wound up - - obviously, it was a black bear. But we're going to have the interaction.

A couple of people here already have said, you know, what about a woman or their children or the elderly or whatever, it doesn't matter. I'm not a little guy. Before I got this brace on me, I could not stand against a grizzly bear. A black bear tends to run from you, a grizzly doesn't. We just don't need these things here.

The other thing that I am really scared about is transparency. We're not going to be told how many bears there actually are out there. We don't have a hotline for the cougar, we don't have a hotline for the - - for the black bears, right, whenever we have sightings or have issues or anything like that. We darn sure don't have one for the wolves.

You know, history has shown us we're not going to have one for the grizzly bear either. So when my wife says she wants to go walk - - hike this trail and we haven't heard

about any bears being up there, do we really know? Anyhow, I just - - that's something that really, really has me on edge about. So anyhow, that's it.

Draft EIS Meeting 1 November 2, 2023 NDT Assgn # 69368 Page 28

Correspondence ID: 14484Project:112008Document:132104

Address: n/a, WA n/a
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: [REDACTED]

Hi, I'm 128, [REDACTED] I thought it was going to be a question and answer thing, so I didn't write out. So I'm not a great public speaker. I'll do what I can. The one thing that I find to be really objectionable is that the state of Washington has passed a law that says that we do not accept grizzly bear reintroduction. I think that it's very - - for the federal government to overstep that, I think is unacceptable.

When I go - - Montana, where there's bears, and I understand that Yellowstone is highly visited, but they have 1.1 million people. Idaho has two, Washington has 7.7 million people. So for the bear/human interaction, I think, you know, a lot of that 7.7 people like to recreate. That's why a lot of people live here. I think that's a huge increase in what we're going to see in bear/people interactions.

I think, also, what's been brought up earlier is that we - - I think there would be bears in the North Cascades. There would probably be bears in the Pasayten. If there was something for them to eat now, they would have migrated across the border and they would be here. There's not enough food to support the amount of grizzly bears that they want to reintroduce here.

What else? I think that's all I can think of right now, so.

Draft EIS Meeting 1 November 2, 2023 NDT Assgn # 69368 Page 30

Correspondence ID: 14485Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: I'm (inaudible). I live in Okanagan. I'm originally from Eatonville, Washington down by Mount Rainier. I'm a forester (inaudible) private citizen. I fully agree with the previous comments. We do need additional forester resources here in Okanagan County to help (inaudible) certain elements of our economy. While I said something that you'll probably all agree with, I'm now about to say something that will probably make you all laugh or nash your teeth at me. And I'm here in favor of reproduction of grizzlies. I've worked and recreated around grizzlies for the last years of my life. I've worked with

them in captivity both at Washington State University and Northwest Wildlife Park back down by Eatonville, and all in all, I'm not going to convince you tonight on the validity of bringing these animals back. That's not what the proceeding here is for. We're all here to talk about what we wanted, how we felt, and what will go on in the future. But ultimately, these conversations from (inaudible) of this is about safety in one form or another, the safety of our homes, the safety of our economic enterprises, our children, our families, and our landscapes, and none of those will be truly exclusive. There can be a day someday, I'm not sure when it is, I'll likely be an old man, but there can be a day when grizzlies and humans can safely exist on this landscape. I would much rather (inaudible) decisions over time and not just passively allowing and hoping perhaps one day a couple unlucky grizzlies wandered down from British Columbia. And at the end of the day, we can have both. We can work together. And this is never not something that cannot happen because we have different opinions. Cooperation and collaboration over time is the key in all things. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14486Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence:): Good evening. My name is [REDACTED]. I'm from the Methow Valley. No action alternative event. It is perfectly important that the public understands that two action plans of this EIS will result in a contract of federal agencies in Washington, D.C. will be required to enforce on public lands, whether those lands are federal, state or county, but also on your private properties. Make no mistake in understanding the extent the agencies reach. The park service U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services, as well as WDFW, are all promoting for the occupation of grizzly bears not just on the federal lands but onto state, public lands, as well into your communities. Page of the EIS cites a report from North Continental Divide Ecosystem that states, "Approximately percent of the recovery zone is in federal, Tribal, or state ownership, with only percent on private lands." The report goes on to say, "However, the majority of human grizzly bear conflicts and bear mortality occur on private lands, especially as grizzly bears expand their ranges." Again, in this document, and I quote, "The majority of human-grizzly bear conflicts and bear mortality occur on private lands." So read this contract. So what kind of human-grizzly bear conflicts are the agencies not willing to disclose either in the EIS or in your public meetings? I'll read just a small sampling of these conflicts, but first (inaudible) management policy language concerning their conduct and decision-making. These are your policies. National Park Service written policy states, The safety and health of employees, contractors, volunteers, and the public are core service values. In making decisions on matters concerning employees' safety and health, those managers must exercise good judgment and discretion, and above all, keep in mind that the safeguarding of human life must not be compromised. Their policy goes on to say, quote, The species does not based on an effective management plan pose a serious threat to the safety of people in parks, park resources, or persons or property within or outside park boundaries. Again, those are your rules. So here is a small sampling on the conflicts. And I did hand out something earlier today for those who got a copy of it. A woman was camping in the city limits, ripped from her tent, killed by a grizzly bear. Grizzly bear and cub euthanized after months of breaking into homes. Navy veteran had jaw torn off in horrifying grizzly attack. He was ambushed. Grizzly killed hiker and then broke into a home. Grizzly charges fisherman in Montana before getting killed. Grizzly bear mauls Montana (inaudible). Woman found dead in Montana following grizzly bear encounter. Grizzly attack two boys. Fourteen grizzlies euthanized, double the ten you're at. That was a single year. And if you believe - - Let me finish this paragraph. If you believe that bear spray will save you, know this. Empty bear spray cans have been found next to dead bodies of those killed by grizzlies. Grizzly proponents will say (inaudible) public education. Yet, attacks results in death or injury also occur against individuals expertly trained in how to protect themselves against grizzlies. My wife will finish the rest of this if she can. SPEAKER: . I am continuing the statement that my husband wrote and to the last sentence he said. The attacks resulted in death or injury also occurred in individuals expertly trained in how to protect themselves against grizzlies. So what are the consequences of these deaths and injuries? Federally referred to by the government as simply complex. According to either of the action plans, when human/grizzly conflicts occur in the park or in our communities, history has shown that very little occurs other than renewed efforts by the agencies to educate the public of the grizzlies' dangers. There is no pause button or intervention in either action plan when the grizzlies have (inaudible) substantial injured or a human, a hiker, a biker, a camper, or becomes conditioned, killed cattle, or starved to death, both action plans call for immediate replacement of the offending grizzlies on a one-for-one basis. But the loss of a human or a livestock has to happen first. Then a replacement grizzly is inserted right back into the recovery zone. In fact, county commissioners from both Chelan and Okanogan asked the same question that was just posed. What happens when the Agency's system is shown to be broken and

public safety is taking a back seat to continued grizzly attacks? The federal government declined to answer the question from either of the commissioners because there is no exit plan. In fact, there are no facts or limits in either duration or the number of incidents of attacks or conflicts that would occur either in our communities or in the park. There's no off-ramp, no threshold point in this contract that would dictate a pause in the intervention or reconsideration of continued insertions of grizzlies into the foothills bordering our communities. Once it starts, it does not end, regardless of the threat to public safety. So read the contract. If you think there is due process for affected states to request relief through an appeal that would (inaudible) grizzly, that process is by the federal agencies who are mistaken. Three recent cases make the point. Montana, Wyoming and Idaho have all filed formal - - formal petitions over the last two years for delisting the grizzly and despite viable populations of new grizzlies throughout three of these states, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has ignored these requests and maybe more today. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14487Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: I guess first back about ' they had a signing of one print. They were about to roll out of Leavenworth, so we were close, Leavenworth. (Inaudible) chasing elk (inaudible) place to go and it was either that fall or, like, six months later, I think it was the next year, I was taking a jaunt up Mission Creek, Cashmere, the back way up and over by Sand County up to Number Canyon Road. It was a place, it looked like it was slough off into nowhere, and so I went, I parked the rig, it was getting (inaudible). I started climbing up (inaudible) cool off. I was in this huckleberry patch. I heard something. I went around the huckleberry patch and then I smelled the bear and I've got a terrible nose. And I really don't know what bears, they smell like. Apparently, they don't smell good, the grizzly. So I went up to the top of that mountain almost, came on top of this kill, a bunch of sticks, about yards away. I did not see him. Crash. Crash. Crash. I had probably , yards away downhill. (Inaudible) downhill too. But he barked at me, like, you know, like this size dog, a good bark, you know, like a warning. So that's really pretty cool. I think that he's going to take this old route across a sunny slope. When I was in the late s and early s, I saw a few wolverines heading there, and I'm sure that's probably where he was heading to (inaudible) across, get up through the - - upper Lake Chelan. I seen a wolverine there and that wolverine did not want to be seen and neither did the grizzly, but I've met a lot of - - quite a number of people on the Pacific Crest Trail (inaudible) and there's this set goal to (inaudible) because they're so (inaudible).

Correspondence ID: 14488Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence:): [REDACTED]. I'm from Manson, born and raised. My folks had part ownership with the Black Warrior Mine in (inaudible) by Cascade or Cascade Path. We have spent lots of time up in the woods hunting, getting crops for our orchards, you know, going with our children, running across the bears that we have that are simple brown bears, black bears, whatever they might be. It's a fearful situation. Having seen and read the situation with grizzly bears is much more serious. When I went to Alaska with - - I met a friend of ours who was with the Fish and Wildlife, we all had to be trained in firearms, shotguns, that someone in the group had to carry at all times. I think grizzly bears are a magnificent animal. I'm willing to go to Alaska to see them. If this was such a great area for grizzlies to be, they would have returned if we were the reason they're not here now. And so I would advocate that we don't bring the grizzly bear back, that we open the forests, and I also find it interesting that the week this news popped, the National Park Services in Eaton closed down long-term parking. So the Stehekin Wild or wilderness area has less access for people and so to me it just kind of seemed to fit. Thank you

Correspondence ID: 14489Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,27 2023
Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Good evening. Growing up as a kid we used to run around and play everywhere and do whatever we wanted. Today I fear that my grandkids can't do that. They can't walk from their house to my house because we have wolves in our pasture, which makes it a nuisance, the wolves, which we said we didn't want. Now you're going to introduce even a bigger predator that is going to come down to my backyard. I'm going to be killing them, not you. You're going to be sitting in Washington, Olympia, wherever. You're not going to have to deal with it. We are, we the people of this Valley, and we don't want it. We don't want 'em here. We have grizzlies. They're up in the Cascades. (Inaudible) somewhere, but I didn't even realize there was grizzlies, but they're there. And we don't need any extras brought in. That's all I have to say.

Correspondence ID: 14490Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America

Outside Organization: Okanagan County Republican Party Chairman County Government(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: For the record, I'm [REDACTED]. I'm the Okanagan County Republican Party Chairman, and during the regular Central Committee meeting in Okanagan County last Thursday, the Central Committee passed a resolution, and they would like me to read it. Resolution in favor of no action options of grizzly bear restoration in the North Cascades Ecosystem, otherwise referred to as NCE, whereas the National Park Service and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife have requested public input on a drafted Environmental Impact Statement, EIS, evaluating options for destroying grizzly bears to the NCE, whereas the EIS has been terminated by the previous administration, Secretary of the Interior, David Bernhardt, and no justification was provided to re-initiate the EIS process, whereas the EIS fails to document mitigation costs for citizens within the adjacent and adjacent to NCE loss of range, expense of fencing, depredation of domestic animals and livestock, livestock, et cetera, whereas the EIS fails to establish liability or set preparations for damages caused by the grizzly bears to individuals or businesses, whereas the EIS has exceeded the scope which is confined to the NCE but now includes two new areas, zone and zone , which impact more stakeholders than those associated with the NCE, whereas the law requires public lands to be managed for multiple use and the (j) rule as proposed seems to rely heavily on closures of roads and access, whereas the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife is already prohibited from introducing grizzly bears from out of the area, and whereas the restoration project is a misuse of the Endangered Species Act because the grizzly bear versus - - I'm going to mess it up, the name - - is not in danger or threatened as a species due to existing healthy populations in significant parts of its traditional range. Therefore, we have resolved, the Okanagan County Republican Party, endorses and recommends that no action alternative in the EIS, and we have further resolved that this resolution be transmitted as a comment to the EIS and sent in at the Public Meeting at the Okanagan - - in Okanagan. Senator Republic - - to Representative [REDACTED] and Senator [REDACTED] (inaudible) and submit it into local newspapers. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14491Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America

Outside Organization: Okanagan County Republican Party Chairman Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Okay. (Inaudible) I am in favor of option - - no option. Leave grizzly bear (inaudible). I also don't believe that grizzly bear was hunted. I think they left because of the food supply. If they want to bring grizzly bear back or any species of that size, they need to bring back the food supply. And we don't want to be the food supply, our livestock, our orchards, or our people. The other thing is the grizzly bear has - - the male has a -square mile area as much as, but what is (inaudible) if they go square miles, we're within square miles of the grizzly bear path. So if they aren't coming, they don't want to come, and I don't think we want to encourage them to come. Also, I don't believe - - I can (inaudible) a lot of people use a backup (inaudible) grizzly bear. No. They didn't use the word grizzly. I use it. They got the word bear, not the word grizzly. Probably they didn't know the difference. Most people can't tell the difference between a grizzly bear and a black bear. Anyway, that - - my comment is leave grizzly bear where it is. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14492Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Okay. Option A, I am hopefully here to save a life, maybe the life of one of my grandchildren or my children who grew up hiking in the Cascades. This is one of the books we used to use to hike the trails. The second edition is at home. I brought this book that holds these photos because - - my name is Leon Homan (inaudible) and I am a business owner/operator. And one summer after a retired marine biologist of this area came to work for me one summer. I got to know him real well. I'm not going to mention his name here, but if you talk to me I will be happy to share it with you. He told me that there is grizzlies that come down through Canada and spend some time in the Cascades, but the habitat is not sustainable for permanent residency of any large grizzly bears. So to bring grizzly bears in, it's not sustainable for 'em. Where are they going to go? They're going to go on (inaudible) and start eating cattle, you know. It's going to happen sooner or later, somebody is going to get mauled. I guarantee it. There's two people up in Canada (inaudible) wilderness area last week, they were pulled out of their tents, a man and a woman and their dog were mauled to death. There will be mauling. Who is going to be accountable for that? And whatever tax dollars they've created, those tax dollars somehow probably go (inaudible) climate change, so who - - is that all in the Environmental Impact Statement? Probably not. But anyway, but my wife and I - - one of the trails that we select to hike was (inaudible), and about years ago we hiked that trail (inaudible) and I thought I seen a grizzly. I've been a avid hunter, a fisherman, involved in several bear hunts. I think I'm a pretty good judge of bears. I've probably seen a bear at least every year. And we've all had several successful bear hunts, killed two of 'em, one on my own, and I think I can tell what a black bear looks like, but briefly saw what I thought was a grizzly bear. Looked at him through my binoculars. We hiked back out. Two days later, this was on a Tuesday, went back in on Thursday. Got my zoom lens on my camera, went in, got as close as I dared to, packed in some heat, and I took some pictures of this bear. My neighbor worked for the Forest Service. He said, "I didn't see that." I sent six pictures. I got the negatives. Took three months to get the pictures back. He wrote on there - - that's all they did was sent me four pictures back of the six that I sent in and said that I took - - It just came back inconclusive because I didn't have any DNA evidence. But these pictures - - you want to see these pictures, you can email me at [REDACTED] We don't need them. They're already here. We don't need to reintroduce 'em or introduce 'em. They are here.

Correspondence ID: 14493Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: : I'm [REDACTED]. I'm a fourth generation rancher in Methow Valley. I grew up - - my dad was an outfitter. I've been in the outfitting business. (Inaudible) associations now. I've traveled the mountains in the North Cascades from the sawtooths clear down to - - to the hearts of Snoqualmie Path too and - - and - - up there and there have been no population of grizzlies up there. Back in ' , my dad cleaned the trail for a band of sheep there and he saw a grizzly crossing Pasayten there. That was the first time that I had heard of one. And then another one, back to ' , and do the same thing, and he said about the same year he saw one grizzly up in the Pasayten. I've lived up in the Pasayten in there taking out trail and building a new trail after the fires, and there's - - there's not the habitat up there for the grizzly bear. There never has been and there never will be. So you're going to put grizzly bear up there. What are they going to do? They're going to be right down in Winthrop. They're going to be right down in (inaudible) and they're going to be right down in (inaudible) because they're not going to stay up there. So I am opposed to it completely. I'm for A, no grizzly bear in there. So if it happens, somebody is going to be coming after you guys. Bingo.

Correspondence ID: 14494Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Hi. I am from the Republic. I was (inaudible) one of the zones is actually on one of the alternatives to introduce the bear there. I think we already have a couple of grizzlies on Sherman Pass because I have seen (inaudible) to work for that have seen them. And I know there's some in Danville too that came across the border because I also have cattle that are there. But I - - I don't know how much you guys know about grizzlies, but I've read a little about grizzlies. Grizzlies in the right conditions can smell miles away. In a matter of time their claws get damaged and their claws are six, eight inches long. They go back. So I hike on a lot of - - I've hiked Pasayten, I've hiked in the Cascades. I haven't seen bear there. I have run into a mamma bear and two (inaudible) September of . By the time I saw her, she was already - - already standing up huffing at me, and that was one of my first fears as a lone hiker, but I want to hike so (inaudible) bears I backed out luckily, a little bears up (inaudible) the street. Then they came down to the trails. So I started staying in the cabin trying to be noisy. But anyway, if - - if bears are introduced, they're going to go to the garbage cans all over - - I'm sorry if I'm all over the wall. I was wondering if they thought about the (inaudible) that the grizzlies are going to get. Those are (inaudible) endangered. There's a lot of fishermen that fish in that (inaudible), and we should worry about the fish and the bull trout instead of grizzlies that aren't here, the species that are here that are already endangered that we should take care of. So that's something to think about. And bear-proof, bear containers are \$, . So if they come down, who's going to pay for those? The citizens aren't required by the public to have mandatory city garbage, but it might come down to that, and who here wants to pay that much to bear-proof a garbage container? I don't think anybody. And I'm for option A.

Correspondence ID: 14495Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Yeah. My name is [REDACTED]. I grew up in Riverside. I live down in George. I am years old. I started hunting when I was . We used to go hunting (inaudible) every year, no problem. Now they want the cougar and they took the (inaudible) off the cougars. We have last year, they brought the wolves in. Last year a group got no deer. This year we got one. The problem is not - - I mean, these guys are super book smart but dumber than hell when it comes to what's going on in the environment. But anyway, you know, the problem with dealing with the bear, like you said, we'd bring them - - the bears in and get a bigger budget. So when they brought the cougar, they had to have more - - a bigger budget to watch out for cougars. They bring the wolves in. They need a bigger budget. They need to go back and fund them out of the hunting license, the tags, and the fishing license and not out of the general fund, and we'd have this whole problem solved. Anyway, we talked about the grizzlies. (Inaudible) the population in the state of Washington in ? Anybody have a guess? I have no idea, but I doubt if it's a million people. Now we're million people. I would go down to Riverside in - - what year was that - - ' and went to Seattle and then I come back to George. I am appalled at how many new houses are around Riverside from what it was when I left. So what's the population of Okanagan County? I think when I left it was around , . What is it now? , now. So that's how it's grown and you want to do all of these things and endanger us. So we need to just get rid of our game department and (inaudible). You don't see them bringing grizzlies in and bringing wolves in. That's all I have to say.

Correspondence ID: 14496Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence:): My name is [REDACTED]. I'm number , but nobody was up here in front of me, so here I am. We don't need any grizzlies anywhere. Nobody needs grizzlies, nobody needs wolves, and the thing we need even less than that is the Department of Fish and Wildlife. These guys, they know nothing about fish. They don't care about wildlife. All they want to do is ruin the most important people, which is farmers and ranchers that grow our food. There is no reason for these people. There is no reason for grizzly bears. I want and I will - - any - - any grizzly bear that comes around my place, I'm shooting 'em, I trapping 'em, I'm poisoning. And that was what happened to 'em in the beginning. That's why they're not here now. We needed 'em out of here. We got 'em out of here. People need to smarten up. You people are the smart people. These, no.

They've never done anything right in the history of the world. And - - and government agencies like that are what's bringing us down. We'd all be prosperous people. We'd be in great shape without government entities like this. Why do we have fight 'em against this? It should be so easy. My friend Rob told me one time, he said, I don't know if he told me or I told him or whatever, but he said, It should be so easy to grow food for people. All you have to do is grow it, let them buy it, and that's how it would happen and everybody would do well if it wasn't for people fighting against us all of the time. Unneeded. I appreciate all of you people. You are the backbone of our country. Thanks a lot.

Correspondence ID: 14497Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: : I mean, that doesn't mean anything. It's a mess. First off, I want to start off with a little history lesson. In the s there was a fund started, the [REDACTED] Fund, cents out of every rifle, box of ammunition that was sold in the United States went into this fund. This fund was set up to keep trails, parks open, anything to do with wildlife conservation but nothing to do with the promotion of bringing wolves into the United States and populating them all through the country. Newt Gingrich took charge of that fund and when this process started he took \$ million out of that fund to get this wolf project going. And how much money has that cost everybody, you know. Plus, every time you buy a box of ammunition, cents goes into that. They can't manage the forest. You walk around the Okanagan National Forest, there is so much dead timber laying on the ground. When a fire gets into that area, I mean, it's just like pouring gasoline on it. Then the wolf conflict, though, I have a really good friend, a lady that owned the K Diamond K Ranch up in Republic, Washington, she's getting all kinds of animals killed by wolves. She's got 'em on video, pictures, everything. She's called up the Game Department. They came out there. Hands in the pockets. You know, and then guess what? They don't do anything. If it wasn't for the Colville Indians coming in and bringing hunters in the tribe because they can kill the wolves. They've only killed one, though, so far. It's basically what you call a good start. I've been hunting since . This last year was my last year going bear hunting again because the fact that they, the DNR and the game department, they ruined that area. All's it is is a giant fund for the game department because they haven't increased the big wolf population, but they have introduced the true (inaudible) which basically (inaudible) propagate the animals to be more like Montana and Colorado where a majority of these elk that are born, their first year of having been born, they'll have two points. That puts them out of the situation they can't be killed. They want to promote the big wolves because there is thousands of people that put in for that tag because there is some giant wolves in that area. That was a quick two - - two minutes. I'm about halfway through. Are you - - one real quick thing. A magnum weighs a lot. Carry a -millimeter, put Buffalo Bore bullets in it. First off, they're solid lead. When they hit, they destroy the rifling on the cartridge.

Correspondence ID: 14498Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: All right. Hello, everyone. My name is [REDACTED] and I'm here to support grizzly bear restoration on behalf of the National Parks Conservation Association, and I'm one of the six (inaudible) supporters. We're an organization that advocates for national parks. Our parks are spectacular places. And some of the (inaudible) the grizzly bear. I want to thank the National Park Service and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for (inaudible) of this plan (inaudible) that is legally required to publicly (inaudible) and the right thing to do. Grizzlies provide collateral benefits to the ecosystem's health. They're expert diggers. They trend the soil and create seed beds for flowering plants and grasses and prevent (inaudible) alpiners and pine meadows. Grizzlies are an Endangered Species because there are not many of them left. They were shot, trapped, and poisoned to death before the North Cascades became a national park. To assume that they were recovering (inaudible) and wide-ranging ignores their biology. They reproduce slowly. They take years to raise their young and (inaudible) up to percent of their cubs die the first year of life. Successful rehabilitation of the North Cascades will take a century to reach just bears. By comparison, the (inaudible) has four times that number today. Since , there have been million visitors to Yellowstone National Park. During this time, people were injured by grizzly bears in the park. For all visitors

combined, the chance of being injured by a grizzly bear is one injury for every . million visits, and injury must be taken seriously but most are not caused by bears. The National Park Service has proposed the local population redesignation be designated as an experimental nonessential population that provides humans with more tools to discourage bears from coming into conflict with us. I hope you'll all learn about this and process (inaudible) essentially allows bears on federal land. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14499Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: : I'm Number . I just came from Ellensburg, Washington. I'm years old. I'm a geologist. I worked seven years in Alaska for the federal government, the U.S. Bureau of Mines. We were required and provided magnum revolvers for us to carry all of the time, plus a shotgun around camp. I had plenty encounters with grizzly bears there. People that have wildlife experience with grizzlies, there's plenty of places, Montana, Alaska, Idaho, Wyoming to see 'em. And what would your thinking be if it was your daughter that was killed in that little town in Montana sleeping in her tent in the middle of the night in a downtown park, or your son that worked for the forester right outside Glacier Park and he was just on a little bike ride on his mountain bike, a trail he's gone up many times before, and was killed by a grizzly. In Glacier National Park they require you to carry bear spray. I also am an avid hiker. I grew up in Ellensburg, Washington. I do parts of the Pacific Crest Trail. On the Pacific Crest Trail they have such a problem with bears down there, everyone is required to carry over miles a heavy metal bear can or a heavy-duty plastic bear can. Is that (inaudible) to all of the trails up here now. And also, after the seventies I have a few friends, her dad saw a grizzly bears up around (inaudible). I have friends that lived up in Oroville and they went with their family hiking and horseback riding in the (inaudible). They buried (inaudible) -gallon drums at the horse camp five feet under the ground. They came back the next summer and grizzly bears had dug them all up, opened 'em all up. And the latest encounter of a grizzly, someone saw a grizzly right outside of Leavenworth this July, and a hiker saw a grizzly just in north parts past a couple years ago. So they're around and I put - - I always, always - - I put in that statement I sent in last fall - - a quick review of this, I didn't see anything. I wanted a statement of all incidents in the last hundred years and how much it cost in medical and insurance and if the government was paying for everyone's funerals and the rehabilitations from being killed by grizzlies or injured by grizzlies, and the cost of all of that. I would love to see that in a Environmental Impact Statement. And I'm for no action, and there's plenty of places to go see 'em. And like some other people have mentioned, you know, a hundred years ago we didn't have all of these houses and all of the highways, so if we want to bring them back like it was years ago, why don't we just close North Cascades Highway (inaudible), all of those roads -

Correspondence ID: 14500Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Hi, my name is (inaudible). I've grown up around here most of my life. I am for option A, no reintroduction to the grizzly bear. Due to the fact I've seen what happened with the introduction of the wolves and how it impacted us, hunting on our reservation, and whatever happens on (inaudible). For instance, a couple of years ago on (inaudible) my partner, and we had to really almost shoot our way back to the range. So I say no to the introduction. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14501Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: I'm number , and I'm no public speaker, but I am a wildlife artist, and I am a grandmother of five beautiful grandchildren, and I have two of them, they're growing up to be artists, and that is thrilling to me. So I had a young moose feet out of my window sitting in the foothills of the mountains, and that was a very thrilling moment for me. I am a hunter but I also love beauty of our wildlife. There was a book written by Ted Lyons and Will Graves. These guys went to Russia to learn about the devastation of the wolves in Russia. If you want to read a book called "The Real Wolf" and really know what this is all about, get yourself a copy and read it. Okay. Also, there was a gentleman named Ted Oxman (phonetic). He was the first private patrolman in Yellowstone National Park and he watched these wolves disburse, and the first thing that they picked on and destroyed were the moose, which doesn't make me (inaudible). There used to be three dozen moose up in the (inaudible) drainage area in Wyoming, and they - - this guy would go up there, an older gentleman, would go up there and he'd see three dozen moose in one trip, and now he says if you see two, you're really lucky. They were supposed to stay in the park, but because the - - the prey base was great up there, well, they didn't stay in the park. They came out of the park and they went into Wyoming and they went all over the place in Idaho and Montana and every place else. So do you think I want them introducing a - - what I call an alpha predator into our area when I have a moose standing feet out of my window? I have whitetail and needle deers and cougars, which I'm afraid of cougars but they're beautiful. Do I want any of this animals killed? No. Do I think grizzly bears are beautiful? Yeah. I'm a wildlife artist. Why wouldn't I? But do I want to take my children up into the mountains, my grandbabies, eight and -Do I want to take 'em up there and put their life at risk to teach them how to do what I do, photograph these animals? No. Think about it. We don't want 'em. I'm for no way.

Correspondence ID: 14502Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence:): Good evening. My name is [REDACTED], your tonight. And I'm not one to - - but as I (inaudible) north end (inaudible), I think I'm your (inaudible) and I'll thank you for that (inaudible). Does Yellowstone have , acres of orchard next to it anywhere? Does it? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Not that I'm aware of. SPEAKER: I guess my concern is in the foothills of the Cascades (inaudible) orchards right up to them. If we have an apex predator, they can smell for - plus miles. He wakes up hungry and he's out in the lower elevation, it doesn't sound like (inaudible) fulfill his caloric intake so he can mass up for the winter and survive and he (inaudible). When he comes out in the spring, he's going to be preying on things down low, so it's going to be his first available food source. So it's mainly going to put trouble with cattle ranchers and orchards. We have these things called bees that we used to pollinate with and we put these things out in foot by pallets, standard around the orchards. We're having a hell of time right now trying to keep our bees here because our bees are being preyed upon by the natural predator loss (inaudible) killing our bee population. The last thing we need to do is bring in bears to see how many crates of bees they tear up every spring and scatter throughout (inaudible). We don't need that. What we need is to be able to pay attention, think about surroundings we're going to introduce these (inaudible) into. This is not the proper surroundings for that. We have an overabundance of apex predators (inaudible) wolverine trail and I (inaudible) but I believe there is no food up there to supply a -mile area after the great fire up there in (inaudible) , acres. It burned so hot, that area isn't regrown seven years. It is a food dessert (inaudible) - - thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14503Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America

Outside Organization: Okanagan County Commissioner County Government(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Good evening. Okanagan County Commissioner Chris Branch. I just have the same comments to make that the other commissioners weren't prepared to comment and one was not available, and but I know my fellow commissioners and I know what they feel about the grizzly bear and I know they oppose the grizzly bears' introduction, so I'm sure option would be what I report as the chair for the Board of Commissioners. Now, to share a little bit, what my own opinion is I formed it over a while and it certainly was happening with wolves. What I see more often than anything not is there's a lot of our community against itself, and I don't like that at all. We have a (inaudible) vision we're dealing with in our community and this country, and heaven sake for me, arguing the grizzly bear issue is not getting at some of the most

important issues that we have to face today. Crime is one. Mental health is another one. And I think about the grizzly bear introduction and I think about the wolves, and I think about the fact that we have management programs. If they don't do what we tell them to do against the animals, then we have to go and shoot 'em. And (inaudible) in grizzly bears. Think about the fact that if it doesn't work out, we take out the pack, we take out the bears. I don't know if I like that management technique at all. And so I - - my job here is to listen to people in this county, and I've heard a lot of opinions here. I'm opposing having the grizzly bear introduced. I do believe the grizzly bear will be in the North Cascades one way or the other, but I don't think we have to introduce 'em and I really hate to see us, you know, again, pitting ourselves against each other trying to - - trying to figure out what to do with them after we get 'em introduced and trying to manage 'em. We have to be good at that. And unless there's a way that you can tell me that we can be really good at it like management in the North Cascades, I'm ready to listen. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14504Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: : I'm going to take the first minute to read this thing from the director of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services. He stated it before Congress, that the grizzly is biologically recovered. He said this based on (inaudible) grizzlies in Montana, Wyoming, Idaho and Canada. In fact, there's so many grizzlies inside and outside the recovery zones that the government is counting (inaudible) management policy. I'd like to say intentional - - intentional information relevant information in any environmental impact statement is the same as lying to the public. As a result of the (inaudible) management programs and leadership within the federal government stating agencies understands, oh, well, (inaudible) are ongoing in the (inaudible) recovery zone. If he takes this bill with these reckless grizzly management plans inside Washington State, they would have done so by lying to the public and cheating the system. The only other thing I would offer to you guys is that I had a friend running a feed store over in Black Diamond a few years ago when a young grizzly (inaudible) hunting food. He moved to Idaho because that's what he did. He hunted cougars. I saw him in the store here not too long ago. I said, What are you doing, and he said there's so many predatorial cougars here now that they hired me by the hour to come back over here with my dogs to kill cougars. So instead of going out and paying for a license and handling the dogs hunting 'em, the government is now paying him to go out and hunt predatory cougars. I see the same thing happening with grizzlies. There's been a lot of talk about Endangered Species. We are the endangered species. Between the fires and grasshoppers and - - and the wolves and the cougars and now we'll have grizzly bears doing things, no. No more grizzlies.

Correspondence ID: 14505Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America

Outside Organization: Chelan County Farm Bureau Non-Governmental(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Hi, I'm [REDACTED] (phonetic). I'm number . I'm with the Chelan County Farm Bureau and we are in support of option or A, no reintroduction of the grizzly bear. I have to ask, if this administration is so desperate to increase the salmon population out in Columbia, they're willing to reach dams, why introduce an apex predator whose main diet is salmon? Two, the gentleman that came before me spoke eloquently about the bees. That's something they'll go after. Another sweet treat bears like to eat right before hibernation is pears. Where is the central location of pears in this state? Dryden, Shasta, Wentworth. This will put grizzly bears in direct contact with our orchards. And once bears take a stab in the orchard, good luck getting a crew in there to work. It will never happen. Thank you for your time.

Correspondence ID: 14506Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: I am number , Stacey Storm. I'm speaking on behalf of the no action option regarding the grizzly bear recovery in the North Cascades. The grizzly bear is a predator. It does not make a distinction between deer, elk, cattle, sheep, cats, or even people. It simply sees its next meal. The DNJ experimental role focuses on education and closures as a way of mitigating the potential problems the bear may cause. The education portion advocates bear-proof storage and feeds and garbage, special fencing and so on. However, there is no mention of who bears the cost of these measures. There is no mention of liability should a bear damage private property or injure livestock, fence, or even people. There is no mention of compensation for losses. Citizens need access to our public lands for any uses including grazing and recreation. These activities remain relative to the economy in many ways. What compensation is provided before you're unable to enjoy these activities due to closures for the grizzly? The pleasure of viewing grizzlies in the wild has been mentioned as a positive, but there are healthy populations with grizzly in significant other parts of its range. One can view them there. And incidentally, there have been a number of reports of people being killed or injured by grizzlies in those areas. I strongly encourage the no action, option A, to be taken in this matter.

Correspondence ID: 14507Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, UN na
United States of America

Outside Organization: Commission of Back Country Horsemen Recreational Groups(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Other

Correspondence: The Commission of Back Country Horsemen in Washington is specifically concerned with keeping the trails and trailheads open and accessible. The proposed alternatives B and C do not provide any protection for recreation. The meaningful impact study, those management options under recreation have not been included in the EIS. Without better alternatives back country horsemen of Washington will accept only alternative A, no action. And an additional concern is mentioned of the concept of the wilderness plans in the back country and the wilderness to control the number of people in a area for recreational activities. This includes (inaudible) users and (inaudible). The EIS planners also need to realize that both the specific Northwest Trail, the National Scenic Trail, and the north end of the Pacific Crest Trail, also a national trail, cut across North Central Ecosystem area. Back Country Horsemen in Washington is concerned that the (j) rule could be used to restrict, regulate, and/or close access over a longer term if agencies perceive a threat to recovery of grizzly bears. Washington State Law RCW . . specifically states grizzly bears shall not be transplanted or introduced into a state. In addition, the following comments are my own opinion as a resident of Methow Valley. The proponents in their rush to relocate grizzly bears in the North Central Ecosystem have left the seriousness of human-bear conflicts. Washington State's population is greater than the combined populations of Idaho, Wyoming and Montana, the states where grizzly bears are currently located in the Continental U.S. This large population will lead to greater likelihood of conflict, destruction of property, maulings, and deaths of our citizens.

Correspondence ID: 14508Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: My name is [REDACTED] (phonetic) and I am strongly in favor of Option A, no action. I am a fifth generation cattle rancher, and my day to-day job is in zone , which is inside the black lines of your map. I was raised as starting as a two-year-old on the back of a pony out in the Forest Service and (inaudible) cattle, and I have continued that way of life with my own two children. We are not willing to die by the hands of a grizzly bear. Your goals have already significantly compromised my safety on a day-to-day basis. I've already trained myself to use firearms and to carry firearms, as do my and -year-old children in the event that we were to come in contact with a wolverine to save our own lives. I know for a fact that a can of bear spray is not going to save me. Neither is my -millimeter that I carry right here. It is not enough to save me from a grizzly bear. So I absolutely do not want that kind of hazard. It is very personal to me. I find you liable for my safety, for my husband's safety, for my children's safety, for my dad's safety, and a lot of the other people in this room go to work on those forests every single day. Further, I live in zone just on the edge of your line. You tried to rehabilitate a little black bear. You dumped him out in the Pasayten wilderness with a leather collar on his neck, and he was in my garage eating

dog food two weeks later. That's the reality of what you're about to do. Translocation is going to dump bears confused, scared, and lost into an ecosystem that has no food supply because you burned it all. There's nothing out there for them. They're going to be in my yard. And I consider you personally liable for that, as well as the other folks that work for the agencies in this room. You all - - and the people who are supporting it. You have to put yourself in our shoes. What are you going to eat when I go out of business?

Correspondence ID: 14509Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Hi, I'm number . My name is [REDACTED] We moved here from Alaska five years ago. I spent years in Alaskan cold, long winters. We have a little bit of experience with wolves, grizzly bears, and things like that. In I spent one year in New Boise, Wyoming, when they reintroduced the wolves there. We told them then you are not reintroducing Endangered Species in this country. You are reintroducing an Alaska wolf. There's a difference. They don't kill just to eat. They kill just for fun. This spring I went on a trip. I come home. Our six-month-old calves are chained in the pasture. We just upgraded them from the (inaudible). They're nose to nose with five wolves, five Alaskan gray wolves. This year we have more calves on (inaudible). We just had a report that there's collared wolves hanging in a pack of nine right up above us on the mountain. I should have tagged my cows. I should have named them kibbles and bits because that's what they're going to be. They're bait. Now you guys want to reintroduce grizzly bears. This country is not ready for any more grizzly bears than what already lives here. They just saw one in Colville. You tagged it. You collared it. They're here. They're already here. But they're already appearing in the capacity that this country can take. And I'm going to say this in the simplest form I can. When you start messing with mother nature like adjusting the balance of things, especially predators, you're going to lose every single time, and that's what's happening.

Correspondence ID: 14510Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America

Outside Organization: Okanogan County Sheriff County Government(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: All right. So mine is a little different from the rest of it. My job as your county sheriff as I present you (inaudible) introducing the bear for the mere fact that I wasn't here to help protect you from the wolves introduction, but I am here to help with this one. Local government has a responsibility to protect local taxpayers, to preserve the value of private property, and to promote local economies to build in general and ensure the health of welfare, economy, and socially of all of its communities. Counties in western states, mainly all I care about is Okanogan County today, that's why I'm out here for sure. That's all I care about is Okanogan County. But if you put 'em into (inaudible) County or (inaudible) County, they're coming into Okanogan County. And trust me, if they attack or go after a person, I'm not going to get into a pissing match with a U.S. Wildlife agent telling me I can't shoot the bear like they did with the last sheriff who had a problem with a wolf, and they told him they were going to arrest him. You will not arrest me in Okanogan County. I will take care of the problem. Federal land manager (inaudible), she was directly and often profoundly impacted to joining and coping with as well as civil liberties, local cultures and economics of residents living adjacent to or within these governing lands counties. Federal policies in all - - in projects also impact the danger of rights to private landowners. Those rights, for instance, in your use of control and use of the land, claims of water rights, and access to rights of ways and grazing, introducing these bears to the forest will bring ((inaudible) their herds. We can't allow that. The other side of that is I'm an avid hunter, avid horseback rider. I am - - I have friends who run (inaudible) who go into these areas of the homes. You will be impacted with your livelihood. Bringing them here will attack the livelihood 'cause this whole Okanogan County, we are probably one of the poorest counties in the state. Bringing them here to stop tourists from coming here. People aren't going to come here to go say I want to see a grizzly 'cause they'll be eaten by the grizzly if they see it. They won't be able to - - they'll shut down the areas that they go hiking that we have hiking abilities and stuff like that now so we don't have - - we cannot do that. So one thing that I know I want to say is there's a coordination process. I'm invoking coordination at this moment, if that means anything. I

don't know if the commissioners - - I know they've talked about it. There - - introduce 'em. The RCW says there will be no introduction. That's - - that's a benefit if they do decide they want to introduce 'em 'cause I'm not going to arrest them.

Correspondence ID: 14511Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Is that better? My name is [REDACTED], avid sportsman, outdoorsman, (inaudible.) you've got to take a bear test to hunt black bear so you cannot do it by grizzly. Make no mistake, guys, they're already here. This is just another run on our rights. If you love your family, if you love your cattle, if you love your country, if you love hunting, you got to vote no on it. We've made it very clear, if they weren't here, we wouldn't (inaudible). Didn't take long to say what I've got to say.

Correspondence ID: 14512Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: I am Naomi Noel. I was raised here in Okanagan County. I've lived here my entire life. My family has been here for years. There's only two things that I really want to say tonight, and that is one of my native Colville friends, she couldn't be here tonight, but she wanted me to be sure to say on behalf of her and her fellow tribal members, no, absolutely no. Absolutely not. And the other thing that I want to say is why are we here again? We were here in . Didn't you hear us? Didn't you hear us? I'm asking you. You're not going to answer, are you? You're a joke.

Correspondence ID: 14513Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: My name is [REDACTED]. I've probably spent more time in the wilderness than anybody here. I've been a wilderness ranger since . I have lived - - in fact, the last six years I have lived back here every other week in Pasayten. I spend a lot of time (inaudible) the last five years. I've done a lot back there even with the fire. But I wanted to remind you, I don't know if it's in your environmental deal, but you have the City Crest Trail and the City Northwest Trail, they cross right in the middle of your section, and I saw the increased number of people coming through. So we have hundreds now, but between the two, we'll have thousands or a thousand, I should say, and that's a huge - - interaction, a collision between deer life and the idea of recreation in the wilderness, and I just don't see how that's going to work. The other thing is the fires that have been there the last five years, I just got out of it. Part of the - - oops, I lost my voice. Because of the fires, it's also reducing (inaudible) talk about how much area square miles grizzly bear has in their range, and it's becoming smaller and smaller, so smaller and smaller range, more and more people, and the human interactions, I don't see how they can allow for that. The next thing I want to mention is they were talking about experimental population. Any time you experiment, you don't know the outcome. You can guess what the outcome is and you can think what the outcome is, but nobody knows for sure what the outcome will be. And I - - I don't know if it's worth the risk with all of the human action - - human interaction we have. So I don't have a lot to say except I know that next year is an election year. I'm not sure why - - maybe that's why this - - you're trying to get it through till next year, because and maybe this won't go through, but I'd ask you publicly to consider all of the people. I see increased use of our - - our woods and our wilderness area, and I just don't see a compatible way to do it without a lot of grizzly-human interaction. I just don't see that. Thank you very much.

Correspondence ID: 14514Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,27 2023
Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: My name is [REDACTED]. I own one of the oldest homesteads in (inaudible). I'm very blessed. I'm sure I won't be around by the time the grizzlies overrun that place, but I just wanted to point out that we've all - - we all kind of know this, but we've seen again tonight the federal government can barely run the stopwatch. I think we ought to focus on some of the projects that already have been started and mismanaged, and maybe we fix some of the problems we already have, people we worry about. Whether or not we need bears, plants and flowers (inaudible) to be safe. I have a lot I want to say, but I'll (inaudible) the rest of my time.

Correspondence ID: 14515Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,27 2023
Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: My name is [REDACTED]. I'm (inaudible). I'm a political refugee from California. Politics (inaudible). Okay. I don't know who came up with this idea or who all is backing it, but I have this question for those who have this concept and feel it needs to be implemented. Once the human death tolls are shooting up on this, and it's not if, it's when, are you ready to accept the blood on your hands? And the silence is deafening. If you're not willing to accept the responsibility for what goes down in this county from the actions that you take, you have no business taking those actions, period.

Correspondence ID: 14516Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,27 2023
Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: My number wasn't up there, but I see all of the chairs are empty. So I'm [REDACTED] and my question is, why are we here again? It's against the law. Senator Mortin when he was still in the legislature passed that piece of legislation that said there will be no grizzly bear introduction in Okanagan County. If they wander in, fine. But if not, it's against the law, period. I know there's a certain segment of the population that believes they're above the law. My message is vote 'em out. In , the county commissioners enlisted a grizzly bear expert from the state of Montana to come here and survey the Pasayten and Okanagan County. He came back and his report said the Pasayten wilderness has no food for grizzly bears, and it all runs to the valley floor. Then he further said you have , acres of tree food in Okanagan County. If you introduce the bears, that's where they're going to be, not up there, down here. And that was a survey that was done and this guy was hired to come in here and do that. We saw the same thing with the wolf. You know, they violated the very Endangered Species Act stipulates in there that if you're going to introduce a species, it has to be an indigenous species, not a -pound Mackenzie arctic wolf. But they ignored that, and what do we have? So I say I don't know how it's got to this point, but if it does go any farther, send measures back to our congressman and tell him do not fund it. And if that doesn't work, then I refer to - - when I was a county commissioner, I called up the office in (inaudible). We enlisted our native American friends to come and hunt wolves because nobody will say a word if they kill one, and it worked in -

Correspondence ID: 14517Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,27 2023
Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Hello. My name is [REDACTED] and - - So my wife and I moved to the Okanagan Valley area years ago, and so we're - - we're not as well-rated in this community as some of the people who have spoken here in this room, but we have come to actually love where we live and we live right at the boundary outside the (inaudible), right in the boundary on the map of the subpart of zone . My wife and I are pretty reasonable people, and I hear all of the folks here speaking today are reasonable people and my (inaudible) the reasons for it. I'm an outdoorsman. I spend a lot of time out in the woods and the mountains around the valley hunting and skiing and all of that. And a lot of grizzly bears. Four years ago my wife and I were here and we spoke against the introduction of grizzly bears. I'm here today again because as a reasonable person that lives in the area that you want to put grizzly bears, I would say no, thank you, we don't think it's a good idea. And I'll tell you, I don't think it's a good idea for a lot of reasons. All of these wonderful opinions that are being expressed today, I have (inaudible) lot and know a lot of it, and it's just when you look at the possible downsize where the - - the downsize just weighed - - outweighed what could happen and be bad for the people, for the bears themselves who are hungry. So I'm an attorney and so I - - I - - I (inaudible) all of the time, so I'm interested in this process. So the process is - - it says they're supposed to be listening to us. Before you make your decision on the EIS and other decisions, you aren't listening to the people who are living where you want to put the grizzly bears. I hope there is no more important public comment than you ever received in this room of people obviously, and it's overwhelmingly against bringing back grizzly bears. So I hope that you listen to that. And, by the way, all of the questions about who will be taking responsibility, on that map it says that the federal agency not be held liable for any actions taken on the basis of that map book.

Correspondence ID: 14518Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: I am [REDACTED]. I am a native of Methow Valley. I've lived there all of my life. And I am so opposed to reintroducing the grizzly bear. I don't know how your (inaudible) can just ignore people that live here, and (inaudible) - - UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You're losing battery. [REDACTED]: Okay. I just don't know how we can ignore the people that live in this area, what - - what we want. We do not want them reintroduced here. I'm just - - I just hope that your boots are - - are realistic to what the local people want. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14519Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: I'm a fruit grower in the Central Valley here in the wild west of Omak. I grow apples and pears. That issue was brought every year. I think another thing that should be considered is the effect to bring an apex predator up in the upper valleys has on potential prey moving down into the valleys to escape apex predators, and they draw the apex predator down into those areas. These forest fires we've had in recent years have really, really (inaudible) the deer population in my area and (inaudible) up here no deer (inaudible) all of the time feeding on my trees and causing damage. They're not the main problem to me. If a bear went out and chewed on my trees, but a bear may be cause for their prey down into the area to cause problems as a secondary effect. It just doesn't make any sense. The adding more things up in the higher range drive more animals down into the lower valleys and cause problems that would not be there otherwise.

Correspondence ID: 14520Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, UN na
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Okay. So I'm going to state to my understanding without really hard core study of the issue and so forth. It would seem just from a natural day-to-day standpoint when we're having more - - the predators that we do have here, like cougars, are having trouble finding - - supporting their population and they're showing up in the rural communities looking for an easy meal - - domestic cats, dogs, whatever. You kind of have to think, well, you know, if the system out there can't support more predators, you know, with the wolf thing and the - - in the Ferry County where they had, I believe, that's where they had a pack there that ended up preying on domestic cattle; that they came to the point eventually where they eliminated the entire pack. And so, at least that was my understanding from reading, you know, the newspapers and so forth. Well, and then to be honest with you, I mean, many people may not share this, but I start to feel sorry for the animals. What about, you know, those animals that they're relocating; they're living a life where they're at and now they're put into a situation where, well, if they're a good little animal and don't do anything bad we'll leave them alone. But the instant they hurt a person or something else then all of a sudden there's a posse after them. How is that fair? How is that fair to the animals? I mean, these are grand animals really - - these predators that - - on the upper end of the food chain. They - - how is it fair anywhere along - - economically, how does it make sense? What about the first hikers in the North Cascades that have a grizzly experience and it doesn't turn out well for them and who's paying for the rescue and who's paying to come in and clean up? And who's - - you know, what is going to happen to that animal? Those are things that concern me. Other than that, my own personal safety I'm not concerned with but, yeah, I'm going to leave it at that. Like I said, it's not much but it's a little.

Correspondence ID: 14521Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Okay. My name is [REDACTED] and I live in Twisp. I live on a farm bordering public land where we raise livestock. I'm an avid hiker and backpacker and I support Alternative C, active grizzly bear reintroduction alongside a (j) designation. Grizzly bears were an integral part of our ecosystem here for thousands of years until we humans hunted and trapped them to local extinction. The North Cascades is ideal grizzly bear habitat. We are fortunate to live so close to these amazing wilderness areas that comprise nearly , square miles of public lands. We have the space for bears. While grizzlies are incredibly powerful animals, there has also been so much misinformation spread about this Keystone species. Reintroduction is something to take seriously but it is totally doable here. I have family in western Montana and have seen firsthand how rural communities that are very similar to ours socially, economically, and culturally are already living, recreating, and thriving alongside grizzly bears and we can, too. Preventative coexistence tools like electric fencing, carcass composting programs, and bear-proof garbage containers have been proven to work. This time around we also have an incredible tool in the (j) designation. This will allow our local communities to have more management flexibility should any conflicts with bears arise giving us more agency in the process. Here in Washington and around the globe, we're facing a biodiversity crisis of immense proportion. Grizzly bears are an endangered species that deserve to be here in the North Cascades and we as a community have a chance to bring them back making our ecosystem more resilient for future generations by doing so.

Correspondence ID: 14522Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: My name is [REDACTED]. I live in Twisp and Dan Newhouse is my representative in Congress; and I'm deeply troubled by Mr. Newhouse's spreading of disinformation to - - to undermine this effort to reintroduce grizzlies. And I can understand differences of opinion on the issue; there are a lot of them and I have good friends that I have differences with. But to spread disinformation is egregious for a sitting congressman and there are efforts that I've heard of to rebut those disinformation campaigns by Mr. Newhouse and I would encourage everybody to seek out the rebuttal to his disinformation and read it. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14523Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: My name is [REDACTED]. I'm with the Chelan, Douglas County Farm Bureau. I am supporting Option Number One, no action. We are talking about introducing an apex predator that will be in direct contact with hikers along the Pacific Crest Trail. We're also talking about introducing an apex predator that can eat up to salmon a day. If Fish and Wildlife and Ecology are truly concerned about salmon, why are we introducing an apex predator that can wipe out that population before it's even started? Also, bears' second favorite food are pears. The direct area that they're intended to be introduced in, Dryden/Peshastin to Chelan County in the direct zone for the introduction is where these pears are. They are definitely going to go find their favorite sweet food and eat it. Once that happens, it will be impossible to ever get a crew back into that orchard again just that humans are scared. I mean, these are apex predators. They can take us out. I wouldn't want to work in a field that has had bear scat in it, either. Thank you. Please support Option A.

Correspondence ID: 14524Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, UN na
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Okay. I oppose bringing them here. I want Option A, you know. I don't want them here. I've seen them, they're already here. I tried to tell the Forest Service when I saw the first one about out by the Pasayten Wilderness before it got into the Pasayten Wilderness, and he tells me you didn't see a black bear or a grizzly bear. I said, "Yes, I saw a grizzly bear." "No," he said, "you don't think they can be a different color. Black bears can be." I said, "I've killed five black bears. I know the difference in a grizzly and a black." So they just didn't even want to hear it. I've seen another one in the state. They're here. So I completely don't want them here.

Correspondence ID: 14525Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: I have spent the - - since I was years old I've lived - - I've not lived - - I have worked and outfitted in the Pasayten/Sawtooth Wilderness range and never seen a sign of grizzly bear. The earliest - - the latest sign I have ever heard of a grizzly bear being sighted within the North Cascades was . That was years ago and was one grizzly bear for a brief moment. That is when I - - that is when I have heard of the last grizzly bear and it was up towards the Canadian border. A grizzly bear - - it's common sense, it's common sense. Grizzly bears don't want to be here. They shouldn't be here because they don't want to be. We do not have the ecosystem to support it. We don't have the land management to support grizzly bears as well. We saw in with the Diamond Point fire all those deer, and those were the deer, they got pushed down into the low ends of the valley. They got pushed down into the low ends of the valley. Are the grizzly bears going to follow them? Absolutely. The grizzly bears are going to follow the bear or the deer - - the grizzly bears are going to follow the deer into the lowlands of the valley and they're going to get pushed by fire because we don't have the land management to support a grizzly bear. We don't have the space to support a grizzly bear. Grizzly bears - - I want people to stop calling it a "reintroduction" because I want people to call it what it is, an introduction of grizzly bears. There's never been grizzly bears here. There's no - - I take that back. There's not really any proof to prove that grizzly bears have been here within the last years. Yet, they want to introduce them, they want to introduce them when they weren't here. They're going to come down to the valley. They're going to eat cows, they're going to eat garbage, and they're going to eat people. That's that.

Correspondence ID: 14526Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,27 2023
Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Go ahead? Four years ago, goats were killing people -- goats, goats were killing people in the Olympic National Forest. They took those goats by helicopter, dropped them in the Sawtooth Wilderness at Finney and Skookum Puss Mountain, which are above Surprise Lake, a very heavily visited lake. Those were all the trouble goats. So what are we going to do with grizzly bears that are causing trouble? Are they going to dump them in the North Cascades? Absolutely. We have seen it before; it will happen again, but this time it'll be with an apex predator not an herbivore. Okay. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14527Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,27 2023
Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Okay. My name is [REDACTED] from Malott, Washington, resident of Okanogan County. I do not agree with introducing grizzly bears to the North Cascades at all. They haven't been here for decades. There's no use for them here now. We don't have the wildlife to support it. I've hunted Okanogan County for over years. We've had a steep decline in the game out here. My biggest fear is human interaction with negative effects for one's wellbeing by being maimed or killed by a grizzly bear. Livestock - - with the federal government trying to reintroduce the grizzly bear, it's going to place it upon the citizens to protect their property and their loved ones and that's too big a burden that we currently don't have to deal with. We're already in the middle of mismanaged forests, over-grazing, and other challenges that government resources would be better spent on than trying to reintroduce the grizzly bears. All right. Cool. Appreciate your time.

Correspondence ID: 14528Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,27 2023
Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Yeah, I'd just like to say I've been in this Okanogan County for years and over the time just from the introduction of wolves, I've seen the game drop off dramatically. And as an avid outdoorsman in the outdoors quite a bit, I don't want to run into one of these apex critters out there and I don't see any positive output or - - how would I put that? No positive - - nothing positive about bringing them in, especially for the ranchers and the sportsmen and just the general public's safety. So I wouldn't want to run into one. That's basically all I've got to say.

Correspondence ID: 14529Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,27 2023
Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Okay. It's just about two pages. Okay. I'm against the proposal to install grizzly bears in the North Cascades or anywhere in Washington State. I believe that just because something once was historically the case, it's not - - it's not a good rationale for why it should be so in modern times. Many things have changed since the grizzlies were reported to have been here in the region. Today there are many more people living, working, and recreating here. Farming and ranching are common in Okanogan County. We have an abundance of fruit orchards here which are known attractants for bears. None of the people here have a working memory of existing with grizzlies or of the challenges that this would require. I will take my own neighborhood community as an example of what has changed in just over the past years. A century ago there was virtually no one living in our neighborhood. Today we have about residential properties, horse ranches, a state park campsite,

a hotel, a golf course, vineyards, and orchards. My neighbors enjoy being out walking, hiking, fishing, camping, and hunting in the wild and beautiful areas in which we live. We have a very healthy native black bear population and we see them frequently. This is their home and we coexist well for the most part. We do not find them to be at all an aggressive bear. A simple awareness of them and a few easy measures help to keep it that way. My concern is that grizzlies are not the same kind of bear. They are significantly larger in size at an average of pounds, which is at nationalgeographic.com. Male grizzlies have been known to achieve sizes far larger. In addition to their powerful large size, they can be very fast having been clocked at speeds up to miles an hour. That was nps.gov.yellowstone. They can be aggressive in nature. My family had the opportunity to visit Yellowstone Park in the summer of August . While we were there a -year-old boy was charged and attacked, pulled off his bike while he was riding through the park with his family by a grizzly bear. He was simply out with his family when the grizzly charged him from the brush. Nothing was done to that bear in follow-up, as it was just being a grizzly. Coexisting with these large apex predators imposes an extra measure of wariness and caution to those who live, work, and recreate near them. Grizzlies are attracted to human food, food scents, and human garbage. In the neighborhood where we stayed in west Yellowstone, the homeowners had to have very expensive large metal dumpsters just to discourage them. People are instructed to not leave any food out and to thoroughly clean barbecues after every use. They're instructed to harvest their gardens rapidly and not leave fruit on the trees. For obvious reasons, that does not work well in a community where fruit is under harvest for months at a time. In , the City of Cody, Wyoming, had to put up a permanent electric fence around its landfill due to it becoming an undesirable attraction for grizzlies. In addition, grizzlies are attracted to fruit. I guess I already said that. Let's see. Grizzlies follow food sources and will be drawn into these orchards that workers frequent. They eat other animals. Most of us have pets and many have livestock. Chickens, goats, cattle, and horses are all very common here. Some of the proposed drop sites are within miles or less of working ranches. This seems to be avoiding the science of how grizzlies behave around cattle. Unfortunately, grizzlies also do attack, kill, and have even been known to consume humans. Public safety should always trump a desire to import an omnivore that is of no real benefit to the community. It seems entirely irresponsible to bring an apex predator like that here. The argument that the most likely proposal will only include an initial restoration of to grizzlies seems shortsighted to the eventual impact here. Grizzlies have a very large territory. For an adult female grizzly, it is about square miles but for the average adult male, the home range can be up to square miles, westernwildlife.org. They will tend to follow food sources. It will not take long for a bear population once established to spread out into our communities. A further concern is that there is no clear communication as to how the population would be managed. Once it does reach its primary target of grizzlies, how will the population be held in check? If one looks to the grizzlies of the Greater Yellowstone now numbering in excess of , there is great cause for concern. The bears have spread beyond the initial target zone and conflicts with grizzlies and humans is escalating all the time. Grizzlies are spreading onto private lands. The US Fish and Wildlife Service removed the Yellowstone grizzlies once from the Endangered Species Act in . A limited amount of hunting was to be allowed in a tightly regulated fashion in order to better manage the population. But a federal judge restored protection and removed hunting as a management tool. Where does that leave citizens? The credibility of those charged and entrusted with responsible management of the situation is left to be questioned. In addition, we are not set up to inform the public of the risks. We are not Yellowstone Park with gated ticketed entries and information packets and a vast array of rangers. How will you adequately prepare for people for a bear they would not ordinarily ever expect to encounter locally? We have already had to cope with the recent installation of wolves into our communities. Many have suffered devastating losses to their livestock and at great personal distress. It has been too brief of a period to have adequately studied the long term impact of importing the wolf apex predator, and yet there is now a desire to install another large and possibly more dangerous apex predator here with the grizzly. We imagine people in more populated areas would not want a dangerous predator released into their local parks where people and animals congregate. We simply ask for the same courtesy. The citizens of north central Washington do not wish to be your Jurassic Park experiment.

Correspondence ID: 14530Project:112008Document:132104

Address: na, WA na
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Okay. The idea of bees was brought up and being very familiar with omnivores, when they're hungry that's exactly what they're going to do. They're going to make a straight beeline down to the easiest food source they can find. In the springtime, obviously bees are going to be, I mean, a priority for them. I mean, that's an easy meal, high calories; I mean, that's going to for sure happen. And then in the fall what does the - - what does the State have planned for

compensation for the orchards because a bear will do tremendous damage to an orchard. And that is by far the easiest food source. Because they're basically big dogs; they're lazy. They just want an easy food source, whether it be a trash can, a - - whatever. They're a giant raccoon, think of it as. I mean, they can be super vicious in the right circumstances, but a huge orchard with apples down and pears down on the ground and on the trees as well is going to be a magnet. And if you've ever seen what a bear does to an orchard, they don't just pick the - - I mean, they rip branches. I mean, they absolutely trash an orchard. And then the one gal pointed out good luck getting some of your out-of-town help to go in and harvest whatever crop is left in there because where they come from this terrifies the living hell out of them. So just something to consider. Thank you much.

Correspondence ID: 14531Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Unknown, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: My name's Chuck Stephens. I live midway between here and Mazama. I'm a scientist by training, but I spent much of my childhood in the Canadian Rockies, living with outfitters and guides in the backcountry. I probably had 50 to 70 encounters with grizzlies in my lifetime, was charged once by a sow and a cub on the north slope of Alaska. So I feel like I have a long history of living with grizzlies and living with people who live with grizzlies, and there's actually quite a few of them, most of Canada actually.

So I would just like to say that I strongly support the reintroduction of grizzlies into North Cascades. I don't think there's anymore fitting habitat left in the contiguous 48s than in the NCE, and I think alternative C is a good plan for carrying out the Endangered Species Act, which is actually legislated on these gentlemen over here to carry out.

And so you have to ask yourself why they keep coming back. Well, they keep coming back because they are legally obliged to. So with that said, I just want to say that, to acknowledge it, the reintroduction of grizzly bears will add a level of risk to humans, no question about it. However, compared to the other risks that we get from wildlife and many other human-made sources, it's a relatively small risk.

You face a greater risk driving home tonight from deer. You face a greater risk from cougars, if you just look at the statistics. You face a greater risk from the newly reintroduced buffalo. Just look at what happens in Yellowstone. So there are - - you've already accepted many larger risks than this, and I think if you look at the benefits of rebuilding the ecosystem to what the west once was, you'll see that this really is a unique opportunity for us. So let me just make a - - let me not make a (inaudible.)

Correspondence ID: 14532Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Methow Valley, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: So first, I'd like to thank the Park Service and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service staff for all the time they put into this process. It's been a long process and I think one that's been given a lot of thought.

I live outside Winthrop, and I am in support of bringing back grizzlies to the North Cascades with the 10-J rule. They've lived in this area for thousands of years before humans hunted and trapped them out by the 1960s, and I think it's part of our responsibility to bring them back to this good habitat.

Before living in Methow, I lived in Western Montana, and I spent a lot of time in the woods in grizzly country. And if anything, I didn't feel less safe in the back country there. I got used to carrying bear spray. I was more aware of my surroundings, and - - and I think that's a good thing if you're more aware of your surroundings in the back country.

I do notice living here, I already need to give space to wildlife. Black bears regularly come through next to my house, and if you leave attractants out for them, they'll get into trouble. Cougars I'm sure come by, I just don't see them. And grizzlies are native to the North Cascades, and I think we can make some space here for them even if it involves adjusting our habits some. With so few bears being introduced in such a huge area that they're being introduced into, I think it's quite unlikely that I'll ever see a bear here in the North Cascades in my lifetime. They're only proposing initially putting in 25 bears over a very large area, but I do hope I will see a bear some day. So thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14533Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Unknown, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: My name's [REDACTED] and I'm going to do something. Most of what I was going to say has mostly been said, but I'd like to have, by show of hands in this room, and you don't have to do this if you don't want to participate. I'd just like to have anybody that's in favor of option A raise their hand if they would please.

It looks like maybe - - I'm just guessing here about half the room. B and C raise your hands. Okay. Can the record reflect we're about 50/50 in the room? Is that a disagreement there? Are we slightly towards A? No, we're not? Okay. I saw from here it looked like 50/50

to me. Maybe it's a little stronger towards option A.

I totally agree with the rancher from Loomis, was it, or over there? He made a lot of the same points I was going to do about grizzly bear habitat. The state of Washington teaches in their hunter safety course that habitat governs whether the animals will be there, and if the habitat's right, the animals will be there.

And according to the research I did today, they say there's around five grizzly bears in this area currently. Is that right, wrong, maybe? I don't know. Anyway, that's research I did today, and it was from U.S. Fish and Wildlife website stuff.

So I'd like to know what these bears are going to eat because today what we're missing are elk, woodland caribou, moose - - there are a few moose - - six or seven runs - - big runs of salmon in the rivers, big horn sheep, mountain goats, and buffalo that were here a hundred years ago that aren't now. Thanks.

Correspondence ID: 14534Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Unknown, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Number - - I don't have my glasses - - 165. The last speaker - - and I'm going to add onto this. The last speaker brought a subject up which is - - which is important, and that is what the history that the EIS is using to justify recovery of the grizzly. In fact, the EIS is using documents that date back into the 60s.

So with using documents that are, what, 70 years old, 60, 50, 60 years old, you're not getting the current biology of what's going on in the - - in this area.

Secondly, if you look at the recovery performance

in the zones of Idaho, Wyoming, and Montana, back in 2016, the guru for the federal recovery program - - I don't remember his name. I know you folks know who he is because he - - he had been in that position for, I believe, 35 years.

Back in 2016, he said that those ecosystems have been recovered. They've been fully recovered, and they should be delisted. That was seven years ago. So we have Wyoming and Idaho and Montana all petitioning for the listing, and they've been ignored. They've been refused by the federal government.

So the bears - - Ray Campbell was absolutely correct. The bears are going to be coming down after they wake up from hibernation. They're going to be ornery, hungry. They need to put on weight. They're going to end up in the valleys, and this is going to change everybody's life here.

All you have to do is look at the injury and death rates that are on that table back there on the computer to see what you're being asked to absorb, and it's not fair. And these decisions, by the way, are not being made locally. They're being made by politicians in DC. And I'm a military vet from 52 years ago. There was a time when we were put in harm's way by politicians, but politicians should not be putting our communities in harm's way. That's all I have to say.

Correspondence ID: 14535Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Chelan, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: I'm 150. Hi. My name's [REDACTED] and I have a home in Chelan that I've had for 20 years. I've spent many days with friends and family and a lot of times by myself in the outdoors around the shores of Lake Chelan, Saheeken (phonetic) here in the Methow, up in the park, and I've seen grizzly bears several times in other states, and every one of those experiences has been awesome and memorable and safe.

I support alternative C, which is returning the bears with the 10-J rule, and I just want to make two points. The first point is there's no question public safety, human safety is of paramount importance. I think with the 10-J rule, we're going to have the protections in place that don't even exist in other areas where there's much larger bear and human populations that have been coexisting safely for decades.

So I think here with the 10-J rule we'll minimize and be able to manage with an effective toolkit of resources and procedures to minimize human and bear conflicts.

So I do think that some of the comments about, you know, bears coming into the valleys and killing people isn't warranted because if that were happening, you'd be seeing news coming out of Jackson Hole and Kalispell, and Bozeman and Sandpoint, Idaho that that's happening, and it's frankly not happening.

There are incidents in the back country. There absolutely are, and that's part of the risk of us enjoying the wilderness.

The last point that I want to make is I feel like as humans, we have this very unique power that's been bestowed upon us.

We're the only species on the planet that can eliminate or preserve all the other living creatures on the earth, and I really think it's important for us to exercise that power constructively in this case.

Human activity eliminated the bears in the North Cascades, and with human activity, we can exercise that power constructively and restore the bears to this wilderness area to make it whole again. So that's why I support alternative C.

Correspondence ID: 14536Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Unknown, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Hi. 10-J is a Trojan horse. No action, alternative A is my option. I'm speaking to the problems associated with the 10-J rule. In simple terms, the ESA allows the agency to adopt any rules and regulations they believe are necessary to provide for the conservation of a threatened species.

The ESA Section 9 regulations pertain to threatened species, and do not apply to experimental species. So the 10-J rule contains additional exemption authority that may or may not be necessary and appropriate to protect the designated experimental population.

Under the 10-J designation as nonessential experimental, the agencies are granted more freedom to impose excessive regulatory control associated with endangered species. Why are the agencies, including the 10-J rule now, while back in 2017 it was not included. One of the frequently asked questions of the draft EIS states,

"Wasn't there a previous EIS?" Yes, a previous EIS process began in 2014. Comments provided during that time contributed to the new EIS and to the development of alternatives.

As a result, alternative C would designate grizzly bears in the NCE as a 10-J nonessential experimental population. This is deceitful. While the agencies accepted the public comments from 2017, the EIS, they cleverly added 10-J. They have essentially manipulated the process and are stacking the deck toward their favor, despite the 2019 overwhelming majority of the local population that spoke out and submitted comments against the reintroduction of grizzlies into the NCE.

Furthermore, the 10-J rule is inappropriate application of the ESA and section 10-J policies. The ESA does not provide a rational basis for the introductions of grizzlies into the NCE when the conditions for recovery of the species have already been met.

Correspondence ID: 14537Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, WA N/A
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:

I am opposed to the reintroduction of grizzlies, or the introduction, whichever it happens to be.

I spoke in 2017, I think it was, in Skagit County and I said that I have two daughters in Alaska. They're in the Anchorage and Eagle River area. Every time I go on a trail, I'm scared to death. Every trail has a sign that tells you what to do if you're attacked by a grizzly or a black bear. With the grizzlies you lie down and protect your neck and try to hold still while they maul you. A park person at that meeting said it's just a matter of education. Well, I didn't agree at the time, and I agree even less now because our son-in-law was killed by a grizzly up there less than a year later. And they didn't know he was missing for about three quarters of a day. They looked for him for 20 hours. They couldn't find him anywhere.

And so finally his cousin said I just feel we need to go down this trail. They went down the trail 50 or 100 feet and, roar, up came a grizzly and attacked the two searchers. The male threw her behind him and took a branch that was still up on a tree and beat the bear in the face with it. He had to beat it off twice, and meanwhile people up on the road were screaming and the bear went away. They never found it, but they did find Michael.

They hired dogs to come look for him, and then he was buried and being used for food. He leaves my daughter and two very small children. My daughter was four months pregnant, and the little girl says, "I wish I had known my daddy."

██████ was a lifelong Alaskan.

People are killed up there when they - - another woman right in Eagle River was killed because she had two canisters of bear spray. Her company dropped her off to be a field worker in a meadow and a predatory black bear came. They - - she used up her bear spray - -
- - used up her bear spray and was killed.

Draft EIS Meeting 1 November 2, 2023 NDT Assgn # 69368 Page 31

Correspondence ID: 14538Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, WA N/A
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: ████████

Good evening. My name is ████████ and I'm number 83. I am totally against the grizzly. Now, I'll give you some information. I live down in Birdsvew on Pinelli Road between Sedro and Concrete. I got an acre and a quarter and there's a little subdivision that's on Pinelli Road.

In my yard all the time I've found bear scat, because we've got black bear around there, within five feet of my house. I get elk that come through there. I got coyotes that come through there. We have cougars there. I've got cougars that I got, you know, covers on my chairs and you can see the claw marks where they've clawed through the chairs. They scratch on the trees.

Three neighbors I got, one neighbor across the street, he has horses. A cougar got in there, attacked his horse and they - - the horse knocked down posts. He got away, the cougar left, but that might - - he had to go to a vet, he was all chewed up.

Down the other end of Pinelli, there was a neighbor just a few weeks ago that their horse was killed by a cougar in their pasture. And then down the road a little ways there was a mare that just had a little colt - - this was about a year or so ago. They were - - cougars got in there, came across 20, tried to go after the colt. The mother fought him off and was able to get the cougar to leave, but she was all scratched up.

We've got cougars and bears there. There is obvious that they're doing stuff. You ain't going to stop these grizzlies from doing it. They - - we know in our area the food population for animals in that is gone. I mean, almost depleted. And they're going to come down for your

pets. They might even attack the people. But they're - - they're going to come down. They're going to get hungry. There ain't nothing up in the Cascades enough to keep them fed. And I mean, I see this. I mean, I got - - I see - -

NICOLE SHERBERT:

Thank you, sir. Thank you, sir,
your time is up.

STEVE:

Okay. I see the path and paw prints and everything in my property.

Draft EIS Meeting 1 November 2, 2023 NDT Assgn # 69368 Page 32/33

Correspondence ID: 14539Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, WA N/A
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: [REDACTED]

Hello, my name is [REDACTED]. In the early 1970s, my dad came back from a hike in the mountains above Stehekin at the upper part of Lake Chelan. And as a young boy, I was interested in nature and wildlife, and I eagerly listened to his story.

He came back, he and his friends, and they said

they thought they saw a grizzly bear. And they weren't sure because the bear was a long ways away and they couldn't have an accurate identification.

But they - - they - - my dad and his friends had seen both black bears and grizzly bears, and they all thought it was a grizzly bear, but we'll never know if it was or not. But I have to tell you, for me, that created a great sense of I want to see a grizzly bear, and I'd like to see a grizzly bear in the North Cascades, so I've got to tell you that's in my heart.

Anyway, not too much long - - not too much time after that, in December of 1973, which is almost exactly 50 years ago, the Endangered Species Act was passed. It was signed into law by President Richard Nixon, and Nixon stated that the legislation provides the federal government with the ability to protect an irreplaceable part of our natural heritage, threatened wildlife. So we made a decision as a nation then to protect threatened wildlife.

And that has been an imperfect tool, but it's one that we've used to try and protect wildlife all across the country. And I know you love wildlife just as much or more as I do, and the question is how can we protect wildlife? How can we live with wildlife?

The grizzly bear was added to the endangered species list in 1975. And that brings us to today. The National Park Service and the Fish and Wildlife Service are leading this effort to protect an irreplaceable part of our natural heritage, and this is not easy. The discussion we're having tonight, among many others, indicates that; this is not easy. You are doing incredibly important work in a very difficult situation, and I hope we can come to some sort of resolution in which we can go forward and protect the grizzly bears of the North Cascades. So - -

Draft EIS Meeting 1 November 2, 2023 NDT Assgn # 69368 Page 34

Correspondence ID: 14540Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, WA N/A
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: [REDACTED]

85. Whoa. Hello, my name is [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

I should be elk hunting right now, but instead I'm here listening to the insane possibility of reintroduction of an apex predator, the grizzly bear.

I guess I'm kind of confused about the term "reintroduction." If we were reintroducing grizzly bears, wouldn't that mean that they aren't here or ceased to exist in Washington State? If that's the case, why is it that

when I buy a black bear tag, I have to take a bear identification class or test?

My brother just moved to Oldtown, Idaho, which is about 30 minutes north of Spokane. They currently have several sightings a week. I find it hard to believe that the bears get to the Washington border and head the other way. I don't understand why the National Park Service or Fish and Wildlife aim to play God. Obviously, they're making their - - obviously they're making their way here and if the habitat allows it, they will either thrive or die.

I'm not sure if anyone here has ever had a grizzly encounter, but I have and it's downright terrifying. They are man eaters.

When in the woods solo hunting or with my friends

and family where I know there are bears and lions, I'm usually carrying a 44 Magnum or a Smith and Wesson 500. Bear spray is for fools. And Lord willing, if I have another encounter with one here or in another state and I have the draw, if it's me or that bear, I'm going to put as many rounds as I can into that predator's head until it doesn't. If the logic is that they once roamed the North Cascades so - - if the logic is that they once roamed the North Cascades so we should do what we can to bring them back, then I'm pretty sure that before Seattle or Tacoma were once a big city, that they were - - there were coastal grizzlies that roamed those shores, so maybe we should turn a few loose there as well. Might help clean the place up a little bit.

I'm sure Grasspoint Park or Discovery Park or Point Defiance could sustain a bear or two.

Washington State Predator Management is complete garbage. We currently have a dense population of black bears, but yet we were stripped of our spring bear hunt based off of hurt feelings and liberal anti-hunting agenda.

Our lion population is through the roof. I'm not sure what the total number of sightings is, but on this map that I printed off, it's so big you can't even count them.

I think it's safe to say that locals here probably

see them all the time. I know my family does. They prowl our property line, and I know it's a matter of time before they kill one of the sheep that our family eat and raise or one of my pack llamas.

And furthermore, I think that the current predator - - I think that the current predator numbers, we should be working towards reversing initiative 655 which took place in 1966 that ban the use of hounds to pursue and track bears and mountain lions, the most effective and primitive way of managing wildlife. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14541Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, WA N/A
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: [REDACTED]:

Number 122. Good evening, my name

is [REDACTED]. I'm here with the Washington Farm Bureau this evening. I want to thank the agencies for expand - - expanding the comment periods from two meetings to four, and I appreciate all you coming out this evening.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:

Raise the microphone.

[REDACTED]:

Sorry, I'm 6'3". All right. Is that better?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:

Yes.

[REDACTED]:

All right. To keep comments short, Washington Farm Bureau is planning on submitting a written comment before the November 13th deadline, but at the end of the day we're here supporting alternative A, maintaining the current management strategy without reintroduction. Not only do property owners, ranchers and farmers

have the obligation to maintain their natural areas while tending cattle, orchards, et cetera, but they also have the obligation to maintain not just weeds and invasive weeds.

And in the ever shrinking labor pool that we have in agriculture, trying to convince an employee that they're going to be in the presence of a grizzly bear while tending cattle will continue to shrink that labor pool.

Washington is in the top five of the safest agriculture and labor states in the nation. And as agriculturalists and business owners, we understand that we are continually in obligation with the Department of Labor and Industries trying to maintain our businesses as a safe place for our employees. Introducing grizzly bears is going to greatly reduce that stat that we have and that we are very proud of as Washingtonians.

Farmers will be disproportionately impacted as they try to - - if introduction happens, as they try to invest in electric fence to maintain their employees' safety, their cattle station, and their orchard lots.

Pollinators are a great example of those that frequently encounter bears while trying to keep beehives safe through the pollination season, moving them from block to block, et cetera. Frequently, those electric fences are not working.

And there is evidence of electric bear fence in Montana. Unfortunately, those property owners are using that electric fence to try to keep their children safe in

their yards. Thank you.

Draft EIS Meeting 1 November 2, 2023 NDT Assgn # 69368 Page 38

Correspondence ID: 14542Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, WA N/A
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: [REDACTED]:

Hi, I'm 126, [REDACTED]. I

- - I, you know, I found Mr. Striker's comments interesting about Montana and Wyoming regarding interaction with bears.

The population in those two states is under two million.

The population in Washington is pushing eight million. A

lot - - a lot - - much smaller geography to plant bears in.

My - - my position, of course, is A, that we don't

introduce more predators to the state of Washington. We've

seen the - - the wolf populations grow, we've seen the - - the

deer population scatter and things of that nature. The

interaction with people, my wife's a hiker. She likes to

hike the PCT. She likes the 40 miles into Canada, so

obviously she can't carry anything but bear spray. And

quite frankly, the idea of introducing grizzly bears along

that trail, which is basically the center of the - - the

space, terrifies her.

And, you know, I've been to Alaska, I work in

Alaska. So basically what has to happen is people have to

change their habits. So to introduce bears and to have

those types of safe interactions, you have to not do what

you wanted to do.

For example, a friend of mine, I took him to

Alaska. It's the solstice. What do you do at midnight when

it's still daylight? Something you can't normally do, you

go for a hike. And so we go to the first place. We get out

of the car and there's grizzly bear tracks up and down the

river. We go back to the car, drive up to the next place.

We get out. We read this big red sign, bear kill down the

trail, don't go down the trail. We get back into the car.

Thank you.

Draft EIS Meeting 1 November 2, 2023 NDT Assgn # 69368 Page 40

Correspondence ID: 14543Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, WA N/A
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: [REDACTED]:

Hi, my name is [REDACTED] I'm a wildlife biologist and I just wanted to make three points. The documentation says that - - and the suggestion has been made that they're mostly - - mostly herbivorous. They're an omnivore. They are an apex predator. Here, the local population of deer, elk and salmon are in a decline. The population of elk we refer to where I work as the Sauk herd. Last year only had six cows in it, no bulls. And we have no record of them on camera at all this year. When we did the mountain goat flights two months ago, flying all the mountain ranges here in Darrington, we counted 21. So the population already in decline, having an apex predator introduced to it is not going to help the situation.

Number two, we have constant conversations, as I work for a tribe, about recreation and how many recreators are out there. I hiked Lake 22 this last summer, and I was passed by 706 people going up that trail because I'm slow. It's true, I am. I'm slow. And with that many people in the environment with an apex predator, which is essentially their - - the drop off range according to the map provided on page 145 in the documentation, it's 15 miles from the Sauk-Suiattle reservation.

My last point is the Point Elliott Treaty was signed in 1856 - - or 55, 1855. That predates the Endangered Species Act. So all tribal hunting rights apply. And they're rights and they're guaranteed. So introducing this apex predator becomes another huntable species that the tribes have legal rights to hunt. Thank you.

Draft EIS Meeting 1 November 2, 2023 NDT Assgn # 69368 Page 42

Correspondence ID: 14544Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, WA N/A
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: [REDACTED]:

I'm number 92. My name is [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] I live down by Squire Creek. And the last 20 years on my place alone, I've seen wolves, black bear, cougar, bobcat. Every predator we have out there has been in my area. I moved here in '99. In '99 I believe we had 12 logging companies that operated out of Darrington. The forest company shut us down and we have, what, one now. So we kind of migrated to tourism.

This is what no one has talked about. What are you guys going to do when our tourism industry gets shut down? So we know that there will be conflict with the grizzly bears, and they are "endangered". So what does that mean? That means the forest gets shut off to humans because

we cannot cohabitate with the grizzly bears, and they take the priority. You shut the forests down, we might as well just roll up the streets here and move to Seattle. So my question is, if this happens, what are you going to do to sustain Darrington? And this is - - this is the discussion that has to happen because this is where we'll end up going down the road if these grizzly bears are let loose into the - - into the "the federal land", which means like we've had evidence talked about, they will not stay on the federal land. They will go where the food is. And the food is down in the valleys, down where the people live. So that's - - that's my two cents.

Draft EIS Meeting 1 November 2, 2023 NDT Assgn # 69368 Page 43

Correspondence ID: 14545Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, WA N/A
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: [REDACTED]

My name is [REDACTED] (phonetic). My number is 106. I'm 100 percent opposed to this. Most of you individuals know me or have met me at the shop, and I speak for myself and myself alone.

But to give you a little backstory, I actually used to work for a (indiscernible) tribe, and I worked on their salmon restoration work. I can tell you that there was a lot of our money and taxpayers money that went into that, and it was a great thing. However, I can tell you firsthand that if this takes place, you can kiss any of your fishing goodbye.

Now, let's talk about the mountains. You turn around and you do this and you put these grizzly bears up there, not only are you going to push all the black bear, ones that are already there and up in the mountains, you're going to push them down to here.

You turn around and do that, we're going to be losing our animals. You're going to have trash everywhere for a place that's beautiful, and it is going to be 100 percent detrimental across the board. I am not good at speaking publicly and I apologize for that, but I can tell you that this is 100 percent without a doubt the worst thing they could possibly do. If this takes place, we all will regret it. There will be deaths.

Most of us here, we were born and raised in the woods, and we know it. You turn around and with all the public that we get from down below that don't have a clue between a cougar and a pet cat, I'm telling you, they're going to try to go up and pet one of these grizzly bears and you're going to find out the hard way. Nine times out of 10

you kick a black bear in the butt, it'll run away. You do that with a grizzly, they're going to kill you every time. So I'm telling you right now, we cannot let this happen, folks, because if they do this, we're going to have deaths on our hands. And this little town is going to hurt because it's going to hurt the logging as well because they're going to - - anywhere they find a grizzly, they're going to shut it off. We will not be able to log anymore either. So thank you very much and I'm done.

Draft EIS Meeting 1 November 2, 2023 NDT Assgn # 69368 Page 44

Correspondence ID: 14546Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Twisp, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: I'm a little bit on the fence on both sides, just so everybody knows. My name's [REDACTED] I'm a resident of Twisp.

Also, I'll just echo what everybody has said, but the one thing I'd like to say to you guys, I think your modeling is wrong. Your bear management unit, you're including high-populated areas like this, and those are problem bears which means that'd be a negative number, not a 02 number.

So I kind of feel like you need to go back to the drawing board on your modeling and look at that again because those bears would be an issue and shot, not a number of 200 that (inaudible.) The lawsuits for the other states that they've been having issues with, that's a problem as well. I think you need to muster up and then have a path forward so that way when it comes time to delisting, you're not twice the number of the estimated population.

And we're apparently having issues with the mule deer populations here locally, if you'd gone to the last meeting that was held. So bringing in a species that would potentially have an impact on that local population, which they're going to be in there feeding in the springtime, and they're dropping a bomb on us. So that'd be a bigger impact on them. That's all I have. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14547Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, WA N/A
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: [REDACTED]

So 135, [REDACTED] I - - I live and I was working in west Yellowstone for a little bit. When I was there, there was actually quite a few people that got mauled by grizzlies. And then when I left, right on the edge of town when my brother was still there, this lady got mauled by a grizzly too and died.

They're going to come into town. It's inevitable; it's going to happen. And right here in the - - this booklet that you can find online, it even states relocations are less effective and lead to higher mortality rates than, you know, this will bring these animals in. We're also going to - - we're going to get them killed.

So we're going to waste time, effort, money, put ourselves in dangers. Because I know if I see a grizzly

bear and I'm out in the wild, I'm going to shoot it too. So that was just a waste right there of effort and time and money and our tax dollars.

And as the - - as our gun laws get worse here in Washington, in certain areas, you're not allowed to shoot a firearm in the forest. And if you do to protect your life and your children and your family, because that grizzly bear is coming after you, how are you going to be prosecuted? Are you going to have to pay a fine and get imprisoned because you're not even supposed to have a firearm in that area? So how are we going to, you know, what are we going to do? So and then also, what has already been mentioned of the - - of the decline and, you know, the deer and elk population and the salmon population and everything. And - - and so, I don't know, people have ideas and are not really thinking about the greater - - well, they are thinking about the consequences. They're not really thinking about how it's going to affect the people in the town, people's lives. I don't know. All right. I'm done.

Draft EIS Meeting 1 November 2, 2023 NDT Assgn # 69368 Page 47

Correspondence ID: 14548Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, WA N/A
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: [REDACTED]

139. Hey, everyone, my name is [REDACTED] and I grew up going out to my grandparent's dairy farm out in Chimacum. And I spent my youth kind of falling in love with the natural world, which later inspired me to go back to college and become an environmental scientist, restoration ecologist.

And I think I look at the world and the state that we're in, and it just - - it's really sad to me that our ecosystems aren't functioning as fully and as robust as they could be. I'm a recreationist. I do mountaineering, I do whitewater rafting, I've paddled the Sauk River, and I have livestock. I do have horses. I ride in the back country. And there is a certain amount of risk that I'm willing to take when I'm out there. I know that I can have a slip and a catastrophic fall when I'm climbing a peak like Glacier Peak. I know that I can have one of my animals fall off a steep - - a steep slope. And that that's a risk I'm willing to take because I feel the most human and the most connected with everyone out here when I'm out in the natural world.

And bears are just part of that natural ecosystem and I think that if we can't recognize that bears can - - by protecting and bringing back bears, we can protect so many other parts of the ecosystem. And I know that's not a

popular voice in this room, but I just implore upon everyone that there are risks that we're going to take, and I think to have a fully functioning ecosystem is going to be worth it in the future. So thanks, everyone.

Draft EIS Meeting 1 November 2, 2023 NDT Assgn # 69368 Page 48

Correspondence ID: 14549Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, WA N/A
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: [REDACTED]

Hi, my name is [REDACTED] and I own a couple hundred acres. I also own cattle and pigs. And I kind of back on the - - the wilderness that's between Granite Falls and Oso, you know, there's like, I don't know how many hundreds of square miles. So I have stuff that come out of the woods all the time. I have experience with predators. I've shot my fair share of predators. I've also deterred predators.

But the point I want to make here is in the early '90s I got tired of my job, and I quit. And I do what you do when you quit your job, I went to Africa. And I spent three months guiding a raft on the Zambezi River on the border of Zambia and Zimbabwe. And one night we were pulling up to the side and the people came out and they said, no, no, you can't do that. And I asked why, and they said, well, we lost our donkey. And I said what do you mean you lost donkey? Well, a crocodile came out of the river and grabbed the donkey and pulled it in. And then he says, and my brother was holding onto the donkey, and he went to. And I said, your brother was eaten by a crocodile here? And he says, yeah, last night.

And it was a fundamental change for me, a fundamental difference because that made it clear that our response would be to kill that crocodile. We can't allow that crocodile to, you know, kill somebody right there. And this man was blaming his brother because, I don't know, he didn't like his brother or something, who knows.

But the point is we've proven over and over again that we can destroy every single animal that we don't like. We can get rid of every instance of it. We can make sure that they can't live every place where they used to live. And we are making a choice to tolerate grizzlies, or I'd like - - I'd like us to make the choice to tolerate grizzlies because they won't get a chance to come back if we don't. We've killed too many. That's it.

Draft EIS Meeting 1 November 2, 2023 NDT Assgn # 69368 Page 49

Correspondence ID: 14550Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, WA N/A
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,02 2023
Correspondence Type: Transcript
Correspondence: [REDACTED]:

132. I like to call them out.

Thanks for that. Hey, everybody, my name is [REDACTED].

I'm a hiker, birder, lifelong enjoyer of America's public lands and wildlife. First off, I just want to thank the agencies for being here and taking public comment. I really encourage folks who have questions about this to talk to the agencies. They're experts. They know what they're doing. They've been thinking about this.

Their proposal, the 10J rule, is actually very important. They've described it as alphabet soup, but basically what it means is that any grizzly bears they bring in would not be managed as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act. They changed the management to a non-essential experimental population. That means there's a map.

It has three different places on the map. Federal lands, that's where they want to see grizzly bears. Non-federal lands, that's like Darrington, and that's where they want to not see grizzly bears. And there are built-in tools into the management plan to move bears out of where they don't want to see them. So if you see bears where they're not supposed to be, they're saying they want to move those bears to where they belong.

I want to talk a little bit about Yellowstone. Since 1979 there have been 118 million visitors to Yellowstone National Park. We talked a lot about how many people live there, not a lot of people but a lot of visitors to Yellowstone, especially compared to the North Cascades. During that time, 44 people were injured by grizzly bears in the park. For all visitors combined, the chance of being injured by grizzly is one injury for every 2.7 million visits. So injuries do happen.

It's the outdoors, like previous speakers have said. They have to be taken seriously. They're terrible events, but most of those injuries are not caused by bears. I'm in support of alternative C. That's the alternative that includes the 10J rule that's the change in management. That rule is important in part because the Canadians may restore bears on their own. And if we don't have a management plan to deal with those bears if they do come in, we'll be in big trouble. So support alternative C. Thanks.

Address: Unknown, WA Unknown
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,27 2023
Correspondence Type: Transcript
Correspondence: Thank you very much for holding this meeting and giving the public an opportunity to provide comment. I appreciate it.

I'm here to voice my support for alternative C, restoration of the grizzly bears with the 10-J rule. My family is from Montana where the Rocky Mountain grizzly bears have been living for quite some time, and I live in Mazama. My home is surrounded by U.S. Forest Service land and is just 13 miles from the North Cascades National Park. I've lived in the heart of the grizzly bear recovery zone that's being discussed. I believe it's possible to introduce grizzly bears with little impact on the local population and our economy. Communities in the Rocky Mountains have been living alongside the grizzlies for decades, using nonlethal methods and tools to prevent conflicts between people and bears. In Yellowstone at Glacier National Parks, grizzly bears are actively managed to avoid negative interactions with people. Front country and back country tourism is thriving. Our North Cascades stage is set for one of the biggest conservation success stories in the region, if not the country. Restoring the iconic grizzly bear to the Pacific Northwest would be a tremendous step forward for indigenous cultures, our region's conservation ethic, and for the ecology of our wildlands. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14552Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, WA N/A
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,02 2023
Correspondence Type: Transcript
Correspondence: 87 SPEAKER:
I'm too short. My number is 87, and
I'm listening to all of you here talk about restoring the grizzly or not restoring the grizzly. They're not extinct. At this - - at - - on this date, they're 60,000 grizzly - - wild grizzlies in this country, in North America. And out of that, 30,000 of them live in Alaska and 29,000 of them live in Canada. Those are two of the largest reserve areas where they have more wildlife to be able to roam free there. That leaves 1,000 - - 1,000 grizzlies for the rest. Everybody's talking about Yellowstone and so many thousands of people coming through Yellowstone. Well, they only have maybe 30 or 40, maybe even 50 residents living there. I used to live outside of west Yellowstone - - I mean, east Yellowstone in Cody, Wyoming. We've had wrestlers mauled by grizzlies. We had campers that are pulled from their camps. A woman was pulled - - she was sleeping outside of her tent. She was pulled from her tent by a grizzly and killed. So there is grizzlies here, but they should not be here in the North Cascade. If anybody thinks that they can outrun a grizzly, think again. They can run 35 miles an hour. If you think you can outswim a grizzly, think again. They can swim six miles an hour. The fastest human in - - in the world can only swim three miles an hour. So - - and a Grizzly has a psi of 1,000 - - 1,000 pounds with its jaws. It can rip the head off of a human and eat them within a matter of seconds. So if you - - and it's - - and I'm not talking about what else they can do.

They can - - they can kill animals. They can destroy your fence.

Just today a lady posted that her - - she (inaudible) a grizzly ripping down her shed in her backyard.

After he got it ripped down, he laid down and he was there laying down. That was now his property. If you go out there to try to get him, he weighs about 800 pounds. Let's see somebody take him away. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14553Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Twisp, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Number 161. My name's [REDACTED] I'm a resident of Twisp. Just to kind of reemphasize a lot of the statements I've heard already, and I agree with. I want to just make another point.

The habitat is a huge impact, is a huge aspect of this whole discussion. There's a lot of information about past history, how many bears, thousands of years of existence. We don't live in that world anymore. That world does not exist anymore. We've changed it.

There was a large population of mountain caribou in the North Cascades. The east slope of the Cascades was the western boundary of bison. There were big horn sheep with large populations. There were elk. A lot of these bears that are going to be reintroduced from outside areas have that habitat. They have elk, big horn sheep, moose in large populations. That doesn't exist here.

There's been no work to expand those populations before the bear introduction. That's kind of the cart before the horse. You need that habitat. You need that arrangement to sustain that population.

There's three possibilities for these bears. One, they're going to leave because bears have been here occasionally already, and they left. Two, they're going to starve to death. They're going to run out of food. They're not going to put on the fat they need, and you're going to find them in their dens, dead. Three, they're going to eat domestic animals in your backyard. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14554Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, WA N/A
United States of America

Outside Organization: Snohomish Tribe Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Number 094, Shawn Yanity, former chair of Snohomish tribe here. I know I said I wouldn't do a public comment, but I'm going to be an idiot and give it here and take my words back. So for - - for this project, I guess, some points for the comment are the management plan needs to - - to have some room in it so that way there is objectives in it like they had in the wolf plan where once the numbers got high enough, they can be hunted.

How are we going to prevent politics from playing into that like they did with the wolves to change it so that way all the people that think, oh, we're going to save the environment by putting all these animals back in. We can give all kinds of examples of Wyoming, Alaska - - I lived in Alaska. I love it.

The difference up there is we seen a grizzly bear, we shot it. We had tags for it. You can hunt them. And all my buddies up there, same thing, they go out to the cabin,

they see a grizzly bear, they shoot it. You don't even have to eat it. If you take it in the springtime, you don't have to eat the meat.

So I think the comparisons - - and if it's being used in our studies by the feds and organizations working with them, you're comparing Alaska, Wyoming, and look how it works there, it can work in Washington. We don't have the habitat. We have a society that is not adjusted to it. We have animals that are already being troubled. You heard it, our mountain goat. I've been involved with the mountain goat relocation with the tribes in the state to help relocation.

We're doing bear studies. There in the north side of Oso, five square miles. We had 500 hair samples and over 100 of those were different bear. And the state's looking at shutting down bear. Five square miles, we have over 100 bears showing up in an area. And so that's the big concern for the tribe is the feds say, oh, it's going to happen. Time's up.

██████████:

And - - but the state takes over management of the wildlife. Now you got politics, you've got all these other things that's going to interfere with other things. And we have - - and you guys have a treaty reserved right to protect our treaty rights: salmon, elk, deer, all the things that sustain our culture. Now, I just want to emphasize that, that these guys will have an impact, just like black bears do and other predators, to our treaty right.

Draft EIS Meeting 1 November 2, 2023 NDT Assgn # 69368 Page 54

Correspondence ID: 14555Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, WA N/A
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: ██████████

Good evening. My name is ██████████ (indiscernible), and I represent our family. We're not the first settlers in this area. Obviously, the Indian tribes have that. But I think we were - - my wife's family was one of the first white settlers in this area in 1890. We still have part of the homestead. And I speak for my extended family. I spoke to them on the phone over the last few days.

And so we're - - we're basically 100 percent against - - we're into option A, and we're 100 percent against - - I call it forest reintroduction. You know, I - - I have no problem with the bears if they work their way down here, not preventing - - preventing them, but they haven't

gone down here so far. We have property over in Okanogan. My son does cruising. He's out in the woods all the time by himself, here and over in Okanogan, way up in the mountains and stuff.

I would ask one question. It's sort of an ethical one. Whoever - - the government hasn't considered this. It's not in any of the reports. Who is liable when I passionately, for our family's sake, we don't need grizzlies. Okay? Some - - eats my son or my dog and I'm going, hey, who's liable? You know, the government is going to say, well, that's just part of nature. You know, you should - - you know, whatever. But when somebody forces something on you that you are not for, you think, hey, if something happens to that, who's liable?

Also, I'm going to - - I've been to many public debate - - I'm kind of a debater. I've been to many public issues. But I want you to question in your report this idea that experts in this and that where they know what they're talking about. Well, I'm an expert in several areas, not in this one. And I'm telling you that everybody that will speak, and every government person will - - has an agenda. And you need to ask yourself, you know, what - - what is - - your going to believe or whatever, because we all have agendas. And if anybody ever says risk-less or 100 percent something, I always question that. Because nothing is 100 percent, nothing is risk-less. If you want to see grizzly bears, go to Alaska.

Draft EIS Meeting 1 November 2, 2023 NDT Assgn # 69368 Page 56

Correspondence ID: 14556Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, WA N/A
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: 97 SPEAKER:

I'm just going to hold this thing. I think everybody in here has a lot of emotional stuff at stake. They're invested in it emotionally on one side or the other. For myself, I would like to see things be the way they were 200 years ago. I would like to see old growth forest here. I'd like to see streams teeming with salmon. I'd like to see the forest full of deer and elk. I'd like to see the habitat that was once here.

Unfortunately, though, that's not reality. So if I try to put something in here that's not supported by habitat, the habitat no longer exists. I'm creating conflict. I'm creating failure. I'm creating emotional issues with other peoples that have economic - - local economics are extinct, their livelihoods are extinct. I'm creating conflict with peoples that like to recreate. I'm

creating conflict with peoples that want to go into the woods and gather berries.

Now, we can see by this little dialog here from everybody that's testified that this doesn't make sense. A plus B equals C, and it really doesn't matter how you feel about it. Everybody here knows it doesn't make sense. So when you see a situation being promoted, being pushed over and over and over again that doesn't make sense, again, you have to ask yourself, what - - what's the agenda here? What actually are we trying to achieve?

We can't restore it. The old growth is gone, folks. The rivers teeming with salmon are gone, folks. The population that is here now, multiple times bigger than what it was when they were grizzly in this area. It's an emotional thing. I would like to see that. I would like to also believe in Santa Claus, but it's not reality.

Draft EIS Meeting 1 November 2, 2023 NDT Assgn # 69368 Page 57

Correspondence ID: 14557Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, WA N/A
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023

Correspondence Type:Transcript

Correspondence: Good thing I'm a shortstop.

I don't - - I don't know where to start unpacking this. I - - first of all, let me just say I support alternative C. My name is Gerald. I support alternative C because of the 10J rule and - - and how it encourages social acceptance of an animal like grizzly bears.

It - - it gives managers a lot of flexibility to deal with the issues that folks in here are concerned about.

But the death and destruction isn't borne out by the data.

I understand people's concerns. I think fears are real.

Nobody here is saying, certainly not me, that there will be no conflicts with grizzly bears.

But let me just give you a couple of examples. And

I apologize for using the Yellowstone example again, but it's - - it's a good one because we have a lot of data from - - from the ecosystem and from the park.

So the 2021 4.9 million visitors contributing \$534 million and roughly 8,700 local jobs in Yellowstone National Park, a place with almost 1,100 grizzly bears. Numbers we'll never see in this part of the world.

This isn't Yellowstone, I'll admit it. But in part, people go to that park because of the wildlife, because of the bears, because of the wolves, and they hike and they fish and they camp. Yellowstone ecosystem is the same size as the North Cascades Park, as the North Cascades Ecosystem, a little less than 10,000 square miles. We have

the big brains. We can coexist with these animals, it's been proven in so many places. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14558Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, WA N/A
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: 113 SPEAKER:

113. This plan totally disregards the safety and wellbeing of our state's most vulnerable population. What you're asking many of the counties lowest income residents to do is not feasible and not realistic. Eighty percent of the Marblemount population earns \$31,000 annually, which is barely above the poverty line. And the average cost of an electric fence around a one acre property ranges between one and \$4,000. We've consistently been told to install electric fences as the best option to protect our property, livestock, and children. Yet there is no funding or assistance marked to aid the gateway communities in bear awareness. You are signing these up - - these bears up for a death sentence as soon as the salmon start running. Being fully realistic, you all are lying to yourselves if you think the locals aren't going to kill a grizzly that comes onto their property. Furthermore, you're delusional if you think a local is going to report a wayward grizzly, much less one that's been taken. We all know no one is coming all the way up river to deal with it. I've read the entire plan and the impact statement as well as attending last night's meeting in Newhelam. As a Marblemount local, I felt it is my duty to do my due diligence on this matter before I formed an opinion. Last night I heard the conservation groups support reintroduction and tried to maintain an open mind while hearing from those who do not live in the gateway communities and never have. Again, there's a certain element of reality that's missing. As someone who lives in Marblemount because I spend so much time in the backcountry, I think it's rich to brush aside the concerns of the locals as so many of those groups blatantly did. And while it's really cute that the Audubon Society and Sierra Club feel the need to comment on this, I urge the National Park Service and Fish and Wildlife Service to be realistic. In conclusion, the amount of outreach and support to the gateway communities is abysmally lacking and I urge you to factor in supporting some of our state's most vulnerable population members and their safety. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14559Project:112008Document:132104
Address: N/A, WA N/A
United States of America
Outside Organization: Washington State Government State Government(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,02 2023
Correspondence Type:Transcript

Correspondence: [REDACTED]

Good evening. I'm Senator [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] I'm here tonight with my - - one of my seatmates, representative [REDACTED] and thanks for all your testimony. I want to read from an RCW. The RCW says grizzly bears shall not be transplanted or introduced into the state. Only grizzly bears that are native to Washington state may be utilized by the department for management programs. So how are they getting around that? Well, they're saying it's federal land. I think that is disingenuous and disrespectful to our state. And I think it's our Fish and Wildlife's responsibility to not support this also because they are directed in here to follow our laws.

One of the members up here said politicians have an agenda. We do. We have an agenda, and that is to represent our constituents. And the number one thing in that duty is to keep you safe. My mother lives up on a hill above Hamilton all by herself in the woods off grid. I would not feel safe if there were grizzlies coming down. Now, we've all seen Jurassic Park, right? They don't stay where you put them. Not even when you fence them in or fence them out.

So another gentleman said follow the money. You're right. Follow the money. We can't affect that here in Washington state. But this has been stopped before, twice. The last time it was stopped, it was by representative Congressman Dan Newhouse. Dan Newhouse isn't new even from this congressional district, but he knew enough to take away the funding. Write your congressman or congress women and do not let them fund this program, and it will go away.

Thank you.

Draft EIS Meeting 1 November 2, 2023 NDT Assgn # 69368 Page 63

Correspondence ID: 14560Project:112008Document:132104
Address: N/A, WA N/A
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,02 2023
Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: [REDACTED]:

All right. Well, I'll follow that. So I am [REDACTED]. I am a full-time resident of Marblemount. We just moved here four years ago with our children. We have seven children. Okay? Last year, I was eight months pregnant coming home from a doctor's appointment and there was a black bear rummaging around my

entire yard.

My husband and our other children came out banging pots to get the bear away from the car so I could come in my house. Bringing grizzlies into the area where we don't have a balanced predator prey population is not going to make our ecosystem better or more balanced; it's going to throw it out of balance even more.

If we had a balanced prey, grizzlies could be here and we could still be here and be safe. We're not - - bringing a more aggressive bear into our community when we can't handle the black bears we already have is not going to make the situation better. You can't balance something by putting more weight on the already overweighted side.

Correspondence ID: 14561Project:112008Document:132104

Address: n/a, WA n/a
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence| [REDACTED]

My name is [REDACTED] (indiscernible).

We moved into the area in 1991. We've been in the state since '86. We've raised our family here. We've seen predators on our acreage, including losing pets to them. I also teach young people wilderness travel and take them into the Cascades several times a month year round. I've seen all the wildlife.

And I've read the impact statements and read the introductory materials anyway, and I don't see any compelling reason why we should introduce an apex predator into an area that's now a relatively high human population and hasn't had them for over a century. Why are they spending a lot of our taxpayer money to bring predators into an area where they haven't been for over a century?

I can assure you there's nothing living in the Cascades that remembers there were grizzly bears here at one time. I have no problem with the first option, alternative A, to protect the few we have. The other thing that strikes me that biologists seem to mess up - - by the way, my sister is a biologist who worked for the federal government on land management, so I know how they operate.

But bears, like a lot of predators, are territorial. You introduce foreign bears into the tiny population of indigenous grizzly bears, it seems to me they're not going to integrate nicely and get along and say Kumbaya. They're probably going to fight.

There's a high risk, it seems to me, that you would decimate the tiny population of native bears by introducing foreign bears into the ecosystem here. And I can't see why grizzly bears have to be in the ecosystem when

we have lots of black bears. What is it that grizzly bears provide that black bears don't, which aren't particularly dangerous?

Draft EIS Meeting 1 November 2, 2023 NDT Assgn # 69368 Page 66

Correspondence ID: 14562Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, WA N/A
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:

Hi, I came here tonight, I support A. I wasn't going to speak, but when I heard all the people talking about Yellowstone, how many thousands of people go through Yellowstone and what the injuries are, I've been to Yellowstone. And very few of those people even get out of their cars or they walk the streets that everybody is on. They aren't out in the backcountry. It would be really interesting to know how many people are injured by grizzlies that go out in the backcountry. But - - so that's something to think about. Thank you.

Draft EIS Meeting 1 November 2, 2023 NDT Assgn # 69368 Page 67

Correspondence ID: 14563Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, WA N/A
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: [REDACTED]:

Hi. Thanks for the chance to speak and thank you to the agencies for hosting this meeting. My name is [REDACTED]. I'm going to be here supporting alternative C with the 10J rule. And I spend a lot of time in the backcountry in the North Cascades. I live in Whatcom County. Days and weeks sometimes by myself far into the back country. And I love seeing wildlife out there. It's some of my most meaningful experiences that I've had in this place that I know we all care about. And just this summer, not in the North Cascades, but in another ecosystem, I spent maybe 10 minutes watching a wild grizzly bear and it was incredible, majestic, inspiring. And so what - - I want to make two points. The first one is that I think what we're not talking about right now are some of these positive experiences that we could be missing out on if we don't - - if we allow the species to disappear from this area. And I hope for my family and future generations that they have the opportunity to experience that joy. And then the second point I want to make is that

anyone supporting the idea of recovering grizzly bears in this region would have, as a highest priority, safety of people who live here. It's absolutely critical to the success of something like this. And I might - - that might not be a popular opinion here, but it is my opinion. I think that's why the 10J rule is so important. If you look at it, it has matrices of what actions will be taken if certain things happen. And so many of the like dreadful things people are talking about here would be things that would be the highest priorities to prevent. So I encourage you to take a look at that rule and what it says and the ways that it would be in place to protect you and that you could use it if you felt threatened by something like this. So thank you for hearing my opinion and I hope you have a wonderful night.

Draft EIS Meeting 1 November 2, 2023 NDT Assgn # 69368 Page 68

Correspondence ID: 14564Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, WA N/A
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: [REDACTED]

Hi, I'm [REDACTED] and I grew up in Skagit and Snohomish County. I recreate out in the woods every week with my wife and kids and family. And I've - - I've done that - - I've recreated my whole life locally. And I very much appreciate that I'm able to do that without the risk of being attacked by a grizzly bear.

I think it would be really an unfortunate thing if my kids had to grow up with the risk of going out in the woods and being attacked by a grizzly. I know a lot of people here have - - that are for it have very good intentions. But just the reality, I don't think, you know, that doesn't do a lot of good if - - if you're one of the unlucky ones that gets attacked, so.

One other point I want to make is I see a lot - - I read a lot of articles that kind of - - news articles that make it sound like the grizzlies disappearing from our forests are a relatively recent thing. I'm 49 years old, and I'm sure there's people here a lot older than me, but - - that can attest to this. But I've never seen a grizzly in the woods and I don't think they went extinct - - extinct in my lifetime locally.

My dad's a retired land surveyor and worked for the timber companies, and we discussed this issue of the grizzly bears. He studied many US geological survey - - surveyor field notes as part of his work and he said - - he mentions that he's never seen mention of land surveyors seeing grizzly bears locally on any of the - - on any of the field notes that he's studied.

So I don't know, you know, when - - when grizzlies went extinct locally. But I don't - - if this was such a great habitat, I think they would - - they would be coming back. So that's all I got.

Draft EIS Meeting 1 November 2, 2023 NDT Assgn # 69368 Page 69

Correspondence ID: 14565Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, WA N/A
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:

It's a lot smaller crowd

now. I know everybody here. I get what you're saying on the grizzly bear act. I am actually not against the grizzly bear act. What I'm against is what our state has done for our fish, for elk and deer, and the fact that we are retracting with more punishment every year from that.

I would love to see grizzly bears here one day.

The problem is we don't have the sustainability. One day we will maybe, but until we can resolve our fishing issues we have here, the elk herds that are going down every year, and every year, soon enough, we're going to be drawing for elk tags because of our populations dropping. We can't resolve that with our current issues.

We go out in the mountains every day. I go hiking with my family and I go hunting. I see elk, I see mountain lions, I'm aware of all those things. We can adapt to those things. But the grizzly bear is not going to survive here, not until we can sustain our habitat. And the fact that we are talking about this right now is ridiculous. Until we talk about the herd problems that we have right now and our animal situation we already have with predators, I'm not willing to do this until that is a result. Thank you.

Draft EIS Meeting 1 November 2, 2023 NDT Assgn # 69368 Page 70

Correspondence ID: 14566Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Okanogan County, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: County Government

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Okay, 159. And (inaudible) County Commissioner for this district. So the county commissioners are formally opposed to re-introduction of the grizzly into the North Cascades. Everybody can go online and see - - get a - - see our letter that we've sent.

On a personal note, we are not a state that manages by common sense. We're a state that manages through litigation. So just recently the Department of Fish and Wildlife - - State Department of Fish and Wildlife, the commissioners were presented a scientific data that said that their spring grizzly bear, or sorry, spring black bear season should continue. Commissioners have decided not to take into account that scientific data and - - and did away with the spring bear season.

So obviously, management by best field of science is not something that we're very good at. The 10-J - - there is a 10-J rule

on wolves in Washington State. It is east of Highway 97, so it splits Okanogan County, right down the middle. That 10-J rule has tools in the toolbox that we can use, that the state can use to actually manage wolves, and is litigated constantly on the actions that the Department of Fish and Wildlife takes in order to use those tools.

I got 30 seconds. So - - so personally, you know, I'm opposed to this because we do not manage on a basis of common sense or best available science. We manage based on the most money thrown at litigation to make sure that their point is heard the loudest and that their position is taken. So that's it. Thanks.

Correspondence ID: 14567Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Carlton, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: 178. My name's [REDACTED] live in Carlton. Like some other people, I was really conflicted on whether I had anything to say tonight. I'm still conflicted about even really what my authentic opinion is on this. So you might wonder why in the heck I'm up here, but I think this is a great - - great discussion to have in our community.

I have no objection per se to grizzly bears on the landscape, but I do at this moment in time think that I favor option A for a number of reasons. One is just my understanding of the human race. I think we - - we're a very active species. We're really good at messing things up. We're not very good at stepping back and - - and letting things take care of themselves. And this is I think a situation where we can benefit from that.

Financially, this is going to be an expensive proposition, and there's a heck of a lot of things to spend money on locally, nationally, globally, and there's only so much to go around.

My preference would be to invest in the species, the habitat that are existing here. There's a lot of wildlife concerns that - - that exist, a lot of species that need our assistance. And we should double down on what's here before branching out into new realms.

The timing of this I do question as well. We're so divided in our country, and do we need to pick every battle on every front at every moment? I feel like not. I feel like these are times for a pause. And that would be my preference in this - - in this situation. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14568Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, WA N/A
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:

I think I'm the last one. I

grabbed a ticket out there and then I lost the thing before I could get up here and speak. I opened up and listened to everybody's comments. And I just wanted to say in my opening I forgot to mention that in the first contact, our tribe up here had over 8,000 people.

And I've told this to the gentleman sitting over there at previous meetings we've been at, now we number just over 300 and that we are more endangered than that grizzly you're trying to save. And I focus that towards the people that want to save that grizzly, is that we are going extinct and these bears might help us go extinct if they run into a group of us going over to Stehekin or something on our annual trip we do.

So I just wanted to say that. I forgot to say that in the opening. And I guess I'm closing.

So thank you everybody, appreciate the support.

Hopefully we can come to a good conclusion. I would guess that we support option A in the paperwork I handed you, it says, you know, to take no action, is what we stated in that. So that's all I have to say, and thank you.

Draft EIS Meeting 1 November 2, 2023 NDT Assgn # 69368 Page 72

Correspondence ID: 14569Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, WA N/A
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023

Correspondence Type:Transcript

Correspondence: UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:

Okay. So I would - - first

I think it's section A, propose supporting that where they continue with the management as it is, without introduction.

And my additional concern, besides other comments people are making, is that as a forest service wilderness worker, I am afraid it's an unfunded mandate where the actual agencies that work managing the wilderness, managing the recreation areas will not have the money and resources to respond to all the extra needs that would come from having introduction of grizzly bears.

Okay. That's it. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14570Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, WA N/A
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Okay. So I live about one minute drive south of the reservation land, about five minutes north of town. I live on a property that has bees, rabbits, poultry of all kinds, waterfowl of all kinds, cats, dogs, and three children under the age of eight.

We have already had black and grizzly bears on the property this year. We have already had a cougar on the property this year. My neighbor lost a dog to a cougar. My other neighbor lost several cats. He feels like he's just feeding cats to the birds and cougars at this point, but...

I know that with all the comments that have been made tonight about the sustainability of the food sources in the valley, the wild food sources, the salmon, the berries, the elk, the deer, there is not enough to go around for the grizzlies if they're introduced. There are already native bears, black and brown, here. And they are already down in the valley where humans are because there's not enough food for them from natural sources already.

And I don't have enough money to contain eight acres against bears and I - - I certainly - - I don't have the mental bandwidth to spend every waking moment worried about

what predator is around the corner trying to - - to harm my livelihood or - - or endanger the lives of my nieces who - - who live there.

I - - I just - - I can't see how anyone responsible and with a shred of common sense could look at the numbers of - - of predators that we have and the numbers of prey items that we have, which I know we have the ability to survey from the air, and - - and think that it would be a good idea to add to those predator numbers.

And I just worry about the people in my life and the people around me who I don't even know having human on bear interactions, because it never works well for the human. And a lot of times it doesn't work well for the bear either. And I - - it feels like because of how willing the people here are to shoot those bears and how, I would say unavoidable the interactions will be, it will be just like feeding bears into a chipper shredder.

We're just relocating them from somewhere where they were living happily to a place where they will die because they won't have an option but to interact with humans to find food. And those humans have no compunction about killing them. That's the end of my comment. Thank you.

Draft EIS Meeting 2 November 2, 2023 NDT Assgn # 69368 Page 3

Draft EIS Meeting 2 November 2, 2023 NDT Assgn # 69368 Page 4

Correspondence ID: 14571Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, WA N/A
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: [REDACTED]

All right. My name is [REDACTED]

some questions I had for the entities who are trying to push this. I'm just wondering what benefit adding grizzly bears is going to be to our ecosystem. It's been - - we've been struggling with the commission right now to get our spring black bear hunting back. We've had issues with lion hunting as well. People are constantly trying to take that from us. So I'm concerned with introducing grizzlies, we're not going to have opportunities to maintain them and they're just kind of kind of get out of hand and, you know, what's going to happen if we do have grizzlies in areas that they shouldn't be? Relocating them hasn't been proven to work. And we're also concerned about our logging here in this city. It would be detrimental to our town especially. That's about it.

Draft EIS Meeting 2 November 2, 2023 NDT Assgn # 69368 Page 5

Correspondence ID: 14572Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, WA N/A
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:

So I am a proponent of alternative C. I believe the 10J rule will be a very effective tool for the forest service and the National Park Service to effectively manage bears and track and maintain their habitat where they're released into the upper ranges of the North Cascades, which is a very remote location. I think there's plenty of evidence from other areas in the grizzly recovery plan over the last 30 years, particularly in the Yellowstone region and the Glacier Park region, that people can live safely and coexist safely with bears. And we've also seen statistically boosts both in the number of visitors to those parks with the presence of grizzly bears, and I would include Grand Teton National Park as well.

So the Teton, Yellowstone, Glacier Park regions have all been in the top 10 of national park visitors consistently, and there's a very positive beneficial economic effect to the neighboring communities with the presence of bears.

But the most important thing is from a safety perspective, even with all those visitors and the growing population of bears, it has been safe for humans to recreate, to have ranches and farms, and to enjoy the back country even in those regions even with the presence of grizzly bears. So I support alternative C. You're pretty amazing if you can catch all that.

Draft EIS Meeting 2 November 2, 2023 NDT Assgn # 69368 Page 6

Correspondence ID: 14573Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, WA N/A
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:

I have lots of grandkids and kids and friends that hike in the mountains and I'm worried about their safety if the grizzly bears are introduced. And like many people said, they don't stay where they're supposed to, you know, they go where the food is easy.

And I have a son-in-law that works for the park service, and he goes up to stay Stehekin and fixes the water up there. And he won't be able to take a gun or anything with him because he has to go into Canada to get there. So

I'm - - I'm for A. I don't want grizzly bears to come in.

He can't take a gun to Stehekin and I don't know
if he can even take a gun in the - - in a park truck or not.
But he will have no way to protect himself from grizzly
bears up there. That's it.

Correspondence ID: 14574Project:112008Document:132104

Address: n/a, WA n/a
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,02 2023

Correspondence Type:Transcript

Correspondence: So I think it is very - -
it's very sad that three quarters of the recovery area is
administered by the forest service and no one from the
forest service is here to listen to comments tonight.
There are some huge issues involved with how we
actually manage if the bears are brought in with food
storage, with potential trail closures and the - - I don't
think that the EIS does a very good job of looking at the -
- all of the broad activities that occur on the - - on the
forest. It's very park centric and there's far more use
that occurs in the national forest wilderness area
surrounding and the national forest as a whole than there is
in the park.

One example I have is for - - we're trying to do
some things with food storage involving camping here, food
storage here, cooking over here. And as soon as we start
doing that, you're basically establishing a developed site
back in the wilderness someplace where people are going to
camp. They're going to cook here and they're going to store
their food over here.

And when that happens, all of the sudden the
agency becomes responsible for managing hazard trees. And
there's hundreds and hundreds - - there's thousands of
campsites in the recovery area compared to in the park where
they tend to be isolated in certain - - certain spots. And I
think that that's a huge issue and the staffing to implement
any of this is - - is negligible.

So in closing, I support alternative A with 10J
attached to it. So I would like to see the agencies
actually work with the Canadians. And if the Canadians can
get bears, which I understand they're working on, to get
south of Highway 3 in Canada to be established north of the
border, and they happen to start wandering in, I'm
absolutely fine with that. So that's the alternative I
would propose is alternative A with 10J attached to it when
bears eventually migrate south, as I think they will.

Correspondence ID: 14575Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Unknown, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: ██████████ Market Business
Received: Nov,27 2023
Correspondence Type: Transcript
Correspondence: ██████████ (phonetic) on behalf of ██████████ where all the deer and all the wildlife is and the apples, okay.

No action. We have the alternatives down here. As a former county commissioner, we see a lot of failure going on with studies. For example, remember we had lots of stuff to (inaudible.) We lost some firefighters because of the Endangered Species Act on faith. I've got memories there.

I have an orchard. And you know what? There are bear in it. Do I get reimbursed anything, the tearing of the trees down and that? No. I know of a bear orchard down in the valley. They have black bear right now in it. Well, they've had black bear in it, five of them plus the other ones. They're not reimbursed.

We are a - - Okanogan County is a farming, rural community. And in the testimony you can tell which side we're on because the farmers are opposed. In fact, we all determined it. I want to give you three Fs.

First of all, fire. Fire changes a habitat. At one time when I snowmobiled from Carlson to Brewster, there was berry brush that high. Everything is gone. Those bears will come into my orchard.

Second F is frost or freeze. When I've seen it 60 below, I've seen a lot of our habitat go by the wayside. I've seen it 60 below here. And we go onto the other alternatives. When I was commissioner, that's all I heard. "██████████ if you vote for that, do you know what the policy is?" I know what the policy is. Okay. The policy is the three Ss, shoot, shovel, and shut up (audio disruption.) But one other thing I did want to say is I resent the cameras along our trails and our forests. I get a (inaudible) following me.

Correspondence ID: 14576Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Unknown, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: That's a hard act to follow. So my name is ██████████ This is the fifth time that I'm speaking on this issue, three while I served as the state senator for the 12th legislative district representing this area, and twice since I've been retired.

I support Alternative A because probably it just seems like no matter how many times we speak to this issue, it just doesn't go away. We have increased population now. We are much bigger in Washington State than Idaho, than Wyoming and Montana. I am fourth generation from Lake Chelan. My grandfather came in 1899. He loaded the wood - - the original wood in the lake. He didn't talk about grizzly bears. He talked about rattlesnakes and black bears. We have black bears.

Has the study done on if these grizzlies come in, how are they going to interact in the same habitat with the black bears? I just think a lot more work has to be done. My dad was a member of the Lake Chelan Sportsman's Group. They worked long and hard to get a fishery on Lake Chelan. If there are bear in the Skowhegan area, where are they going to go? They're going to go to the river, and they're going to eat the kokanee.

This doesn't make sense, but I'm trying to figure out because sometimes I feel like no matter what, the agencies are going to do what they want. So will there be another chance at the end when a final decision is made? Could they not have as many as they're talking about? Maybe try five? There must be an alternative where we can come together and stop this because it's been going on too long.

Correspondence ID: 14577Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Unknown, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: National Parks Conservation Association Conservation/Preservation

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Excuse me. Hello, Winthrop. My name's ██████████ and I'm here to support the grizzly bear restoration alternative C, on behalf of the National Park's Conservation Association and it's 1.6 million members and supporters.

NPCA is a nonprofit organization. We advocate for America's national parks, our park service by tagging the places to be

maintained in an absolutely unimpaired form for the use of future generations, as well as those in our time.

After attending all four meetings on North Cascade's Grizzly Restoration, I've heard a common refrain. We've lost so much wildlife in this area and lost so much habitat, we can't restore it. We shouldn't even bother trying. It's gone, according to some.

I hear this message, and I feel the sadness behind it. I know that we're facing many environmental challenges, but despite these challenges, I believe nature, like our bodies, wants to heal, and we can let it heal. We must not give up on nature, its wildlife, or the beings that cannot have a voice in this process. Our fate is inextricably linked to theirs.

We're seeing species like wolverine bounce back. The fish in the lakes are being successfully reintroduced. And I believe that if we take the right steps, "Free the Snake River," we can see salmon rebound too. If there was no habitat here, there wouldn't be black bears here. Grizzly bears and black bears eat a lot of the same things.

So at the end of the day, we have a choice, to share the land with the grizzly or not. We can take it for ourselves, for our needs, for our convenience, and that's a choice we can make. We can also choose to make room for the grizzly.

Americans had the forethought to protect thousands of square miles of habitat. Wilderness in contrast with those areas where man and his works dominate the landscape is recognized as an area where the earth and its community of life are untrampled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain.

It is in this place and for this place that the grizzly bear must be allowed to roam. Its presence attribute to our continued commitment to allow nature, natural systems, and wildlife to have a place to fully exist and thrive.

Correspondence ID: 14578Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Unknown, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Washington Sierra Club Conservation/Preservation(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Hi, everybody. I'm [REDACTED] I'm a resident of both Whatcom and Chelan Counties. I'm co-chair of the Washington Sierra Club Wildlife Committee. I grew up in Eastern Washington, in a hunting family. I spent summers in a primitive cabin about 20 miles out of Chelan with a two-seater outhouse and outside running water. I know what it's like to be out in nature.

I regularly hike on both sides of the North Cascades and fully support grizzly restoration in the North Cascades ecosystem. Both the National Sierra Club of 3.7 million members and supporters and the Washington chapter this year with over 100,000 members and supporters, support grizzly restoration.

With over 9,800 square miles, the North Cascade's ecosystem is larger than Glacier National Park, Yellowstone National Park, and Mammoth National Park combined, all areas where grizzlies coexist. Grizzlies will be started from small numbers each year. They'll repopulate slowly, and will be in very remote areas. Although I hike regularly, I'll probably never be fortunate enough to see one.

Contrary to fears, grizzlies don't prefer livestock. They mostly commonly prefer fleshy roots, fruits, berries, grasses, and herbs, and sometimes rodents, fish, and ungulates. As a psychologist, I understand the element of fear and the unknown.

However, the risk of a grizzly bear attack on a human is infinitely smaller than other risks we encounter daily.

The risk of a grizzly attack in one's lifetime is 2.1 million to one. The risk of dying due to guns, 1 in 89. The risk of dying from a motor vehicle crash, 1 in 93. The risk of dying from a dog attack, 1 in 53,483.

To prepare for grizzly restoration though, we need to prepare now. This summer the North Cascades National Park had significant problems with food and garbage that served as bear attractants. Artist Point in Whatcom County and other national North Cascades rescue programs have overflowing - - we're done? I saw the yellow. I didn't know. So I really support that we take bear safe practices seriously, and the Forrest Service and the National Parks need to do that. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14579Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Unknown, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Defenders of Wildlife Conservation/Preservation(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Hi, everyone. My name is [REDACTED] (phonetic.) I live down in Puget Sound. They didn't have one of these meetings in my community, so I hope you don't mind me coming here to speak.

This is my first time in Winthrop and in North Cascades National Park, and it was breathtaking, the drive up here. I've lived in Washington for three years, but before that, I lived down, and actually from Philadelphia. And the most interesting piece of wildlife you can see in Philadelphia is a pigeon or an (inaudible) depending on, you know, the circumstances.

I work for Defenders of Wildlife. We're a nonprofit that focuses exclusively on restoring endangered species, and I thought about all the scientific points, process points I could bring up here, but the truth is we all make our decisions based on emotions.

So I'm here to tell you there is - - that I would like my descendants, my future generations to be able to see the wilderness that you have here and how precious it is. You know it's precious. You live here. You've seen it every day. Grizzly bears are the last missing mammal from this landscape. And I hear someone back there ask, you know, what is - - is the cost of a grizzly bear versus a human life?

Well, there were thousands of them, and we hunted them down to extinction. I don't think anyone should die, but I spend my life, and my colleagues spend their life driving around this state working with people like you to talk about electric fencing, securing attractants, ways that we can coexist with these bears. So I just ask that you consider it, and we're in support of alternative C. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14580Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Unknown, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: North Cascades Conservation Council Conservation/Preservation(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Hi. My name's [REDACTED] and I'm 164. I

represent the North Cascade's Conservation Council. I live down the street here.

As all of us here, I'd imagine, would know the wild west is no place for wimps. And I believe we have the strength and the wisdom to live with grizzly bears. Now, what this plan to reintroduce grizzlies is doing, it's admitting a mistake that our forebearers made. And that mistake was that if you find some species of wildlife inconvenient, you just kill it off.

We're amending that mistake by reintroducing the bears, and that's why I support alternative B. I don't support C. I support B. my organization supports B because we don't want the option of making that same mistake again where we just kill everything that's an inconvenience to us.

Now, a word about litigation. I have great respect for esteemed commissioner who I bought a lot of lumber from. But litigation, folks, is not something that anybody enjoys doing. It's a very expensive, time-consuming process. But litigation is what gives us as Americans the right to challenge our federal government. We're a nation of laws, and we have the right to enforce those laws. Nobody likes to live in (inaudible.)

I want to make a couple of comments about livestock conflicts. Just as a point of - - a point of reference from EIS, that is that I believe that the preferred alternative at least needs to have a provision where if livestock are killed by a bear in an open range situation, that's not open to lethal means. If it's killed on a private land and it contained livestock operation, that would be fine in my opinion.

I have a lot of respect for ranchers. They're good, honest, hardworking people, but we need to learn to live with wildlife again, all of it. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14581Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Unknown, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: : My name's [REDACTED] (phonetic.) I've worked for the Forest Service for about 30 years here in

Winthrop. First time - - I used to do geographical information work. The first time I knew that grizzly bears were anywhere near our community was in 2015 when they started coming across many parts of Canada, the first official time I've heard that they come into the community. And that is less than 50 miles from downtown Winthrop.

With the introduction of grizzly bears, as the population increases, what's going to happen is our recreational areas are going to change because we're going to have to put electric fences around the campgrounds to prevent the grizzly bears going in there.

My experience with that is a camp in Alberta. We were camping there. Those are things they have to do. All the households in downtown can or have to have bearproof garbage cans so that the bears will not have nuisance - - or not be a nuisance coming and taking your trash and stuff, which would mean more - - more interaction with people. California and Oregon both have eliminated the reintroduction of grizzly bears because of human safety, animals, and range-type animals. So why are we doing this again? Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14582Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Winthrop, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Hi. My name is [REDACTED] I live about five miles out of town, here in Winthrop. And I just thought I'd mention - - something we encountered a couple of years ago is there was a brown bear getting into our garbage in our neighborhood, and I can't imagine what that would be like if it were a grizzly doing that. I never saw them, but I saw the effects and got to pick up all the garbage, but that's a small issue. I have some facts here that I thought I'd mention. So these are facts.

Grizzly bears will not remain in the park. Another fact, the EIS fails to address the consequences resulting from grizzly to human conflicts, human deaths and injuries. Another fact, in similar recovery zones, the majority of grizzly to human conflicts, deaths, and injuries occur on private lands.

Another fact, the previous director of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services stated before congress that the grizzly is biologically recovered. Another fact, empty bear spray - - bear spray cannisters have been found next to the dead bodies of those killed by grizzlies. Another fact, neither the federal government or the WDFW have an exit plan to withdraw the insertion of grizzly bears into our communities, once the action is executed.

And another fact, this is from the National Park Service. Written policy states the safety and the health of employees, contractors, volunteers, and the public are core service values. Above all, keep in mind that the safeguarding of human life must not be compromised. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14583Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Unknown, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Thank you. I spoke over in the Omak area. I'm for A, but I wanted to make sure that everyone knew I - - I misspoke on one of the acts, the Coordination Act. That's mainly for BLM, but there is acts for that say there has to be coordination between all the different government agencies, so there are multiple things.

That coordination means they get to, or have to come to us, i.e., the state, the local government, the commissioners, and everybody has - - we get to see all of the data that they have there. Will we get it all? Probably not, but it's a federal thing. And besides that, the other side of that is it was brought to my attention, I made a threat which was not a threat. We have an RCW that says there will be no grizzlies introduced into the state of Washington. That's the RCW. That falls under our RCW. If there's a grizzly that's introduced into the Okanogan County, that's the one thing I said last time also, my only concern is Okanogan County, because I am your sheriff, and I will protect everybody, whether they come in or come out and they're allowed to. My number one job is to protect all persons and the wildlife. If they're allowed to come in, we don't shoot them unless, you know, something's going on. But I'm telling you the other side of that is, if they're introduced, the RCW has not been changed. Federal government doesn't go to litigation on it. As the commissioner said, everything's litigation, because the - - I can't remember the word, but that's all right.

The federal government could overstate, override the state on certain laws, but that's only constitutional laws. Animals do not fall under the constitution. Maybe with the Endangered Species Act or something like that. That might be another way of entering into that.

But what - - what I will say is if there's a bear threatening a human, I will shoot that bear. Okay. I do not care. I will go forward. I will fight that fight within federal court. You are my number one reason to be here.

Correspondence ID: 14584Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Unknown, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: [REDACTED] (phonetic) I'm 189. I'm in opposition to the bears. I've lived here only 32 years. I haven't seen any bears, but I'm an avid hunter, fisherman. And I can obviously see that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife and the local State Fish and Wildlife has not managed the existing data we have, as we have a dying mule deer population, pretty much no elk, very few moose, goats, any other species here. So why would I believe that they're going to manage the grizzly bears? I would say no.

I was just recently in Alaska on a moose hunt with a guy that actually - - a guy that's for grizzly bears. He carried a 454 on his chest at all times. This is the guy that's with bears that's shot all the time. He knows whether they would get him or not, and he carries a 454 with him at all times. If we're all prepared to do that, bring them on in, and I guess we can protect ourselves. Otherwise, the food they will be eating will be the hikers, the bikers, and the skiers. So if you guys want to become the food, that's fine. But I'm in opposition to bringing them in.

Correspondence ID: 14585Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Methow Valley, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Hi. My name is [REDACTED]. My family has been in Methow since the late 60s. We - - we are still here. I have an alfalfa field. It is full of mule deer. So anyway, getting to the grizzlies. I know where they're going to come to drink. It's my property because there's a creek there. I know where they're going to come to eat, at my apples, at my field, and where I am successfully providing habitat for mule deer.

Right here I have a list of 12 people who have been attacked by grizzlies since July 2023. I wonder why this hasn't come up tonight and how that plans to be addressed. I as a woman am not in the habit of having a high-powered rifle on me when I go and do my gardening, tend my apple trees, or feed my chickens. I am not in the habit of carrying a high-power rifle with me to go check my mailbox which is right beside the creek where they will find water. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14586Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98504
United States of America

Outside Organization: State of Washington State Government(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,13 2023

Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: Re: Comment in favor of Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan - North Cascades Ecosystem, Washington

Dear Superintendent Striker:

I am writing to express my support for the federal restoration of grizzly bears (*ursus arctos horribilis*) to Washington state. Grizzlies are native to Washington state and should be returned to their original station in nature, where they would help to restore balance to our state's natural heritage and ecosystem.

The North Cascades ecosystem is a prime habitat for grizzly bears. This region provides excellent habitat for grizzly recovery, as do the various wilderness areas in the North Cascades Grizzly Bear Recovery Zone. Despite this fact, the last confirmed grizzly sighting in the North Cascades was in

1996. In Washington state, grizzlies are identified as a "species of greatest conservation need" in our State Wildlife Action Plan.

According to the federal alternatives for action on reintroduction, grizzlies would be reintroduced slowly over a period of years. This is a reasonable method for proceeding with reintroduction, one that would give Washingtonians time to acclimate to the presence of the species. Alternative C would allow flexibility and be less restrictive for management - benefiting people, property and bears. This alternative demonstrates that the agencies have heard and are responsive to local concerns.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan for the North Cascades Ecosystem.

Correspondence ID: 14587Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Twisp, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Hi. My name is [REDACTED] (phonetic.) I live in Twisp. A number of things that are on my list, I have heard already, and so I'll just skip to the ones I haven't.

One, I can't be in favor of B or C because I don't find the EIS at all compelling. It's pretty skinny on context. It doesn't mention, for example, there are 60,000 grizzly bears in North America, about half of them in Canada and half of them in Alaska.

The numbers that we're talking about are much smaller than that. The other thing that I find very odd, I've been involved as a retired scientist and before I retired in several EISs. This doesn't do the scenario of looking at the affects that the introduction will have on other populations. It mentions who - - who a grizzly sometimes eat. But who are they going to eat here with the prey that are available now is a question that doesn't appear in the EIS, and the answers certainly don't. The third point I want to make is that there are extensive studies of what happened with the grizzly bear not quite introduction but rejuvenation of the population. They were down to 136 bears in Yellowstone. They're now at 1,000 which is roughly the carrying capacity. And they've had very different relationships with the food chain than the famous wolf story, and none of that's in there.

There are publications on this that are in highly reputable journals, but it's not mentioned in the EIS. They've been useful for drawing conclusions or at least suggesting what'll happen when you put grizzlies here. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14588Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Unknown, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: This is a real rotten time for both of my hearing aids to go dead, so I guess I'm going to be up here talking and not listening anyway.

So if you guys remember, about something like 12 years ago, we had the same - - same kind of issue with wolves. They had meetings about whether we wanted them or not, and at the time I had wolves killing my livestock, and I turned it into two federal biologists. Both of them said that that was bologna, and one of them even told me that he would put that in his file with his bigfoot sightings.

Well, as most of you know, we went to court because we started shooting the wolves for killing our livestock, and of course we lost because you can't shoot them. I paid tens and tens of thousands of dollars in fines and penalties, felonies, and the only solution I came up with is to feed them.

I can legally feed them, and now I don't lose these livestock. And I'm feeding these wolves regularly, and I have not lost any cattle. The cattle come right through where I'm feeding them, and it's working. And I can do it all by my own self with no help from anybody. The only way I can raise livestock is I have to feed the wolves.

Now, what I'm saying is you guys are enjoying these wolf packs thanks to me. There's one in particular that I'm feeding because - - because if I wasn't feeding them, they'd be eating your cows and your chickens and your dogs. What I'd hate to

see happen is the grizzly bear situation get in the same boat, that we have to start feeding them because there's nothing for them to eat. When it gets to that point, I think we went too far.
So anyway, thanks for letting me speak. I'll keep feeding them wolves so I can keep raising cows.

Correspondence ID: 14589Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Twisp, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Hi, everyone. My name's [REDACTED], and I live in Twisp. I live on a farm bordering public land, where we raise livestock. I'm an avid hiker and backpacker, and I support alternative C, active grizzly bear reintroduction alongside the 10-J rule.

As has been mentioned, grizzly bears were an integral part of our ecosystem here for thousands of years until settlers hunted, trapped, and poisoned them to local extinction. North Cascades is ideal grizzly bear habitat.

There's been a lot of talk tonight about diet, and I think there's been some misinformation. In frontier, grizzly bears - - so actually 80 percent of their diet is plants, insects, roots, tubers. Across the world grizzly bears have been shown to eat 124 different species of plants, and the North Cascade ecosystem is home to 100 of those species, which is pretty cool.

I personally have family in Western Montana and have been - - and have seen firsthand how rural communities that are very similar to ours ecologically, socioeconomically, and culturally are already living, recreating, and thriving alongside grizzly bears.

We know that preventative coexistence measures like electric fencing, Perkus (phonetic) composting programs, and bearproof garbage containers have been proven to work with grizzlies. I ask the agency staff to take into consideration the funding and resources needed to implement these preventative measures in our communities and plan for those accordingly. I also support the 10-J rule that will allow our communities and local agencies more management flexibility should any conflicts with bears arise. Tonight it feels like there's been some different information said about the 10-J rule, and it feels like a missed opportunity to give accurate information. And so I hope the agencies will - -will make an effort to come back and give our communities more accurate information on the 10-J.

Here in Washington and around the globe we're facing a biodiversity crisis of immense proportion. We're losing species left and right. Grizzly bears are an endangered keystone species that belong in the North Cascades, and we as a community have a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to bring them back, making our ecosystem more (inaudible) for future generations by doing so. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14590Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Unknown, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: 172. Hi. My name is [REDACTED] and first I'd like to start by - - by thanking the National Park Service and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for the opportunity to comment this evening on the reintroduction of grizzly bears to the North Cascades ecosystem.

I support the reintroduction plan. Grizzly bears have been in the north part of the North Cascade's ecosystem for thousands of years. They play an important role in the health of the environment and enhance the richness of the North Cascades.

As an avid outdoors person, I spend a lot of time in the wild. I think the probability that I may ever encounter a grizzly in the North Cascades is pretty minimum. It's my understanding that the reintroduction plan is to release three to seven bears annually over 5 to 10 years.

The goal is to establish an initial population of 25 bears, with a total population target of 200 bears. It may take 100 years to reach that total population target of 200 bears. That seems like a pretty conservative reintroduction plan to me.

I also think though that the reintroduction plan needs a parallel plan to go with it for all bears, a plan that emphasizes safe bear practices. We need to work with communities to enhance bear safety. That's for black bears and for grizzly bears.

There are examples of communities that have successfully implemented bear safe practices. We could replicate these

successful programs here in Washington. A simple example is trash storage and collection, a major bear attractant. I have a home in rural Chelan County, and in the summers, bears get into peoples' trash. There are bearproof receptacles available. We need to make sure that they're available for use and actually used. It's tragic that bears are currently being killed because we basically bait them with our trash, and then eliminate them simply because we cannot or will not dispose of our waste. I'd like to close my comment just to say that I'm in favor of the reintroduction plan. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14591Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Methow Valley, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: My name is [REDACTED] (phonetic) and I'd like to reiterate what you just said. I was in Okanogan on Friday or Monday evening, and I want to apologize to the Park Service folks, the Fish and Wildlife folks, for that gathering. I've lived in this county since 1979, ran a business here for 30 years. I know the people of this county. I know them well. And what you saw on Friday night in Okanogan does not represent this county. People of this county are better than what you saw on Friday night. And the difference between this meeting and that meeting, I'm proud to say that I live in the Methow Valley, and we can put on such a respectful evening as this. Now let's get to the bears. I support option C, which employs the 10-J designation. I've studied that quite a lot. I've looked at it thoroughly, and it looks to me like the park service has done a really good job of reaching out to the farmers, ranchers, people who oppose reintroduction. And this option C seems to be their sincere effort to employ all points of view in their - - in their planning. And I would urge everybody who hasn't delved into the 10-J rule and to option C which is their preferred alternative, and I can see why, to do so, read it thoroughly and then make your conclusions.

Correspondence ID: 14592Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Unknown, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Hi. I'm 187, [REDACTED] (phonetic) geologist and backpacker. I worked in Alaska seven years at the U.S. Bureau of Mines, and they provided 44 magnum revolvers, and the Fish and Wildlife agency provided two days of training. They said, "Always carry your gun because grizzlies are dangerous." In (inaudible) I came down to Okanogan Valley. He shot 10 times, but the grizzly kept coming back closer and closer. After three miles and down to his last bullet, we rescued him in the helicopter. Will the Park Service change the state law to allow us to buy gun magazines greater than 10 rounds now? A grizzly charged four friends in Okanogan ground from half a mile away. Three rounds didn't slow him down. All four of them fired their guns when it was 25 yards away, and it finally ran away. Glacier National Park requires all hikers to carry bear spray. Bearproof cans are required for backpacking the 350-mile section of the Pacific Crest Town in the California Sierra. Will these be required in Washington now? My comment for the EIS last fall stated it needs to include all the bear attacks throughout history. A few examples; June 2016, a grizzly killed Brad Treat, Forest Service, law enforcement employee, while sitting outside Glacier National Park. July 2021, a grizzly killed Leah Lokan in her tent, in a Montana town, next to the post office. July 2021 in Island Park, Idaho, a grizzly mauls Tom Whitney jogging, and a mountain biker avoids injury being chased by a grizzly. There's no mention of all these attacks in the current EIS. My comments were ignored. Why? Don't you care about people getting mauled and killed? Apparently not. To all of government officials who want grizzlies, it appears that you're possibly approving a grizzly killing and mauling your children, parent, and friends, and someone else's children because in the EIS it states, "Negative interactions between humans and grizzly bears, while rare, do occur." Alternative B would result in adverse impacts on public safety. Under alternative C like alternative B, members of the public would retain the ability to take the grizzly into (inaudible.) There are numerous areas in other states people can go experience grizzlies in their native habitat. I just gave you some areas.

We don't keep them in our backyard. In my lifetime - - I am 71. I've talked to thousands of hikers, number one, to camp where bears are around, and none of them want to hike with heavier packs and bearproof cans, bear sprays, and guns.

Correspondence ID: 14593Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Unknown, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: I'm 185. I'm not - - I'm probably not going to say anything new to anyone here. You guys have heard most of it. But I have a question of how does this really help.

I've heard a lot of people talk tonight about protecting grizzlies and the reintroduction and what it will do to - - to numbers. And then we hear about deaths and attacks, and but something we haven't heard, and this is what I did a lot of research back in 2019 when this came up then.

And when bears are overpopulated in an area, whether it's for food or otherwise, they will - - they travel. They can get hit by cars, and they can get hit by trucks, and they go into areas they're usually not supposed to be in. And individuals will try to protect themselves, their families, or their stock. And that's not happening right now. So how does it help?

I've heard several people mention about the North Cascades doesn't have a fence. Well, it doesn't, and neither does Canada. Grizzly bears travel from Canada. They stay. Then they leave. They're not staying in the area because the area can't sustain them. And to drop animals that are going to starve to death or travel and get hurt or killed or hurt someone else, I don't see how that's a valuable way of spending our tax dollars. And thank you very much.

Correspondence ID: 14594Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Unknown, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: ██████████ (phonetic.) I am number 184. So I have a couple of technical things here I'd like to mention. First of all, the Secretary of the Interior, Bernhardt, terminated the EIS process for grizzly bears restoration. ESA section 4(b)(2) notes that the secretary may designate or make revisions of critical habitat based on scientific and economic and other considerations. And two, that the present Secretary of the Interior should have provided such time to make an economic justification for starting a new process. I have not seen it in the plan.

The nonessential 10-J designation indicates that grizzly bears with introduction into the NC - - well, sorry. The nonessential 10-J designation indicates that grizzly bears entering into the NCE conserves the species, but it is nonessential to its continued existence.

So classically the EIS is admitting that the grizzly bears are neither threatened nor endangered in a significant part of its range. So why wouldn't the option be to delist the bear and not introduce it?

The 10-J manage option still means that collateral damage must still be experienced before any option can be initiated, so it's not necessarily an improvement over the ESA. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14595Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Unknown, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: My name is ██████████. I've lived here for 47 years. I've never seen a grizzly, and I don't want to. So I flew for the Forest Service for about 20 years as a charter pilot. And one of the things I did was follow bears with collars. And I can guarantee you that there's no fence between Manning Park and upper Okanogan County. Yet there are bears, grizzly bears, three miles north of the border.

If you're a biologist and you said [REDACTED], can you show me a grizzly bear? I'd say, yeah, just a second. So we'd fly up there, go past the border, three miles, and there was a nice area there. It's kind of generally sloping south. In the - - kind of the midspring, you might see three or four grizzlies in that area.

Now, there's no fence keeping them up there. And so they could come down here, but they don't. So why are we trying to introduce them? It doesn't make a lick of sense.

And then there's the idea of money. I pay taxes just like all of you guys do. I would much rather see my tax money go for something productive, rather than wasting it on a bear study that's already been done, and it seems that the departments don't really understand what the word no means.

Correspondence ID: 14596Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wenatchee, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Good evening. My name is [REDACTED] I live in Wenatchee. I was a cherry orchardist there. My family and I had a cherry orchard on Stemilt Hill, which is outside of Wenatchee. And this has been a very long process. I've been following this for many years, as many of you have, and I wish it weren't such a long process. I wish we could just get this over one way or the other. But the decision was made to bring bears back into the North Cascades actually in 1991, which is 32 years ago.

So to the agencies, you've been at it for a long time. I - - I think you probably want to get this done too. But in that period of time, 32 years, we've learned a lot about grizzly bears in the North Cascades. We've learned - -there have been numerous studies done that indicate that the North Cascades is big enough, is wild enough, there's enough food for grizzly bears there, a viable population of grizzly bears.

One of the previous speakers tonight said that studies show that inland grizzly bears like those that were in the North Cascades or those in Glacier National Park eat about 80% plants and insects. And there is enough food for them in the North Cascades.

Studies have also shown that it's extremely unlikely that grizzlies will be able to repopulate the North Cascades on their own. I've got to hurry. So it's also clear that grizzly recovery must be done in a way that does not threaten the lives and livelihoods of local people. We've heard that very clearly tonight.

We - - as a cherry orchardist, we didn't have problems with bears. We had problems, and my neighbors especially had problems with Elk, and Elk can do a hell of a lot of damage to a cherry tree in a very short time. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14597Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, WA N/A
United States of America

Outside Organization: Western Washington University University/Professional Society

Received: Nov,12 2023

Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: Comments on Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan and Environmental Impact Statement for the North Cascades Ecosystem

Prepared by

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Western Washington University

12 November 2023

The draft environmental impact statement (DEIS) and its cited literature provide a comprehensive assessment of the current status of grizzly bears in the North Cascades Ecosystem and three restoration alternatives. Due to the tenuous status of grizzlies in NCE and their highly interactive nature (Soule et al. 2003), a credible restoration plan must consider diverse ecological and social elements. The DEIS appears

to do so well.

Two of the three DEIS alternatives involve grizzly population augmentation, or translocation of bears into NCE. Translocations increasingly are being applied as a conservation tool, with mixed success. The DEIS cites Pérez et al. (2012), who described ten criteria for evaluating translocation projects and evaluated 454 published and unpublished translocation projects relative to those criteria. Pérez et al. (2012) concluded most projects addressed less than half of the criteria, and less than 1% addressed all ten. By comparison, the NCE grizzly DEIS is very good (Table 1). The DEIS addresses eight of the 10 criteria directly, and partially addresses the remaining two criteria. The status of NCE also is consistent with the criteria: grizzly augmentation fulfills five of the 10 criteria strongly or fully. Of the remaining five criteria, three are either beyond control of the lead agencies or are subject to societal perceptions that preclude consensus on organisms such as grizzly bears. The remaining two criteria (2 and 7 in Table 1) are amenable to adaptive measures as described in the DEIS. In summary, population augmentation or translocation is an appropriate means to achieve grizzly conservation goals in NCE, and the DEIS has evaluated most risks, potential costs, and benefits.

Table 1. Criteria for evaluating translocation projects, from Perez et al. (2012).

(1)

Criteria: Is the species or population under threat?

Addressed in DEIS: Yes

Status: Yes

(2)

Have threatening factors been removed/controlled, or absent in release area?

Addressed in DEIS: Partly

Status: Partly

(3)

Are translocations the best tool to mitigate conservation conflicts?

Addressed in DEIS: Yes

Status: Yes

(4)

Are risks for the target species acceptable?

Addressed in DEIS: Yes

Status: Yes

(5)

Are risks for other species or the ecosystem acceptable?

Addressed in DEIS: Yes

Status: Yes

(6)

Are the possible effects of the translocation acceptable to local people?

Addressed in DEIS: Yes

Status: Mixed

(7)

Does the project maximize the likelihood of establishing a viable population?

Addressed in DEIS: Partly

Status: Uncertain

(8)

Does the project include clear goals and monitoring?

Addressed in DEIS: Yes

Status: Yes

(9)

Do enough economic and human resources exist?

Addressed in DEIS: Yes

Status: TBD

(10)

Do scientific, governmental, and stakeholder groups support the translocation?

Addressed in DEIS: Yes

Status: Most

The DEIS gives appropriate emphasis to adaptive measures. Grizzly bears have been well-studied in other regions, including ecosystems not far from NCE. Results of this work provide a strong basis for planning NCE grizzly restoration, but some uncertainty is inevitable due to unique NCE characteristics. In particular, lack of data on NCE grizzly food utilization, spatial movements, and responses to climatic variability lead to uncertainty about grizzly restoration and management. In this context, an adaptive restoration approach is essential. The DEIS gives due emphasis to adaptive measures. Despite the comprehensive scope of the DEIS, I offer several technical suggestions that would strengthen the scientific basis for NCE grizzly conservation planning.

First, population growth rates and projected time intervals required to achieve the 200-bear restoration goal appear to be overly optimistic. These rates and times appear to be derived from age-specific grizzly survival rates, given on page 64 in the DEIS. The assumed survival rate for adult females is at the upper extreme in the range of values reported from five grizzly populations (Wielgus 2002), and a full standard deviation above the mean. Projected population growth rates depend sensitively on adult female survival; growth would be slower and time required to reach the 200-bear restoration goal would be longer under a more realistic survival rate. In practice, grizzly survival rates for any age class are unknown in NCE, and the restoration plan could be adjusted accordingly as monitoring data become available.

Second, the decisions about the proposed alternatives could be reached with greater confidence if the DEIS evaluated the likelihood of achieving the restoration goal under each alternative. Population viability analysis (PVA) is the appropriate method for conducting such evaluations. PVA would require estimates of grizzly demographic rates, uncertainty in those rates including effects of environmental variability, and effects of management actions on those rates. Two data sets available in the scientific literature could be adapted for this purpose, published by Wielgus (2002) and Pease and Mattson (1999). Neither includes NCE bears, but they could be used to develop baseline scenarios from which alternatives could be evaluated and adaptation measures could be developed. PVA would inform the restoration program with depth and rigor commensurate with analysis in Lyons et al. (2016). As restoration monitoring proceeds, data on NCE grizzlies could be incorporated into PVA population models to inform adaptive measures with NCE-specific analyses. Without PVA, the NCE grizzly restoration program will require greater reliance on adaptive measures, with commensurate funding and staffing resources available over longer time periods required to achieve restoration goals.

The DEIS concludes that grizzly restoration would not be achieved under Alternative A. PVA can quantify this conclusion. Under optimistic assumptions about environmental conditions, extinction by mid-century is certain (100% probability), with a mean persistence time of 5.5 years. (PVA results obtained by me from 1000 simulations using initial abundance of six bears, as in Romain-Bondi et al. 2004.)

The DEIS needs clearer analysis of important food sources associated with grizzly population viability. The DEIS and the Ransom et al. (2023) article it cites documented a large diversity of plant, fungi, and animal food sources. They did not identify abundant food(s) available in high density during the late summer-fall period of grizzly hyperphagy. Viability of grizzly populations in other regions is associated with one or more such food sources. The DEIS did not identify such a source in NCE, and relevant sources in other systems have declined markedly in NCE or are absent (e.g., salmon, whitebark pine seeds). Including analysis of key food source availability would indicate whether restoration of those food sources is necessary for grizzly population viability, and hence would inform restoration planning and resource allocation.

Finally, restoration planning should include analysis of population and habitat connectivity to regions beyond NCE. This issue has not been adequately addressed throughout IGBC efforts, but it is essential to address grizzly restoration in the long term. Lack of analysis of inter-ecosystem connectivity is not likely to substantially alter conclusions in this DEIS or decisions regarding restoration in NCE.

As written the DEIS is very good, with comprehensive consideration of most translocation criteria outlined by Pérez et al. (2012). With revisions described above, a final EIS could address all ten criteria in Pérez et al. (2012), and thereby rank in the top 1% of comparable conservation plans.

Thank you for your consideration and for your excellent work.

References

Lyons AL, Gaines WL, Begley J, Singleton P. 2016. Grizzly Bear Carrying Capacity in the North Cascades Ecosystem, Final Report. Submitted to Skagit Environmental Endowment Commission, Seattle, WA.

Pease CM and Mattson DJ. 1999. Demography of Yellowstone grizzly bears. *Ecology* 80(3):957-975.

Perez I, Anadon JD, Diaz M, Nicola GG, Tella JL, Gimenez A. 2012. What is wrong with current translocations? A review and a decision-making proposal. *Front.Ecol.Environ.* 10(9):494-501.

Ransom JI, Lyons AL, Hegewisch KC, Krosby M. 2023. An integrated modeling approach for considering wildlife reintroduction in the face of climate uncertainty: A case for the North Cascades grizzly bear. *Biol. Cons.* 279:109947.

Romain-Bondi KA, Weilgus RB, Waits L, Kasworm WF, Austin M, Wakkinen W. 2004. Density and population estimates for North Cascades grizzly bears using DNA sampling techniques. *Biol.Cons.* 117:417-428.

Soule ME, Estes JA, J Berger, Del Rio CM. 2003. Ecological effectiveness: Conservation goals for interactive species. *Cons.Biol.* 17:1238-1250.

Wielgus RB. 2002. Minimum viable population and reserve sizes for naturally regulated grizzly bears in British Columbia. Biol.Conserv. 106:381-388.

Correspondence ID: 14598Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Carlton, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Good evening. I'm [REDACTED]

(phonetic) C [REDACTED] I just want to get up and voice my opposition to the reintroduction of grizzlies into the North Cascades. I'd rather stick with the alternative A and let things go as it be.

In this valley, when I first came here back in the late 80s - - I've lived in other parts of the country. They're similar, Colorado, other areas that - - and when I came here, I thought this place was going to explode right away. There's going to be (inaudible.)

Well, it's taken about 40 years, but it's happening, and with more and more people coming in, more and more homes, more and more pressure on local resources taking time to try and prevent a problem that we don't have, you know, if we introduce bears, we're going to have a problem. We - - we've got local ranchers, people that have been here for generations that know that we haven't had a history of grizzly bears coming out of the North Cascades because it doesn't happen for whatever reason.

If they stay in Canada, that's great, but if - - I don't see why we would want to start a problem where we don't have one currently, when we've already got other issues - - other natural resource issues. The issue about mule deer was brought up. If you hunt, you've seen it.

We reintroduced wolves, and I'm pretty certain besides the fires, that's been probably our biggest impact on the mule deer herd. So what's going to happen if we introduce another apex predator into our mix? Let's work on what we - - what we can have here now and support that going forward. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14599Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Unknown, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Stan from (inaudible.) My dad was in the

CCs and Forest Service in the 40s, and having (inaudible) they had a grizzly about take the radiator out of their Model T truck. That was the first one I ever heard of.

My cousin, Tom, go hunting up - - Tom Hoyt

(phonetic.) That's just below Manning. There was four grizzly bears in the sight of view one day. Rocky Wilson (phonetic) shot the last legal one in 1968 over by Marblemount, so they haven't been hunted for like 58 years.

Yes, there have been sightings. They've come and they've gone. There's a reason why they don't want to be here. I asked at the meeting we had four or five years ago if anybody knew, of all of our parks people and game department, where the designated grizzly bear habitat was in the Mount Baker-Snoqualmie Forest, and nobody knew the answer, which I thought was strange. 2001, I believe it was, I was packing fish from the game department, and Doug Huddle (phonetic) the biologist, he was laughing and asked me that question. I said, I got no idea.

The Fannie Creek (phonetic) block of forest south of the Skagit River, south of Concrete, between Darrington and Arlington, that's their habitat. He says that we've got a couple across the Mount Baker Highway through Glacier Maple Falls, through Concrete, Lyman, Hamilton, swim the Skagit River to get to where they're supposed to be. And why didn't any of these bear experts know that? I have no idea.

But why are we trying to reintroduce something that never really has been here. And that meeting we had four to five years ago, the guy had the stats from the Hudson Bay Company, and there was only one or two grizzly bear hides that'd been taken in 18 whatever. So that's my question. Are they really bear experts? Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14600Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Unknown, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: So, anyway, my name's [REDACTED] My wife, [REDACTED], and I are both native Washingtonians. I grew up over here, spent a lot of years working on the other side of the mountains, and always called this home. But the last few years I've heard a lot about bringing, you know, the salmon back to streams and creeks around here, and I - - I get these really exceptionally well-done flyers on this embossed paper and what they're going to do to bring back salmon. And then I hear people talk about how we need to build their habitat back before we reintroduce them. So I'm absolutely afraid not to introduce them because we aren't anywhere close to being ready. And I'll tell you what the dinner bill is. The dinner bill is our \$40,000 horses, sitting there where they can't run - - can't outrun a grizzly bear. A black bear - - I'd put our Friesian horses up against a black bear. A grizzly bear, nuh-uh. I've seen what they do to elk, moose, and mainly people. Some of those years weren't just spent on the other side of the mountains. They were spent on the pipeline in Alaska. And I'll tell you what. There's a whole bunch of Alaskans, at least all the ones that I know, who say if we've got an opportunity to keep them out of here, by God you better do it. I mean, do people know what's going on with the coyotes around here? Do you think that grizzlies are stupid? They're just as smart as coyotes, and they can hunt. And when they eat berries, it's - - you know what? They eat what's available. And they were smart, and they could adapt, and if this was habitat, and we're ready for grizzlies, they'd already be here.

Correspondence ID: 14601Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Olympia, WA 98504
United States of America

Outside Organization: Washington State Legislature Unaffiliated Individual(Official Rep.)

Received: Oct,30 2023

Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: Dear Secretary Haaland,
As state representatives for Washington's 39th Legislative District, we are writing to express our strong opposition to the proposed North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan that would reintroduce grizzly bears to the North Cascades region.

While we respect the efforts of your department to conserve and protect wildlife in this country, we have thoroughly reviewed the proposal plan and have come to the conclusion that its implementation would negatively impact our local communities and ecosystems and put the public at risk.

During the National Park Service's public comment period, we have received direct feedback from our constituents. They oppose this plan. The 39th District is comprised of a diverse range of stakeholders, including farmers, ranchers, and outdoor enthusiasts. Opposition is strong due to the increased risk that would be present for potential conflict between bears and humans. Moreover, the North Cascades ecosystem is already home to countless wildlife species. The reintroduction of grizzly bears may disrupt the delicate balance of this ecosystem, potentially harming native species and habitats.

In closing, we are asking the US. Department of the Interior to immediately suspend the proposed North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly Bear Reintroduction Plan. We trust the DOI to seriously consider the concerns of the residents we represent and work toward a more sustainable approach "that promotes the well-being of our local communities and natural environment. Thank you for your attention on this matter. I look forward to receiving your response.

Correspondence ID: 14602Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Twisp, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Hi. My name's [REDACTED] I'm from Twisp. I'm a retired ocean ecologist. And in my world, the ocean world, people always argued about is it top-down control, is it bottom-up? Is it the structure of the ocean, the nutrients? Is it the chemistry? And the answer is, it's all of these things. And, you know, I keep thinking about what did the landscape look like when there were beavers. I took Bill Hatel's (phonetic) course when he was talking about the local history in Washington State and Native Americans, and he talked a lot about Beavers.

By 1840, the beavers were exterminated. Maybe we're putting our money in the wrong direction. Maybe we should do the hard work first and help restructure and re-heal the land. Bring back beavers. If I've got to put my money any place, I'd go with beavers.

Correspondence ID: 14603Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Bellingham, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Okay. So my name is [REDACTED]. I'm a resident of Bellingham, but I grew up in Skagit. I have a long time, years, decades playing in Skagit. A lot of hiking in the cascades. A lot of good points tonight. I recognize both sides. There's very heartfelt, you know, feeling on this.

However, I'm old. Nostalgia's great. The world changes. We have to recognize that. The environment is not conducive to this. You're bringing in an apex predator that's going to create conflict.

Now, I look at the process. In the past I've actually ran some programs with biologic controls, including a lot of tagging, collaring. So I look at the 10-J section sort of as something that was brought in to make this more amenable to people to accept it.

I would like to suggest some modifications to the 10-J section. First of all, I think we have the opportunity here if we collar these bears, to actually collar them with tracking that can be monitored. And I'd go and I'd ask the rangers and the sheriff to issue those bears, if they get outside their bounds, a ticket, and make sure that they're held accountable because I think if we don't address these conflicts appropriately, their reward is going to be your neighbor's dog or even maybe your neighbor, perhaps seasoned with a little bit of pepper spray. So that's my comment.

Correspondence ID: 14604Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Unknown, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Hello. I've probably spent more time in the wilderness than anybody here, so I've got to tell you, you're going to start to (inaudible) into August, first of September. It was all of these old hikers that started the Pacific Crest Trail in Mexico, and they were trying to get - - to get to the Canadian border.

And growing up or living and helping build trails in the mountains, I knew of all the big, good, berry patches on the Crest Trail in Hopkins Pass, and I'd get - - and I can visualize that poor old boy that walked all this way with his two fishing poles, carrying a pack, but there'd be a grizzly in the berry patch, so the Forest Service will say, "No, you can't go in there now because the grizzly's got the right of way." So you've got to wait until he leaves the berry patch.

I've seen the trails in the Methow and the safe wilderness go straight to hell in my lifetime after 35 years. I did a lot of that, and to me, when you have

(inaudible) come along with five or six mules tied behind you, and you meet old grizzly on the steep hillside of a narrow trail, I don't know who's going to be able to back up or turn around.

And it's these kinds of things I don't think we need and we don't have. And it's been my theory in life if you're not in a wreck, don't go get in one. And I believe that to be a fact that there's no sense in bringing something that's going to cause trouble, whether he does or he doesn't. Thank you. Okay.

Correspondence ID: 14605Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Skagit County, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Number 072. Thank you for taking my comments at this meeting. My name is [REDACTED], and I live in Skagit County. I've worked and recreated in the North Cascades ecosystem for the past 31 years. Prior to that, I worked in the greater Yellowstone ecosystem.

I think the draft EIS is strong, and with the use of the 10-J rule, it addresses many of the concerns people have expressed about the restoration of grizzly bears to the North Cascades. The care with which the bears will be selected, coming from a similar food economy, radio collared, and monitored, and the slow rate of relocation all assure me that the program will be carried out in a systematic and science-based manner.

I worked on some of the early efforts to find bears here in the North Cascades. That was more than 30 years ago, following up on sightings reported by hikers to the Department of Fish and Wildlife, and making attempts to attract bears in areas of likely habitat. As you know, we didn't find anything. Without an active restoration effort that is alternative A, we will not see grizzly bears return to the Cascades, and we and the ecosystem will be lesser for that.

For 20 or more years I've been volunteering for a University of Washington program that monitors populations of rare plants on public lands throughout the state. I usually request assignments in the Pasayten Wilderness because it feels like the wildest place I can find in Washington State.

I'm willing to camp with care in these places because I feel we need to share the wilderness with all the species in the ecosystem. The notion that we need to have completely safe experiences in the areas -- in the wildest areas of this incredible country seem very selfish to me.

So many people have become unwilling to share even the remotest places on earth with other creatures. The ecosystems we depend upon are breaking down because of this. Restoring bears to the ecosystem is important for a whole host of reasons, some of which we may not know yet. The North Cascades needs grizzly bears. I encourage you to adopt alternative C in the DEIS and implement the 10-J rule.

Thank you for your service to our wildlands and wildlife that make them the jewel of our nation.

Correspondence ID: 14606Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Skagit County, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Skagit County Farm Bureau Non-Governmental(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Hello. I'm [REDACTED] I'm the [REDACTED] of the Skagit County Farm Bureau, and since I've been president, we've had over 1,200 members in our group. Not one member is in favor of putting grizzly bears into the North Cascades.

These are people that farm, people that have cattle, people that have children, people that recreate here, and I think our vote for working in the valley should carry more vote than somebody in King County or somebody outside of our county. If they want the bears, put them down in Seattle parks is the way I feel.

The other thing is on your background here you talk about only one official sighting. When you Google it, it shows several sightings. I don't know if everything you see on the internet is true, but you might want to fact check your message board or the sign there. The other thing is I don't know of any vegan grizzly bears, so trying to have a grizzly bear that's friendly I think is just stupidity. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14607Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Unknown, WA Unknown
United States of America
Outside Organization: Woodland Park Zoo Conservation/Preservation
Received: Nov,27 2023
Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Thank you. I'm 080. I'm (audio disruption.) Thank you for this opportunity to speak in support of restoring grizzly bears to the North Cascades. I'm here on behalf of my role with the Living Northwest Program at Woodland Park Zoo. Each year more than a million adults and children pass through the zoo's gates to spend time with the animals who live in our care. Our job is to help ensure that when visitors leave through those same gates, they know a bit more about the realities of wildlife placed in their natural environment and feel inspired to make conservation a priority in their own busy lives.

When recently at the zoo, I stood among dozens of people as they watched our young rescued brown bears, Juniper and Fern, chase each other around like siblings in their habitat display, splashing in the stream, digging up plants, rolling over logs like they would in the wild.

The audience was spellbound, clearly in awe of these magnificent animals. I overheard one enthusiastic woman who grinned ear to ear, while holding a baby in her arm, lean over and say to her companion, quote, "We've waited our whole life for this moment." The same can be said of grizzly bear recovery in the North Cascades.

Before any of us were born, the grizzly bear population was basically gone here. We all inherited a legacy of ecological and cultural loss that we now have an incredibly rare chance to reverse. Alternative C will allow the National Park Service and Fish and Wildlife Service to reintroduce grizzlies slowly, carefully, at a flexible management capacity so that our grandchildren can inherit a different type of legacy, one of tolerance and appreciation for grizzly bears.

Woodland Park Zoo recognizes that reintroducing grizzlies is not a trivial matter. We're committed to using our diverse resources to promote coexistence between people and bears, and we look forward to ongoing conversations about how we can help make alternative C a success.

We've waited our whole life for this moment. Let's work together to bring grizzly bears back to the North Cascades. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14608Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Chelan and Whatcom County, WA Unknown
United States of America
Outside Organization: Sierra Club Conservation/Preservation(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,27 2023
Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: I'm 078. I'm Dr. [REDACTED], and I'm a resident of both Chelan and Whatcom County. I'm cochair of the Washington Sierra Club Wildlife Committee, and I'm providing comments for the National Sierra Club. The National Sierra Club has over 3.7 million members and supporters and is the oldest engaged and (audio disruption) grassroots organization in the United States, with the largest membership of all environmental public advocacy groups. The Washington State seat chapter at the Sierra Club includes over 100,000 members and supporters. Sierra Club has a strong national interest in full recovery of grizzly bears in the lower 48 states. We support restoration of grizzly bears into the North Cascades ecosystem and want to ensure that it's done right.

Young, healthy, non-conflict bears will be taken out of their native ecosystem, likely from Montana, for this restoration. They must be given every chance to succeed in the North Cascades. We are concerned the proposed 10-J rule, although we support it, will not provide sufficient protections as it's currently written.

So we would like these things to be significantly revised. One, no incidental take should be allowed. Two, the authority (inaudible) grizzly bear should only be considered where there is a demonstrable threat to human safety, and for nonimmediate threats to human safety, only after nonlethal removal options and utilization of conflict prevention methods have been exhausted.

Three, no grizzly bear should be hazed or relocated as a result of conflict with livestock, unless demonstrable, repeated efforts have been made by the livestock producer to prevent such conflicts using commonly available techniques. No grizzly bear should be killed on public lands as a result of livestock degradation.

Five, landowners should not be given a permit or otherwise authorized to kill grizzly bears. And six, no grizzly bears should be preemptively relocated if the bear is not a threat to human safety, particularly if the bear has not become habituated or food conditioned. Doing so acts as a disincentive for communities to employ conflict prevention methods and increases the

risk to the bear of injury or death from capture and relocation.

We appreciate the time and effort spent on restoration and the Biden administration's willingness to reestablish grizzlies in the North Cascades' ecosystem. The Sierra Club strongly urges the strengthening and protections and revision of the 10-J rule for enduring a successful grizzly restoration in the North Cascades ecosystem. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14609Project:112008Document:132104
Address: N/A, WA N/A
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Comment: Proposed Grizzly Bear Reintroduction in the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE)
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Proposed Rule: FWS-R1-ES-2023-0074-0001
National Parks Service Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Environmental Impact Statement

Note:

The following comment is a draft version and we hope that the action agencies (USFWS and NPS) will accept and give full consideration to the complete version which will be submitted in mid-December. We ask for this extension of consideration for a final draft as we are students in an Environmental Decision-Making law class at the University of Colorado, Boulder and we are operating on an academic timeline.

Introduction

As students studying natural resources and environmental management, policy, and law, we have taken a particular interest in the proposed restoration of a grizzly bear population to the North Cascades ecosystem. One of the authors of this comment completed his undergraduate degree in Washington and spent a significant amount of time recreating in the North Cascades Ecosystem admiring the flora and fauna that the diverse region supports, and the other author used to enjoy catching occasional glimpses of grizzly bears while he lived in Montana. This proposed rule, draft restoration plan, and draft environmental impact statement offers the chance to consider restoring a population of threatened bears to an ecosystem that has historically hosted them for millennia. Through the commenting process, the public can assist the FWS and NPS in finalizing planning documents in a manner that leads to outcomes that are responsible to contemporary human communities and the regulations and guidelines outlined by the Endangered Species Act, Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan, and other documents. The North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Environmental Impact Statement evaluates the impacts of a range of alternative approaches for restoring the grizzly bear to the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE) grizzly bear recovery zone, a portion of its historical range. This plan/DEIS evaluates the impacts of the no-action alternative (Alternative A) and two action alternatives (Alternatives B and C). All action alternatives would seek to achieve a grizzly bear restoration population and the no-action alternative (Alternative A) would continue existing management practices with no grizzly bear reintroductions. Under both action alternatives, it is anticipated that 3 to 7 grizzly bears would be released into the NCE each year over roughly 5 to 10 years, with a goal of establishing an initial population of 25 grizzly bears before switching to adaptive management.

Under Action Alternative B grizzly bears restored to the NCE would be managed as a threatened species with the existing special rule (50 CFR 17.40(b)) under section 4(d) of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) governing the regulation of grizzly bears in the lower 48 states as other grizzly bears in designated recovery zones are managed. Under Alternative C, the preferred alternative, the FWS would designate grizzly bears in the US portion of the NCE and surrounding areas as a 10(j) nonessential experimental population (NEP) under section 10 of the

ESA. A 10(j) NEP designation would allow for different management abilities such as greater allowance for takings of grizzly bears. Our comments, suggestions, and recommendations for the proposed rule and plan/DEIS are outlined as follows:

Primary Comment Elements:

- 1) Critiques and Recommended Updates to Scientific Basis of Carrying Capacity, Initial Population, and Adaptive Management Practices
 - a) Carrying capacity estimates should reflect best available information
 - b) Initial population re-establishment: Lessons from augmentation efforts in Cabinet-Yaak Ecosystem
 - c) Adaptive management outcomes should be qualitative rather than quantitative goals to reflect the principles of the management framework

- 2) Evaluation of DEIS Action Alternatives and Support for Alternative B
 - a) Grizzly bear reintroduction in the NCE needs to be kept closely grounded in the meaning and intent of the Endangered Species Act
 - b) Support for DEIS Action Alternative B
 - c) No Support for Action Alternative C or FWS Proposed Rule

- 3) FWS Should Designate Critical Habitat for Grizzly Bears in the NCE
 - a) FWS Has Failed to Designate Critical Habitat for Grizzly Bears Historically, and Should Designate Critical Habitat in the NCE if it is Serious About Recovery
 - b) The NCE is an Ideal Location To Designate Critical Habitat for Grizzly Bears

- 4) Support More Educational Programming to Limit Impacts of Human-Bear Encounters
 - a) Agencies Should Target Educational Efforts at Backcountry Recreationists
 - b) Agencies Should Make Bear Spray Available for Groups Recreating in the NCE, And Should Install Bear Wires At Campsites
 - c) Agencies Should Partner With Local Groups Already Focused on Human-Bear Coexistence
 - d) FWS Should Promote Compensation Programs and Non-Lethal Preventative Approaches for Ranchers to Counter Livestock Depredation by Bears

1) Critiques and Recommended Updates to Scientific Basis of Carrying Capacity, Initial Population, and Adaptive Management Practices

The US Fish and Wildlife Service and National Parks Service have gone to extensive lengths to build accurate and comprehensive scientific information into the foundation of the Restoration Plan/ DEIS and Proposed Rule. However, there is room for improvement that more functionally incorporates the NCE carrying capacity estimates, initial introduction plan, and adaptive management framework. Firstly, carrying capacity estimates should be updated to reflect best available information, primarily recent studies that project climate impacts on ecosystem health in the NCE. Secondly, in planning for initial population re-establishment, the agencies should take a hard look at the recent augmentation efforts in Cabinet-Yaak Ecosystem to compare augmentation successes with the small proposed initial population in the NCE. Lastly, adaptive management outcomes should be reevaluated and further specified as qualitative rather than quantitative outcomes to reflect the principles of the management framework and integrate new information.

Carrying Capacity Estimates Should Reflect Best Available Information

The DEIS and proposed rule reference five studies that examine grizzly habitat in the NCE, two of which offer specific analysis of contemporary or future carrying capacity. A 2018 evaluation of current habitat provides the basis for the current carrying capacity estimates; "The mid-range scenario results of 139 females, or a total population of 278 bears, represented the most plausible scenario for this ecosystem."¹ This estimate of the NCE holding a carrying capacity of 278 individuals is the basis for the target population restoration of 200 individuals within 60 to 100 years. Given this long time horizon for grizzly bear restoration in the NCE, it becomes necessary to consider the effects of climate change on the ecosystem as a whole, and consequently the effects it will have on grizzly habitat and carrying capacity. It makes no sense to set a goal or target populations based exclusively on current conditions when that target is set for 60 to 100 years in the future, and will undoubtedly face different climatic and ecological conditions.

The 2023 study that is cited in the DEIS states that the projected future shifts in vegetation in the NCE may result in high quality grizzly bear habitat increasing across all climate scenarios, and that "estimates of carrying capacity in the future NCE project an increase of at least 70% across scenarios of future climate as compared to current conditions."² These projections on ecosystem impacts from climate change alter the overall carrying capacity estimates for the ecosystem through the coming century. The study notes:
At the most plausible home range of 280 km² and across climate scenarios, we estimated a carrying capacity of 241-289 female grizzly bears by the 2080s.
Assuming a 50:50 sex ratio, the estimated grizzly bear density in the NCE would thus be 20-22 bears/1000 km² (male and females) by the 2080s.³

These increases in carrying capacity come both from the increased density of bears per the projections (from the 2018 estimate of 17 bears/1000 km² to the 2023 estimate of 20-22 bears/1000 km²), and from an increase in available high-altitude habitat due to climate change. Considering that the target population is currently set to be reached between the 2080s and 2120s, the 2023 report considers a realistic carrying capacity to be 481-578 total bears as opposed to the 278 bears that the 60-100 year population goal target is based on.

The proposed target population should be updated from 200 bears to better reflect

the latest scientific information, which takes into account future climatic changes and is found in the 2023 report. While the 2023 report does not specify a guideline target for grizzly reintroduction, the goal population target should nonetheless be reflected by what our data and projections tell us about future conditions. Basing a 60-100 year target on current conditions is less sensible than basing a target on the best science, data, and projects that we have for the targeted period of time. Managers must leave room for uncertainty in future ecosystem conditions, but as the agencies acknowledge that the population target of 200 bears in 60-100 years is "conservative" based on current conditions, it is an extremely conservative target given the scientific evidence we have that supports enhanced habitat and carrying capacity for grizzly bears.⁴

Initial Population Re-Establishment: Lessons From Augmentation Efforts in Cabinet-Yaak Ecosystem

The Cabinet-Yaak Ecosystem (CYE) is one of six overall designated recovery zones for grizzly bears in the lower 48 states, and one of four that currently hosts a population of grizzly bears. The USFWS has augmented the grizzly population in the CYE since 1990 when research indicated a declining population with only 15 members. "Primary objectives are to bolster reproduction through the addition of female bears and improve overall genetic diversity through the addition of female and male bears. Twenty-two bears have been added in the Cabinet Mountains since 1990."⁵ When augmenting the bear population in the CYE to reverse the declining trend of the population, managers considered the quantity of individuals based on the need to increase genetic diversity, the size of the ecosystem, projected mortality of individuals, and other factors. As the population now numbers at 55-60 individuals, with steady augmentation efforts, the CYE grizzly management approach can serve as analog for grizzly restoration efforts in the NCE.

There are some important differences between recovery zones and restoration approaches, including the differences in ecosystem size. The NCE is nearly four times the area of the CYE at 25,305 km² versus 6,705 km², complicating how bears in numbers far below the carrying capacity locate and mate with each other. The total population target size is different for the NCE and CYE, however bear densities remain similar. For the CYE, "potential densities for the entire sample area averaged 2.1 bears/100 km² [21 bears/1000 km²]." This expanded population estimate is similar to the estimated bear density for the NCE of 20-22 bears per 1000 km².⁶ It is also important to consider that the NCE restoration will begin with fully reintroduced individuals rather than bolstering and diversifying existing genetic stock.

Despite the differences in ecosystems and bear populations between the CYE and NCE, there are some important commonalities that offer learning opportunities and which should be reinforced in the DEIS. The CYE population has been experiencing a growth trend of 1.6% annually, not including additional augmentation bears.⁷ 22 bears have been introduced to the CYE since 1990, in addition to the estimated 15 bears that made up the population previous to introduction efforts. While this introduction effort is over a 32-year time horizon, it is similar to the initial target population of 25 bears as outlined in the DEIS and proposed rule. This growth rate, however, takes place in a management area 26% of the geographic size of the NCE and with a foundational population of 15 grizzly bears. While we can consider the slow growth rate in the CYE to be the result of the 0-2 annual grizzly introductions to the ecosystem over the past 32 years, we cannot immediately expect a similarly small introduced bear population to establish a growth rate akin to the CYE's without examining other factors. Mortality has been a factor in population management in the CYE for both introduced and existing bears within the population. "Of 22 bears released through 2021, 8 are known to have left the target area, 5 were killed by humans, and 2 died of unknown causes."⁸ These bears have contributed to population growth through offspring but have faced losses. Between an established population pre-augmentation, a slow growth rate with continued augmentation, and mortality, the CYE demonstrates the need to establish a significant baseline population to encourage population growth.

In considering both the slow population growth rate and mortality of introduced individuals in the CYE, land managers must remember that introducing a population of grizzly bears in the geographically-large NCE too conservatively will not encourage the growth necessary to maintain a self-sustaining population in the ecosystem. As stated in Chapter 2 of the DEIS, it is likely that 11 bears will be reintroduced following the initial staged release of 25 bears. Considering the CYE examples discussed above, which support a larger initial population, the FWS should be transparent about the expected starting population and update the initial population count to 36. As the CYE demonstrates, erring on the conservative side and not introducing enough bears through the first stage of restoration will not create the population

foundation necessary to establish a self-sustaining and successfully reproducing population.

Adaptive Management Outcomes Should Be Qualitative Rather Than Quantitative Goals to Reflect the Principles of the Management Framework

Adaptive management principles should be discussed wherever possible in the DEIS and proposed planning documents. While these principles are present in the management strategy, they are not present enough through each opportunity for adaptive management, nor are they explicitly stated with enough background or detail in the introduction. DOI regulations define adaptive management as "a system of management practices based on clearly identified outcomes and monitoring to determine whether management actions are meeting desired outcomes; and, if not, facilitating management changes that will best ensure that outcomes are met or re-evaluated." 9 Desired outcomes should reflect the action areas outlined in the Purpose and Need statement and the Objectives in Taking Action statement. The action areas are outlined as follows:

- Restore grizzly bears to the NCE where they have been functionally extirpated from the ecosystem.
- Contribute to the restoration of biodiversity of the ecosystem to build ecological resilience and for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations of people.
- Enhance the probability of long-term survival of grizzly bears in the NCE and thereby contribute to overall grizzly bear recovery through redundancy in multiple populations and representation in a variety of habitats.
- Support the recovery of the grizzly bear to the point where it can be removed from the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife.¹⁰

Based on the action areas outlined in the P&N statement, 'desired outcomes' should be qualitative rather than quantitative. As such, the agency should define the desired outcomes as a "healthy, self-sustaining grizzly population within the bounds of the estimated carrying capacity of the ecosystem," rather than a hard number for a population target, like the 200 bears figure which is currently stated. While a 60-100 year quantitative population target will help guide the agency in short, medium, and long term management decisions, that number should be viewed as a flexible component of an adaptive management framework that works towards a qualitative goal, such as a healthy and self-sustaining population, rather than the specific desired outcome that the adaptive management plan works towards. Agencies have the opportunity to consider the outcomes of adaptive management through both the phases of initial introduction and population establishment through intermittent evaluation of the ultimate target population.

Despite 54 occurrences of the term 'adaptive management,' the DEIS doesn't adequately define specific potential outcomes of the adaptive management framework. Instead, the agency uses vague statements like:

The restoration population goal [200 bears] is thus seen as a population size that can be adaptively managed for genetic viability and long-term persistence, and may or may not require active human intervention. This restoration population goal could be adjusted based on information gained from monitoring grizzly bears and their overall population response during the adaptive management phase of the action alternatives.¹¹

This management perspective that the population goal can be adjusted based on future information does not shine through the DEIS in the way that the 200 bear population target does.

The FWS and NPS need to bring the explicit sentiment about adaptive management that adjusts quantitative targets as new scientific information is gathered to every section of the DEIS and proposed rule where adaptive management is mentioned in a substantive way.

2) Evaluation of DEIS Action Alternatives and Support for Alternative B

In creation of the proposed rule and draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / DEIS, the FWS and NPS have included two action alternatives that address grizzly bear reintroduction and management in similar ways. The action alternatives both carry out reintroduction of the bears in a similar manner, but they diverge in terms of the overall management framework. One plan follows the standard management framework used for the existing four populations of grizzly bears in the lower 48, while the other plan uses a new framework for grizzly management under ESA section 10(j), designating the bears as a nonessential experimental population. In considering these alternatives, the agencies should remember to keep grizzly bear reintroduction in the NCE closely grounded in the meaning and intent of the Endangered Species Act. We also advocate for the agency to reconsider Action Alternative B over Alternative C, as it allows for similar grizzly takings while better adhering to the principles of the ESA and the stated Purpose and Need of the DEIS.

Grizzly Bear Reintroduction in the NCE Needs to be Kept Closely Grounded in the Meaning And Intent of the Endangered Species Act

The Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / DEIS propose two action alternatives for the restoration of a grizzly bear population in the North Cascades Ecosystem, both of which would take place under the authority of the Endangered Species Act (ESA). Congress noted in the ESA that:

The purposes of this Act are to provide a means whereby the ecosystems upon which endangered species and threatened species depend may be conserved, to provide a program for the conservation of such endangered species and threatened species, and to take such steps as may be appropriate to achieve the purposes of the treaties and conventions set forth in subsection (a) of this section.¹²

The second clause of this statement, "to provide a program for the conservation of such endangered species and threatened species," is primarily relevant to the context of the alternatives already outlined in the DEIS as the aim of each is to create a restoration program for the conservation of a threatened species.¹³

In the context of these proposed actions, it is also necessary to keep the program framed within the context of the ESA. "The term 'threatened species' means any species which is likely to become an endangered species within the foreseeable future throughout all or a significant portion of its range."¹⁴ Additionally, the ESA notes that:

The terms "conserve", "conserving", and "conservation" mean to use and the use of all methods and procedures which are necessary to bring any endangered species or threatened species to the point at which the measures provided pursuant to this Act are no longer necessary. Such methods and procedures include, but are

not limited to, all activities associated with scientific resources management such as research, census, law enforcement, habitat acquisition and maintenance, propagation, live trapping, and transplantation, and, in the extraordinary case where population pressures within a given ecosystem cannot be otherwise relieved, may include regulated taking.¹⁵

The aim of "conservation" of a species per the definition of the ESA is to bring a threatened species to the point where the measures provided in this act are no longer needed. Therefore, the goal of conservation action should never be to indefinitely manage a species or population under the auspices of the ESA but rather to support the recovery and self-sufficiency of a given species. Specific programs and actions taken by agencies in the process of ESA species conservation, even those carried out as exceptions, should reflect this ultimate goal of removing a species from ESA management.

Support for DEIS Action Alternative B

The DEIS action Alternative B proposes to restore a grizzly bear population to the NCE as a threatened species with the special rule (50 CFR 17.40(b)) under section 4(d) of the ESA governing the regulation of grizzly bears in the lower 48. This is the regulatory framework under which all populations of grizzly bears in the lower 48 are currently managed. The 1993 Grizzly Bear Recovery Plan discusses the management regulations under 50 CFR 17.40(b) under ESA section 4(d) as "extensive" and makes no mention of ESA section 10(j) Nonessential Experimental Population status and doesn't suggest that agencies look to create other management frameworks beyond the plan. The section 4(d) regulations provide a proven management framework through which bears have been introduced to augment the struggling CYE populations as well as managing the highly successful Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem (GYE) population.

Management of grizzly bears in the currently inhabited areas with the special rule under section 4(d) has led to increasing and self-sustaining populations with at least some of the recovery criterion or objectives being met for three out of the four inhabited recovery areas. The GYE has met all current recovery targets, including population size, population distribution, and mortality rates. The Northern Continental Divide Ecosystem (NCDE) has also met all three of its current recovery targets for population distribution, mortality, and genetic connectivity. The Cabinet-Yaak Ecosystem has not met most of its recovery targets for population of females with cubs or population distribution, but has partially met the target for mortality (total mortality met, female mortality exceeded). However, augmentation of the bear population in the CYE has moved the ecosystem closer to meeting its targets. The Selkirk Ecosystem has not met its recovery targets for population of females with cubs, population distribution, and mortality. Despite not meeting these targets, the Selkirk Ecosystem still averaged an annual growth rate of 2.6% between 1983 and 2022.¹⁶ Overall, management through the special rule under ESA section 4(d) has contributed to the stabilization and growth of populations in the four inhabited Grizzly Bear Recovery Areas.

The stabilizing and slowly growing grizzly populations in these recovery zones can be partially attributed to the protected status they have as 'threatened' under ESA section 4(d). This 4(d) rule allows grizzly bears to be taken in limited circumstances as described below, as long as such take is reported promptly to the FWS. "Take" as defined under the ESA means to "harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect, or to attempt to engage in any such conduct." Relevant takings language from the DEIS includes the following:

- Defense of life. Persons may take grizzly bears in self-defense or in defense of others.
- Federal, state, or Tribal scientific or research activities. Federal, state or Tribal authorities may take grizzly bears for scientific purposes, but only if such taking does not result in death or permanent injury to the bears involved. Such taking

must be reported.

- Removal of grizzly bears involved in conflicts. A grizzly bear constituting a demonstrable threat to human safety or to lawfully present livestock, guard dogs, crops, beehives, or other personal property, may be taken, up to and including lethal removal, but only if:

- It has not been reasonably possible to eliminate the threat or depredation by live capturing and releasing unharmed in a remote area the grizzly bear involved; and
- The taking is done in a humane manner by authorized federal, state, or Tribal authorities, and in accordance with current interagency guidelines covering the taking of grizzly bears involved in conflict.¹⁷

This framework allows for takings for necessary and practical reasons while maintaining the intent and integrity of ESA protections. Takings are permitted for self defense, research, or to remove bears involved in conflicts (such as conflicts with wildlife). Takings for self defense is currently a contentious issue, especially with the recent deaths of hikers in Banff National Park, in Canada, as well as other recent instances of human-bear conflict in the western United States. The standard 4(d) rule allows for takings, both in wounding to bears, through non-lethal defense mechanisms like bear spray, and lethal harm in self defense if necessary. Non-lethal takings for scientific purposes is also permitted, allowing researchers to learn more about the bears and their population through the early years of bear introductions to better inform adaptive management practices among other purposes. Non-lethal relocation and lethal removal are also permitted under the 4(d) rule for "a grizzly bear constituting a demonstrable threat to human safety or to lawfully present livestock."¹⁸ Considering the perceived and real threats that grizzly bears pose to livestock and crops within and in proximity to the NCE, the 4(d) rule offers options for relocating or removing nuisance bears or threatening bears. As these three areas are some of the largest areas of concern, the standard population framework allows for more than adequate takings already.

Additionally, the following "takings" allowance is included solely in the Alternative C takings section but should be listed under Alternative B as well. This bullet point is a component of the 4(d) takings allowance for 'defense of life,' but it is not elaborated on in the Alternative B discussion of the takings allowances as it in Alternative C:

- Deterrence for the purposes of avoiding human-bear conflicts or to discourage bears from using areas in the immediate vicinity of homes and other human-occupied areas. Any person who deters a grizzly bear must use discretion and act safely and responsibly in confronting grizzly bears involved in conflicts.

The FWS provides guidelines for safe and responsible hazing of grizzly bears.

See FWS Grizzly Bear Hazing Guidelines.¹⁹

The FWS Grizzly Bear Hazing Guidelines was written specifically for populations currently managed under the ESA section 4(d) special rule and therefore it would ostensibly apply to this proposed 4(d) management as well. By not including this additional detail on bear deterrence under the self-defense takings allowance for Alternative B as it is seen in Alternative C, this misleads the general public to think that this form of deterrence taking is not included in the self-defense takings clause.

As the ESA framework outlines, the purpose of "conservation" of endangered or threatened species is to work towards de-listing and management of the populations beyond the bounds of the ESA. Current management under the ESA section 4(d) special rule has demonstrated stabilization in slow growth in the four inhabited recovery zones, with two of the recovery zones meeting all recovery criteria. As this management strategy is a proven method for successful stabilization of populations and progress towards recovery in ecosystems throughout the American West, the restoration of a grizzly bear population in the NCE under the 4(d) rule has a strong chance of success in following these examples.

No Support for Action Alternative C or FWS Proposed Rule

Action Alternative C of the DEIS, which is also the basis of the FWS proposed rule, proposes to restore grizzly bears to the NCE using the same methods and parameters as Alternative B but under a different regulatory and management framework. Alternative C would designate the reintroduced population as a nonessential experimental population (NEP) under section 10(j) of the ESA. Section 10, Exceptions, discusses 'Experimental Populations': For purposes of this subsection, the term "experimental population" means any population (including any offspring arising solely therefrom) authorized by the Secretary for release under paragraph (2), but only when, and at such times as, the population is wholly separate geographically from nonexperimental populations of the same species... For the purposes of this Act, each member of an experimental population shall be treated as a threatened species; except that-- solely for purposes of section 7 (other than subsection (a)(1) thereof), an experimental population determined under subparagraph (B) to be not essential to the continued existence of a species shall be treated, except when it occurs in an area within the National Wildlife Refuge System or the National Park System, as a species proposed to be listed under section 4.20

Managing a grizzly population as a 10(j) Nonessential Experimental Population would offer some of the same protections as status as a threatened species but with a few key differences. These differences include a reduced requirement for agency consultation with FWS on federal action (still required on NPS lands), greater takings allowances, and the ability to manage the population as non-essential to the continued existence of an endangered species or a threatened species.

The FWS and NPS propose that "designation of grizzly bears released into the US portion of the NCE as a 10(j) NEP would provide authorized agencies with greater management flexibility should conflict situations arise."²¹ Greater management flexibility would primarily take the form of greater takings allowances as discussed in the DEIS. In addition to the 4(d) takings allowances for self-defense, federal, state, or Tribal scientific or research activities, and removal of grizzly bears involved in or threatening conflicts, the 10(j) rule allows additional takings based under three different management zones. The first management zone being mostly federal land within the NCE, zone 2 being some additional federal lands outside of the NCE, and zone 3 being all other lands all other lands not contained within management zones 1 and 2 within the NEP boundary. Notably, zone 3 lands include private lands within the NCE, the primary habitat area for the restored grizzly populations.

Zone 1 takings allowances in addition to those included in Alternative B are as follows:

Unintentional take of a grizzly bear, provided such take is non-negligent and incidental to an otherwise lawful activity, the take is promptly reported to the FWS, and if the take occurs on national forest lands, that the USFS has maintained its "no net loss of core" approach and implemented food storage restrictions throughout management zone.²²

Alternative C allows for greater takings than necessary within Zone 1 of the NCE. Necessary non-negligent takings should already be covered by the takings allowances outlined in Alternative B under the section 4(d) rule where takings for self-defense, scientific study, and conflict avoidance are already allowed. The agency should describe more specifically what an unintentional take that "is non-negligent and incidental to an otherwise lawful activity" but which doesn't fall into one of the three existing takings categories would be, and examine whether that form of takings can be allowed but still support the restoration of a healthy grizzly population in the NCE.

Zone 3 takings allowances in addition to those included in Alternative B and Zone 1 are as follows:

Preemptive relocation of any grizzly bear. With prior approval from FWS, federal, state, or Tribal authorities may live-capture any grizzly bear occurring in management zone 3 and relocate as a preemptive action to prevent a conflict that appears imminent or in attempt to break habituated behavior of bears lingering near human-occupied areas.

Conditioned lethal take. The FWS, or authorized agency may issue prior written authorization to any person to kill a grizzly bear in management zone 3 when necessary for public safety or to protect property, but only if:

- The FWS or authorized agency determines that a grizzly bear presents a demonstrable and ongoing threat to human safety or to lawfully present livestock, working dogs, domestic animals, crops, beehives, or other property; and it is not reasonably possible to otherwise eliminate the threat by live capturing and releasing the grizzly bear unharmed;
- Once the FWS or authorized agency determines the threat is no longer ongoing, the FWS or authorized agency would notify the person, terminating the authorization;
- The individuals requesting the written authorization are otherwise authorized by the landowner or land management entity;
- The taking is done in a humane manner; and
- The taking is reported to the FWS, and the carcass is surrendered to the FWS."²³

The basis of the additional Zone 3 takings allowance are not fundamentally different than takings allowed under the Alternative B ESA Section 4(d) management framework. Takings are allowed there for removal of "A grizzly bear constituting a demonstrable threat to human safety or to lawfully present livestock, guard dogs, crops, beehives, or other personal property." Similarly, lethal takings are allowed under 4(d) if "the taking is done in a humane manner by authorized federal, state, or Tribal authorities, and in accordance with current interagency guidelines covering the taking of grizzly bears involved in conflict." The only difference between these allowed takings being that under the 10(j) regulation the FWS could offer prior written authorization to a private individual to take a nuisance bear.

The additional takings allowances offered by the 10(j) proposed management are not substantively different from the takings allowed under 4(d) management with the exception that they may offer more opportunities for unnecessary takings of grizzly bears. 4(d) management offers all the same necessary takings allowances for self-defense, scientific study, and removal of nuisance bears without unnecessary takings exemptions that would threaten the long-term health and viability of what would be a fledgling population. The third and fourth statements of purpose and need for action for this DEIS are worth evaluating in the context of allowed takings found in Alternative C:

- Enhance the probability of long-term survival of grizzly bears in the NCE and thereby contribute to overall grizzly bear recovery through redundancy in multiple populations and representation in a variety of habitats.
- Support the recovery of the grizzly bear to the point where it can be removed from the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife.²⁴

Considering that Alternative C offers more takings allowances for the grizzly beyond the practical and necessary allowances for self-defense, scientific research, and removal of nuisance bears, compared to Alternative B Alternative C does not "enhance the probability of long-term survival of grizzly bears in the NCE" or "support the recovery of the grizzly bear" to the point of delisting. Additionally, looking back on the goals of the ESA encapsulated in the definitions section, "The terms "conserve", "conserving", and "conservation" mean to use and the use of all methods and procedures which are necessary to bring any endangered species or threatened species to the point at which the measures provided pursuant to this Act are no longer necessary..."²⁵ Similarly to the Purpose and Need statement in this DEIS, it is unlikely that in comparison to Alternative B that Alternative C uses 'all methods and procedures' to ultimately

delist the species.

3) FWS Should Support Alternative B Over Alternative C, And Designate Critical Habitat for Grizzly Bears in the NCE

Background on Critical Habitat Designation

A "critical habitat" designation protects specific areas inside and outside the geographical region occupied by the threatened species if it is necessary for the conservation of the species.²⁶ Under ESA Sec 4 (3)(B), once a species is listed and a petition is filed, the agency is required to consider designation of the species' critical habitat within one year.²⁷ The Act states that "critical habitat may be established for those species now listed as threatened or endangered species for which no critical habitat has heretofore been established as set forth in subparagraph (A) of this paragraph."²⁸ Under §4(b)(2) of the ESA, the Secretary shall designate critical habitat: On the basis of the best scientific data available and after taking into consideration the economic impact, the impact on national security, and any other relevant impact, of specifying any particular area as critical habitat. The Secretary may exclude any area from critical habitat if he determines that the benefits of such exclusion outweigh the benefits [of the critical habitat] ... unless he determines, based on the best scientific and commercial data available, that the failure to designate such area as critical habitat will result in the extinction of the species concerned.²⁹

Section 7 of the ESA notably requires federal agencies to ensure that their actions are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of a species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of the critical habitat of such species.³⁰

Concurrent with an agency's decision to list a species, the Secretary is required "to the maximum extent prudent and determinable" to issue regulations "designat[ing] any habitat of such species which is then considered to be critical habitat."³¹ The duty to designate critical habitat concurrently with a species listing was added to the ESA in 1978.³² Congress excused species that were already listed from this requirement, allowing designation of critical habitat, but not requiring it.³³ Grizzly bears were a previously listed species, and thus do not require listing of critical habitat.³⁴ Currently, USFWS lists 825 final critical habitats, with the grizzly bear noticeably absent.³⁵

FWS Has Continuously Failed to Designate Critical Habitat for Grizzly Bears, and Should Designate Critical Habitat in the NCE if it is Serious About Recovery

Under Alternative C, the Service's preferred alternative, FWS would designate grizzly bears in the US portion of the NCE and surrounding areas as a 10(j) nonessential experimental population (NEP) under section 10 of the ESA.³⁶ FWS claims that "designation of grizzly bears released into the US portion of the NCE, including their offspring, as a NEP would provide state, federal, and Tribal agencies with greater management flexibility should conflict situations arise."³⁷ As noted in FWS' related proposed rule on grizzly bear reintroduction, Section 10(j)(2)(C)(ii) of the ESA states that critical habitat shall not be designated for any experimental population that is determined to be nonessential, and accordingly FWS cannot designate critical habitat in areas where it establishes an NEP.³⁸ While designating critical habitat is barred in the NCE if the grizzly bear is reintroduced as an experimental population, under Alternative B, no such prohibition exists, and management would be consistent with existing ESA section 4(d) rules governing regulation of grizzly bears in the lower 48 states.³⁹ Designation of critical habitat

is an important step to species recovery that has continuously been neglected for grizzly bears for decades, and FWS should promote Alternative B, as this would allow the Service to designate critical habitat for grizzly bears in the NCE, which would be beneficial to their successful reintroduction to the area.

While the plan to reintroduce grizzly bears to the NCE is admirable in many respects, FWS' historic reluctance to designate critical habitat for grizzly bears appears to be at odds with the ESA's overarching goal of successfully recovering populations. The USFWS proposed critical habitat for the grizzly bear in 1976 but the designation was never finalized.⁴⁰ 47 years later, the agency still has not designated critical habitat for grizzly bears. While the recovery of grizzly bears in the NCDE and the GYE in the past few decades is a positive development, the fact that there is still no critical habitat designation puts the species' ability to fully recover and eventually be delisted in jeopardy.

FWS has undertaken previous efforts to establish areas for grizzly bear recoveries, including the nationwide Grizzly Bear Recovery Plan, which was finalized in 1982 and updated in 1993.⁴¹ A key part of this plan directed recovery efforts at establishing viable populations in six recovery areas in four states where the grizzly bear was known or believed to exist when listed in 1975 (including the NCE).⁴² The plan went as far as to outline criteria specific to each recovery zone to gauge grizzly bear recovery, including population size, sex ratio, number of females with cubs, mortality limits, and geographical distribution within the recovery zone.⁴³ Despite this extensive plan, FWS has limited recovery to the four ecosystems where grizzly bear populations survived when the species was first listed, and has never designated critical habitat in these areas. The Forest Service has also only enacted habitat protections, such as caps on road density, in national forests within the same four ecosystems.⁴⁴ FWS identified the NCE as one of the recovery zones under the plan, but has failed to take actions to restore populations in the area (outside of the current reintroduction plan). It is worth noting that the last confirmed sighting of a grizzly bear in the American portion of the NCE occurred in 1996.⁴⁵ FWS' failure to designate critical habitat in the NCE may not have led to the grizzly bear's extirpation in the area, but it also could not have helped. Recovery efforts are admirable, but recovery plans like the NCE grizzly restoration plan are a last gasp effort of sorts, which aim to bring back locally extinct species after the damage has been done. A wiser decision going forward for FWS would be to designate critical habitat for grizzly bears, which could eliminate the need for future reintroduction efforts.

In *Fund for Animals v. Babbitt*, FWS claimed before that critical habitat designation would be redundant, due to designated recovery zones that are comparable to critical habitat.⁴⁶ FWS also argued that critical habitat areas would likely be smaller than recovery zones and could harm grizzly bear populations more than it might help them.⁴⁷ The Service notably explained in *Babbitt* that its grizzly management regime had achieved social acceptance and that designating critical habitat could lead to a backlash that would jeopardize recovery.⁴⁸ This last argument seems to form the basis for much of FWS' grizzly management policy over the past few decades. FWS' choice not to designate critical habitat in *Babbitt* may have been partially based on science, but per FWS' own admission, it was also based on its perceived social acceptability. Much of FWS' current decision-making with regards to reintroducing grizzly bears as an NEP also appears to be based on social acceptability, as opposed to scientific evidence.⁴⁹ Ultimately, such a decision to not designate critical habitat may not be arbitrary or capricious, but it also appears to limit the potential for grizzly bear populations to successfully recover in a reasonable amount of time.

The NCE is an Ideal Location To Designate Critical Habitat for Grizzly Bears

Noah Greenwald, the director of the Endangered Species program at the Center for Biological Diversity, has noted that grizzly bears' "need for large undeveloped areas, wide distribution, and [their] danger to people make them one of the most difficult and contentious

species to recover under the ESA.⁵⁰ While these criteria may severely limit potential grizzly bear recovery areas, the NCE fits the bill and is an ideal location for critical habitat designation for grizzly bears. As noted in the DEIS, The NCE is comparable in size to Vermont and encompasses approximately 9,800 square miles, or 6.1 million acres.⁵¹ The recovery area is 85% federal land, 8% local lands (including state parks and Department of Natural Resources lands), and 7% private lands.⁵² Additionally, as seen below in Figure 1, portions of the NCE already serve as designated critical habitat for several species, including the Northern Spotted Owl, the Canada Lynx, the Bull Trout, and the Marbled Murrelet.⁵³ While none of these species has designated critical habitat that encompasses the entire NCE, collectively their critical habitats make up much of the area for proposed grizzly bear reintroduction. This is relevant information that FWS should have made available itself.

Figure 1. Northern Spotted Owl, Canada Lynx, Bull Trout, and Marbled Murrelet Critical Habitat in the Blue-Outlined NCE Area (Approximate)⁵⁴
[FIGURE PRESENT]

While FWS may claim that designating critical habitat would be redundant, as it is already planning on designating the NCE as a recovery zone for grizzly bears, it is important to highlight that consultation would not be required in much of the NCE, which could threaten the potential for grizzly bear recovery in the area. As the DEIS notes, Section 7 consultation provides valuable tools to conserve listed species, assist with species recovery, and help protect critical habitat, by mandating that all federal agencies consult with the FWS on proposed federal actions that may affect a listed species.⁵⁵ Consultation is required for any threatened or endangered species that could be affected by an agency's action, but is not required for designated 10(j) NEP populations, except where species are found in the national park system and national wildlife refuge system lands.⁵⁶ Within a national park system or wildlife refuge system lands, NEPs are treated as a threatened species for the purposes of consultation, and consultation requirements under section 7(a)(2) apply to these lands.⁵⁷ In the case of the NCE, the North Cascades National Park complex makes up 11% of the recovery area, and there are no national wildlife refuge system lands in the ecosystem.⁵⁸ This means that section 7 consultation would not be required in 89% of the designated recovery area in the NCE, which is troubling. Even if grizzly populations in the GYE and the NCDE were listed as 10(j) populations, they would still likely receive more protections than the proposed NCE population, as the GYE and the NCDE are both made up of a larger percentage of national parks than the NCE.⁵⁹ Many reasons have been spelled out for why critical habitat designation would be valuable for grizzly bears in the NCE, and this is yet another.

It is clear that FWS has the ability to designate critical habitat for threatened species when it desires to, begging the question why the Service refuses to do so for the grizzly bear. FWS shirks this duty by pointing to the grizzly bear's proposed status as a 10(j) nonessential experimental population (NEP), thereby abdicating its responsibility or ability to designate critical habitat. While the threat of conflict with bears is a real risk, education and programmatic opportunities could reduce such risks and negate the need for FWS to designate the bears as experimental populations. This could allow for critical habitat designation which would help population recovery in the long-term.

4) FWS Should Promote Educational Efforts That Inform Recreationists of the Dangers of Human-Bear Conflict, and Should Promote Programs to Support Ranchers

Background on Human-Grizzly Conflict

It is first worth mentioning that grizzly bear attacks on humans are rare, and fatal ones are even rarer, accounting for just 14% of attacks.⁶⁰ There is much news coverage of bear attacks, but in Yellowstone National Park, where one of the largest grizzly bear populations exists, a grizzly bear attack occurs once for every 2.7 million visits to the park.⁶¹ Additionally, as noted in the DEIS, the NCE's lower level of visitation than Yellowstone, and its lower population density of grizzly bears is expected to result in far fewer potential injuries and fatalities during both the primary and adaptive management phases.⁶² The reintroduction of a small number of grizzly bears to the NCE carries obvious risks, as there is ample opportunity for backcountry activities in areas where the bears will be reintroduced. However, through educational programming on human-bear coexistence and efforts to provide bear protection to recreationists, as well as creative concepts like compensation funds and the use of livestock guard dogs for ranchers, grizzly bears can successfully be reintroduced to the area with minimal issues.

The Threat of Human-Bear Conflict in the NCE is Slight

The proposed population of grizzly bears to be reintroduced to the NCE is small, and the threat of conflict to humans is minimal. The DEIS has a stated plan of releasing 3 to 7 bears per year at multiple sites over 5 to 10 years to achieve an initial population of 25 bears, with the hopes of achieving an eventual population of 200 bears in the next 60-100 years.⁶³ The CYE and Selkirk Ecosystem populations are useful comparisons of ecosystems with relatively small populations of grizzly bears, with 55-60 and 90-100 bears, respectively.⁶⁴ Combined, these two areas have bear populations that are roughly six times larger than the initial stated population of bears in the NCE, and have roughly $\frac{3}{4}$ of the desired long-term grizzly population of the NCE. As noted in the DEIS, there have been two human injuries caused by grizzly bears in the last 42 years in the CYE and Selkirk Ecosystem.⁶⁵ The threat of human-bear conflict in the NCE will not be pronounced, as the number of bears being introduced is so low to begin with. Despite the low likelihood of human-bear conflict, it is important that FWS educate visitors and locals on the risks of encountering grizzly bears.

Agencies Should Target Educational Efforts at Backcountry Recreationists

A major focus of FWS' public education efforts on grizzly bears should focus on backcountry hikers and campers. Risks are highest for visitors who explore the backcountry, with roughly one attack occurring for every 1.7 million overnight stays in the backcountry, and one for every 232,613 person travel days for hikes in the backcountry.⁶⁶ While still unlikely, an attack on hikers in the backcountry is approximately 255 times more likely than an attack on visitors who remain in developed areas of the national park.⁶⁷ As noted in the DEIS, there was a 29% increase in backcountry campers in the North Cascades National Park Service Complex in 2022, with 49,770 overnight backcountry stays recorded.⁶⁸ Taking the above human-bear conflict statistics into account, backcountry visitors are potentially the population most at risk of negative interactions with grizzly bears.

The DEIS has some language referring to requirements and educational efforts for backcountry users, but it mostly utilizes current NPS, USFS, and Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) guidelines, with language like "current backcountry campground design protocols separating food preparation/storage areas from tent pads on NPS lands would continue to be implemented," and "the WDFW would continue its efforts to educate the public about proper sanitation, as well as other best management practices to reduce conflicts with bears and other wildlife."⁶⁹ This language lacks the specificity necessary for successfully educating backcountry users on the dangers of grizzly bears. One improvement for educating backcountry recreationists would be to require all members on a permit to attend an information session on bear safety from a ranger. While the DEIS notes that visitors obtaining permits for backcountry camping in North Cascades National Park receive information about food storage, safety, and wildlife concerns, including bears, as a part of the permitting process, it is not indicated how such information is conveyed to backcountry users.⁷⁰ A useful place to look for a successful

grizzly bear educational program for backcountry users is YNP.

YNP mandates in-person information sessions for backcountry campers.⁷¹ In such sessions, backpackers are given "face-to-face verbal information about bears and bear spray from the ranger issuing the permit... [and are] required to watch a safety video containing information on hiking and camping in bear country and how to use bear spray."⁷² While pamphlets and signage may be helpful tools for educating backcountry visitors about grizzly bears, social surveys indicate that YNP visitors retain verbal information better than written information from signs or brochures.⁷³ It would also be beneficial to extend these educational sessions to day-hikers, as studies from YNP indicate that only 13% of day hikers carried bear spray, when compared to 52% of backpackers.⁷⁴ The park hypothesizes that "since a permit is not required, day hikers may not receive verbal safety information from a park ranger, may not obtain published bear safety materials, and are not required to watch the safety video containing bear safety information."⁷⁵ Such efforts could and should be applied outside of the National Park area of the NCE as well, and relevant agencies and nonprofits could provide similar information sessions. While educational efforts may be costly, they would likely reduce the risk of human-bear conflict (thereby reducing the risk of human injury and bear euthanasia), and promote the successful reintroduction of grizzly bears to the NCE.

Agencies Should Make Bear Spray Available for Groups Recreating in the NCE, And Should Install Bear Wires At Campsites

State and Federal Agencies should sell, rent, or loan bear spray to individuals recreating in the NCE, and install bear wires at campgrounds. While the DEIS mentions increased public outreach and education efforts on the proper storage of attractants and the use of bear spray, there is no mention of agencies offering to furnish bear protection for hikers themselves.⁷⁶ The DEIS notes that bear canisters are available for loan at the Wilderness Information Center in North Cascades National Park, but there is no comparable program for bear spray or bear wires.⁷⁷ Such a program for bear spray already exists in YNP, where a concessionaire rents bear spray to individuals, and is advertised on the park's website.⁷⁸ Bear wires are also an inexpensive but helpful device for hanging food away from bears at campsites, and could be installed in campgrounds with relative ease. Despite this, North Cascades National Park has no plans to install bear wires for hanging food or to make any changes to existing frontcountry or backcountry campsites.⁷⁹ If a hiker or camper reads signs or brochures on the dangers of bears once he or she has arrived at the NCE, but has nowhere to purchase or rent bear spray, or fails to obtain a bear canister, then educational efforts by agencies may be somewhat futile. National parks often sell a plethora of memorabilia and food supplies to visitors, and extensively prepare campgrounds each year, so having them sell or rent critical bear protection, and install bear wires does not seem unreasonable. This could be accomplished by NPS, USFS, or through partnership with a nonprofit or private company.

Agencies Should Partner With Local Groups Already Focused on Human-Bear Coexistence

Educational outreach efforts may be a taxing and complicated task, but agencies within the NCE would not need to reinvent the wheel and wholly design new programs themselves, and could instead partner with local organizations that already have tailored programs promoting human-bear coexistence. The DEIS mentions that "ongoing public outreach by nonprofit organizations is also likely to continue, which would promote tolerance of and coexistence with grizzly bears."⁸⁰ While these groups are likely to continue their work, with or without the help of agencies, forming partnerships with such groups would go a long way in promoting the overall goal of successful reintroduction of grizzly bears to the NCE. For instance, Home Range Wildlife Research, a Washington based organization, already has a human-bear coexistence project, and WDFW is a partner.⁸¹ Having other agencies partner with local groups that already have active community ties and educational programs on human-bear coexistence could help agencies reach

a broader base, and successfully educate more people.

FWS Should Promote Compensation Programs and Non-Lethal Preventative Approaches for Ranchers to Counter Livestock Depredation by Bears

A major concern of reintroducing grizzly bears is their impact on cattle and sheep populations, and thereby the livelihood of ranchers. Such a concern appears to have played a major part in FWS' preference for a 10(j) status for the reintroduced grizzly bears, as the Service noted that such a 10(j) status would reduce the potential costs and the operational constraints "for impacted businesses such as ranches from the presence of grizzly bear[s]."82 It is worth noting that the DEIS predicts that only between 1 and 19 cattle, and between 1 and 4 sheep once the population hits the target quantity of 200 will be killed per year by grizzly bears, and that the number would likely fall on the lower end of the range, constituting less than 0.01% of the total cattle and sheep populations in the area.83 Despite these small numbers, any deaths to cattle caused by the reintroduction of grizzly bears should be taken seriously, and FWS should make efforts to ensure that Washington's compensation program for ranchers whose livestock are killed by bears is adequately funded.84

FWS should also promote non-lethal preventative approaches for ranchers to deal with grizzly bears, like the use of livestock guard dogs (LGDs). LGDs could be useful in the NCE for ranchers, as they have been shown to suppress sheep depredation by large and small predators including grizzly bears and gray wolves (which are also located in the NCE).85 Additionally, the use of LGDs allows producers to become actively involved in protecting their livestock and promotes a nonlethal method to aid the conservation of grizzly bears.86 FWS should promote the use of LGDs to known ranchers in the area and ask relevant state agencies to do the same.

- - - -

1 Andrea L. Lyons, et al, "Spatially explicit carrying capacity estimates to inform species specific recovery objectives: Grizzly bear (*Ursus arctos*) recovery in the North Cascades," *Biological Conservation*, 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2018.03.027>.

2 Jason I. Ransom, et al, "An integrated modeling approach for considering wildlife reintroduction in the face of climate uncertainty: A case for the North Cascades grizzly bear," *Biological Conservation*, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2023.109947>

3 Id.

4 United States Fish and Wildlife Service and National Parks Service, "Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS): North Cascades Ecosystem," Department of the Interior, September 2023, p.23.

5 United States Fish and Wildlife Service, "Grizzly Bear Recovery Program 2022 Annual Report" Department of the Interior, 2022, p.8.

6 Ransom et al. 2023.

7 Wayne F. Kasworm et al, "Cabinet-Yaak Grizzly Bear Recovery Area 2022 Research and Monitoring Progress Report," U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2023.

8 "Grizzly Bear Recovery Program 2022 Annual Report," p.8.

9 Implementation of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, 43 CFR §46.30 (2008).

10 DEIS, p. ii.

11 DEIS, p. 26.

12 Endangered Species Act, 16 U.S.C. 1531-1544 §2(b) (1973).

13 id

14 16 U.S.C. 1531-1544 §3(20).

15 16 U.S.C. 1531-1544 §3(3).

16 "Grizzly Bear Recovery Program 2022 Annual Report."

17 DEIS, p. 34.

18 DEIS, p. 34.

19 United States Fish and Wildlife Service, "Grizzly Bear Hazing Guidelines: Guidance for Livestock Owners, Homeowners and the General Public," Department of the Interior, March 2020.

20 16 U.S.C. 1531-1544 §10(j).

21 DEIS, p. iv.

22 DEIS, p. 38.

23 DEIS, p. 39.

24 DEIS, p. ii.

27 16 U.S.C. §1532 (b)(6)(A)(i).

26 Fund for Animals v. Babbitt, 903 F. Supp. 96, 103 (D.D.C. 1995), amended, 967 F. Supp. 6 (D.D.C. 1997).

25 16 U.S.C. 1531-1544 §3(3)

35 "USFWS Threatened & Endangered Species Active Critical Habitat Report." Environmental Conservation Online System, October 26, 2023. <https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/report/critical-habitat>

34 Fund for Animals v. Babbitt, 903 F. Supp. 96, 104.

33 16 U.S.C. §1532(5)(B)

32 Fund for Animals v. Babbitt, 903 F. Supp. 96, 104.

31 16 U.S.C. §1533(a)(3)(A).

30 16 U.S.C. §1536(a)(2).

29 16 U.S.C. §1533(b)(2).

28 16 U.S.C. §1532 (5)(B).

39 DEIS, p. 42.

38 Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Establishment of a Nonessential Experimental Population of Grizzly Bear in the North Cascades Ecosystem, Washington State, 88 Fed. Reg. 67193 (September 29, 2023).

37 Id.

36 DEIS, p. 3.

45 Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife. "Grizzly Bear," <https://wdfw.wa.gov/species-habitats/species/ursus-arctos>.

44 Id.

43 Id.

42 Id.

41 Greenwald, Noah. "Recovery of the Grizzly Bear at the Intersection of Law and Science." *Frontiers*, June 16, 2023. <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fcosc.2023.1142991/full>.

40 88 Fed. Reg. 67193.

49 DEIS, p. 72.

48 Id.

Correspondence ID: 14610Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Chelan and Whatcom County, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: I'm number 77. I reside in Whatcom and in Chelan Counties. I'm fortunate to live in both places. I want to thank first the Forest Service for giving us the opportunity to speak tonight. I want to speak because I'm in favor of restoration, and I wanted to say that I'm also in favor of the 10-J rule. And listening to the last comments about the 10-J rule, I also think that some of those additional protections for the grizzly bear are very important. I know that we've had other wildlife conflicts in the state, wolves in particular, that have had serious issues with conflicts with ranchers. And I think that we need to really think about how we're going to protect the bears in international habitat. And I think it's important to bring them back to the North Cascades. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14611Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Marblemount, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Cascade Wagon Road Campground Business(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: My name is [REDACTED], I'm a resident of Marblemount, creator, owner, and operator of Cascade Wagon Road Campground on the Cascade River Road. I, as well as a lot of others who are not brave enough to stand up in front of everybody tonight are against this. The number one question I get in 18 years of my campground from thousands of people, "Is there bears?" "Do we have to worry about bears?" "Is there grizzlies?" Constantly I get that.

My vote is for alternative A, no action. Leave it alone. If nature wants to have the bears back in, let it do it. I am one who has witnessed grizzlies in the last handful of years. I'll give you exact locations. County Line Creek where Skagit and Whatcom County come together.

I witness this year, this summer actually, an uncollared grizzly, mature, but not adult. Also, five years ago, similar bear, Big Foot Crossing area, at the bottom of Ruby Mountain. One I did not see myself but I'm going to try to come with a picture of it tomorrow to the Darrington meeting is at the top of the Lavit (phonetic) Creek Road.

So there are bears in the area. That presents another problem from what we want. We're not supposed to introduce bears if bears are currently here. So again, I support alternative A, no action. Thank you for your time.

Correspondence ID: 14612Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Unknown, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: I've been a long-time recreational user of the North Cascades ecosystem. I also - - since a teenager, actually, have lived and worked amongst grizzly bears, starting out as a teenager back in the 70s in Montana. That's over 45 years of being amongst grizzly bears, I've been away from them for a while, but I go back frequently with my wife and hike in Montana, probably 130 miles in the last few years.

And I say all of this because I am of firm belief that humans and grizzlies can get along together. I'm living proof of that personally. But I think all you have to do is look back to the - - to Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, and know that humans and grizzlies can coexist together.

Certainly, there are some issues, but those issues can be overcome and worked out. I encourage you, when you think about conflict with grizzlies, look at what's going on back in the Rockies and how they are managed there and doing there.

I'm a strong supporter of grizzly recovery here, in favor of alternative C. I cautiously support the 10-J rule, and I'll put forth some comments inviting some concerns with it. But I'm a strong supporter of grizzly recovery here. Thanks.

Correspondence ID: 14613Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Unknown, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: All right. We're meeting here today to discuss the federal government's plan to introduce the grizzly bear species into the Cascade Mountains, specifically to the area where (inaudible.)

The federal government and the experts sitting here before us as the representatives for this plan have stated on the record that this plan reintroduces the grizzly bear species back into its historic range and that its reintroduction would have a positive effect on the ecosystem in the areas of the state.

The question becomes, Are these statements true? Although it is true that the Cascade Mountains fall into the historical range of the grizzly bear species, it is absolutely false that the Cascade Mountains are the historical habitat of the grizzly bear species.

To understand the historical habitat of the grizzly bear species, we will have to understand the difference between the modern-day western region of what is now the United States and the region 200 years ago. Two hundred years ago the area that makes up the Western United States was sparsely inhabited by roaming nomadic tribes, and the vast majority of animal biomass was either in the flatlands, valleys and prairies, and our forests had an average of 65 trees per acre.

These flatlands, lowlands, or prairies is where the grizzly bear species historical habitat is. I hate public speaking. In the moderate age, it is in those flatlands, valleys, and prairies that we have built our farms, ranches, towns, and cities, forcing the bulk of animal species into the hills and mountain forests, which are steep, rough, broken places. And the forest averages anywhere from 165 to 600 trees per acre. These mountain areas 200 years ago were almost void of large animal life. I will give here a historical count of grizzly bear habitat and behavior.

This is a historical account from a fur trapper named Zenas Leonard. "The grizzly bear is the most ferocious animal that inhabits these prairies and are very numerous. They no sooner see you than they will make at you with open mouth. If they - -

if you stand still, they will come within two or three yards of you and stand upon their hind feet and look you in the face. If you have the fortitude enough to face them, they will turn and run off. But if you turn, they will most assuredly tear you to pieces, furnishing strong proof of the fact that no wild beast, however daring, is ferocious, unless wounded, will attack the face of man." Now if you want to hear an actual account from this area and give me the time, I will give it to you.

Correspondence ID: 14614Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Skagit County, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Skagit Audubon Society Conservation/Preservation(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: My name is [REDACTED]. I live in Skagit County. As conservation chair for Skagit Audubon Society, I'm representing our 480 members who live in Skagit County.

Because we focus on protecting and restoring wildlife in its necessary habitat, restoration of the grizzly to the North Cascades is a cause we've supported for a very long time.

A number of our members, including myself, have lived, worked, hiked, and camped for years in grizzly country in Alaska, Wyoming, and Montana in areas where the density of the grizzly bear population is far higher than it will be in the North Cascades a century from now.

The National Parks Organic Act, the Wilderness Act, the Endangered Species Act will make restoring natural conditions an affirmative obligation of federal agencies. The grizzly was present in North Cascades for thousands of years and is only gone because of human actions.

It's our legal and ethical obligation to right that wrong, and Skagit Audubon supports doing so. We support alternative C with the accompanying 10-J rule. This approach to restoring grizzlies to the North Cascades is carefully planned, extremely gradual, and gives due consideration to local concerns.

We appreciate too that our spoken comments about potential impacts of helicopter use on spotted owls and marbled murrelets have been carefully addressed. We also appreciate the necessity of designating grizzlies brought to the North Cascades' ecosystem as a nonessential experimental population, and of devising the 10-J rule.

Our only concern is with the provision for livestock owners who claim losses from grizzly predation to be authorized to shoot the offending bear. Our confidence is not high that the correct bear and only that grizzly will be shot, and that any bear shot will be only wounded and then present a greater hazard.

Qualified agency biologists or other qualified employees should not only confirm the livestock loss, but also be the ones doing the lethal removal if that's determined to be the only acceptable course of action. Other than that, we support alternative C and the proposed 10-J rule. Thank you for your attention to our comments.

Correspondence ID: 14615Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Unknown, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: My name's [REDACTED] (phonetic.) I'm number 68. The - - I'm one of those that've also seen the grizzly up there last spring, working up on the pass, saw the - - saw the grizzly up at the county line road - - county - - county line between Skagit and Whatcom County, 145 East.

We have grizzlies here. We have them in a low enough population, they don't make an impact. We bring in a bunch of grizzlies, we will have an impact, just like the disaster of the wolves. When they brought them in here, we were sure that they're going to stay up there. They're not going to be down here. They were in Marblemount where I live, killing peoples' pets, killing peoples' livestock. Now they're not there anymore because people have shot them.

Those needed to go. And you guys brought them in, put them up there, they came down and caused a whole lot of problems. Grizzlies will do the same thing. I have (inaudible) where I take kids camping. When we're out, we never see a black bear because they hear the noise our kids make, and they go the other way. A grizzly gets curious. He'll come find out why. This is a dangerous thing, and it's unnecessary. Thanks.

Correspondence ID: 14616Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Whatcom County, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Good evening. Thank you for hearing our concerns. I'm here to support the restoration of grizzlies in the North - - in the North Cascades. I also support plan C including the 10-J rule. I'm Judith Akins from Whatcom County. I just wanted to let you know that I had my first hike - - I went to Glacier National Park this year, this spring, and we got to watch grizzlies up in the mountains.

And one of the hikes we went on were - - a grizzly was present right before us because I got to put my foot in his footprint, and I felt pretty safe, you know. We had our bear spray, and we had - - there was plenty of people out there hiking, and we continued to talk and wander on the - -on the trail. So I felt pretty safe in doing all the things that we were supposed to do, and I'm here.

So grizzly bears roamed across the North Cascades for thousands of years as an essential part of the ecosystem. In the 20th century, however, people hunted, trapped, and poisoned them to near extinction.

Grizzlies are one of the slowest reproducing land mammals in North America, so the sooner we begin supporting their repopulation, the better chance they have - - will have of a long-term survival.

The latest review process was with the 10-J experimental population designation. According to you, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the designation for reintroduction of the species are - - offers flexible, less restrictive management by authorities and land owners, benefitting people, property, and bears.

Redesignation of the species in North Cascades as an experimental population will allow land managers to prevent conflict before it happens and address it when it happens. Reducing and addressing conflict will help bears bounce back and help people accept them to the landscape.

I just wanted to also, you know, hearing, and your excellent signs, you know, five bears within the next few years doesn't seem to me like we're reintroducing a whole lot of bears. So I just wanted to say that also.

The 10-J map imagines future expansion of the grizzly bear population into Zone 2. This expansion could contribute to the conservation of the species as a whole and potentially create connectivity between populations if more habitat is protected and quarters are developed.

Correspondence ID: 14617Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Unknown, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Endangered Species Coalition of the Pacific Northwest Conservation/Preservation(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Hi. My name is [REDACTED], with the Endangered Species Coalition of the Pacific Northwest, representative, speaking on behalf of our 600,000 members across the U.S., our 10,000 members in Washington State, and our members that reside in this valley.

We would like to support alternative C and the 10-J rule. This alternative is in line with one of our great laws, the Endangered Species Act, which ensures recovery of threatened and endangered species. It will also bring recovery to one of our six ecosystems that need bears. Right now, four of them are occupied, and this needs to happen for the North Cascades. Grizzly bears and humans can coexist. If we look at the greater Yellowstone coalition where there's over a thousand bears and the Northern Rockies where there's over 1,000 bears, people coexist with the bears. We have seen ranchers. We have seen farmers. We have seen hikers. We have seen families coexist with these bears.

In these areas there's a robust economy with tourism, thousands of campgrounds in these areas that live with bears. Once again, please choose alternative C with the 10-J rule. Thank you for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, thank you for the National Park Service, and thank you for Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife people are here tonight.

Correspondence ID: 14618Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Unknown, WA Unknown
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,27 2023
Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Number 79. Thanks so much to the National Park Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the land managers that are here considering grizzly bear restoration in the North Cascades National Park and surrounding ecosystem. My name's Graham Taylor, and I'm commenting on behalf of myself. I did bring a few props. I've been doing the grizzly bear tour this week to all the public meetings, and I've been talking with all the folks that I've been meeting with. And I met with the front-desk person in Omak, and she said she's for the bears, but she was working and couldn't go to the public meeting. I went and talked to the front-desk person at the - - the Concrete hotel I'm staying in, and he said he's for the bears, and he notes the park that brings up so much of the tourism and industry that benefits his business. We met at the Up River Grill & Taproom today, and the owner there said he opened especially just today so that my group could go there and eat because he - - as he said, is for the bears.

There are a lot of business owners in the community that are for the bears that aren't here tonight, and I really appreciate their support. You know, I've heard a lot about substantive comments and about some comments counting more than other comments, and I just really feel like we have a problem in this country right now counting all the votes properly and equally, which I think we should do, not that this is a voting process, but I did bring a document, and I'll submit this.

This is a FOIA request from the agency about what the comments looked like in 2017. How many people commented in support? How many people commented oppose. General support for grizzly restoration had 109,000 comments. The support for alternative A at the time had 1,300 comments.

So, you know, this is a wildly supported thing that the Park Service is trying to do. People like wildlife. People go to national parks to see wildlife, to experience wildlife, and they're some of the few places left on this planet and this country where people can go to see and experience wildlife or to know that wildlife is existing there. And I think it's important that we share the landscape of wildlife because if we don't, it's just going to be us. It's going to be a pretty lonely world out there. So please move forward with alternative C. Thanks.

Correspondence ID: 14619Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Wenatchee, WA Unknown
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,27 2023
Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: My number is 74. My name is [REDACTED]. I'm from Wenatchee. I strongly support the restoration of grizzly bears to the North Cascades. I believe this is the right thing to do for ecological, cultural, legal, and ethical reasons. But if we're going to do this, we need to do everything we can to proactively reduce human bear conflicts.

The good news is we know how to do this. In recent years, several programs have been developed to create what are usually called bear smart communities that address the root causes of human bear conflicts and reduce the risk to humans and private property.

Typically, these initiatives include local organizations, agencies, local jurisdictions, individuals, and businesses that work together to reduce and eliminate garbage and other attractants that so often lead to conflict.

Unfortunately, the saying, "A fed bear is a dead bear," is too often true. We have a clean slate in the North Cascades. There are no grizzly bears here now. I suggest that before any bears are brought into the North Cascades, we must have a well organized and well funded program to eliminate attractants that would get grizzly bears into trouble.

The National Park Service and the Forest Service have been putting in bear resistant trash bins and other infrastructure to manage garbage, but more needs to be done to eliminate attractants throughout the North Cascades grizzly recovery zone and in nearby areas managed by state agencies. And we need to find resources to help local communities become bear smart.

If we're going to bring grizzly bears back to the North Cascades, and I think we should not miss the opportunity to do that, then we must make sure that we're bringing them back to a place that is safe for bears and safe for people. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14620Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Unknown, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,27 2023
Correspondence Type: Transcript
Correspondence: Good evening. My name's [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] I'm number 82, and I live nearby here.

I'm a bear specialist and ecologist, and for the last 35 years or so I've worked all over the world on different bear populations, and it's been an amazing journey, and I like to share those stories through films and podcasts and in person. And for 25 years I've lived here in Washington State and spent a lot of time in the North Cascades, and searched for grizzly bears, and been a part of the whole process for many years.

There are - - I think what is lost sometimes is the fact that there are a lot of very smart scientists in this room that have been working on this issue for decades, for a long time, that have the background information and the scientific knowledge of these bears here and in other ecosystems.

For example, Wayne is here from Idaho, from Libby (phonetic) where they've routinely put grizzly bears into the - - restored grizzly bears there and put - - put grizzly bears into the backcountry without much fanfare. And so there's a lot of expertise in a room like this.

I'm here to voice my support for grizzly bear restoration alternative C and the 10-J rule. And I think it's a wonderful opportunity for Washington State to do something, thinking about the big picture. These bears are keystone species, indicator species, and an umbrella species. Globally we've lost 78 percent of wildlife population since 1970, and I'm 55 years old. That's my lifetime we've lost nearly two-thirds of the world's wildlife.

We have an opportunity in this wild, wonderful state to do something incredibly special, and as long as we all communicate about it and collaborate with it - - about it, I think it's a - - it should be looked at in that positive opportunity - - opportunity type way in a way that respects local people, all of the perspectives out there, the indigenous tribes that have called this home for thousands of years, and the many, many people that I've spoke to over the years who are doing outreach here that support grizzly bears whole heartedly.

Thank you for your time, and thanks to all of the agencies and indigenous representatives here, you know. We appreciate your time and work on this. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 14621Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Unknown, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,27 2023
Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: My name's [REDACTED]. Some people might recognize that name as one of the founding citizens of the area. I grew up probably 10 to 20 miles from here, and I've recreated in the North Cascades for many decades. I won't get into how long that is.

I suspect with a greater than 50 percent possibility that I've seen a grizzly bear in the North Cascades roughly 15 years ago, but that's debatable. Of course, I wasn't close and did not feel threatened, however I think what this comes down to is a little bit more of a balance perspective from my part, and I'll be crude. I'll apologize in advance.

But I'll say that as long as sex is more popular than death, there's going to be more people, and those people have to live somewhere, and they want to play somewhere. And a lot of them want to play up here and camp up here, as do I. And so it comes down to me a question of conflict. And I relate that most closely to environmental justice, since I read that part of the EIS. I believe it's deficient because it did not address in this area of Whatcom County.

In fact, right now we are in part of Whatcom County, and so that's something that you should consider. The area of the North Cascades for most of my lifetime, early lifetime, a lot of the environmental economics was based on resource extraction. In fact, this area here, all that you see built here, is from resource exploitation that's funded that. That's dramatically decreased. Recreation cannot meet the same economic vitality of either environmental - - either of those two previous activities.

So I'd say in a twist of economic justice here, a balance - - I think that it's not going to bring in the search for Paddington Bear, the nice bear that's going to live next door to you is not going to do it. So I fall back to economic justice. I believe your analysis is deficient.

And I want to make one more comment in here that people should realize that if you comment on one, you should comment on both. The comments are not going to be comingled and shared between the 10-J and the guidance. So thank you for your time. Recreate safely out there, please.

Correspondence ID: 14622Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Marblemount, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: Yeah. It's [REDACTED] and my comment is I live in Marblemount. I live on the river. My concern is that any grizzly bears introduced to the areas - - area will migrate down to Marblemount because the fishing is better down there, and I think grizzlies like to fish. And my concern is I'll find a grizzly in my backyard, and I'm afraid of that. So I'm against this, and I'm against it just on the basis of I think the Forest Service or the Park Service should - -should leave the park as is and let it do what it - - what it's going to do. And that's pretty well it.

Correspondence ID: 14623Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Unknown, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,27 2023

Correspondence Type: Transcript

Correspondence: [REDACTED] concern is just that the - - the conflict with the people that live in the area, the domestic animals, that sort of thing. The population of elk and - - and deer and other wildlife seems to be majorly impacted by the introduction of grizzlies, and I think that needs to be considered a little more strongly also. Okay. I'm done.

Correspondence ID: 14624Project:112008Document:132104

Address: N/A, WA N/A
United States of America

Outside Organization: Washington Farm Bureau Non-Governmental(Official Rep.)

Received: Nov,13 2023

Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: RE: Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Establishment of a Nonessential Experimental Population of Grizzly Bear in the North Cascades Ecosystem, Washington State

To whom it may concern,

The USFWS preferred alternative is to introduce a non-essential population of bears into the NCE which acknowledges the fact that such a population is not essential for the continued existence of an endangered or threatened species.¹ On this basis, alternative B is an illegitimate action for USFWS to pursue because it is not essential for the recovery of the animal. Furthermore, the NCE is not geographically distinct from the Kettle-Granby and Stein-Nahatlatch Grizzly Populations in Canada. This makes preferred alternative C to introduce an experimental population into the NCE illegitimate by violating clear language in the ESA at 16 U.S.C. 1539 SEC. 10(j)(2). On this basis, the only lawful and appropriate action is no action.

Introductory Statements:

- There is no legitimate procedural pathway for artificial Grizzly bear recovery in the North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE).
- Federal agencies governing by executive edict are systemically resulting in statutory obligations being ignored by agencies resulting in greater regulatory burdens and unfunded mandates on small entities than necessitated by statute.²
- The Department of Interior (DOI) failed to publish this rule in its semiannual Regulatory Flexibility Agenda as required by the Regulatory Flexibility Act and Executive Order

12866. (Sec. 2)

- The proposed rule poses significant federalism implications which have not been thoroughly addressed.
- Grizzly bear recovery efforts in the NCE have a high likelihood of cumulatively imposing mandates in a manner that may displace other essential local governmental priorities.³
- It is inappropriate for the Federal/State agencies or Environmental NGOs to introduce or incentivize the dispersal of grizzly bears into any part of Washington state, particularly outside the NCE ecosystem where natural connectivity is lacking, and increased human conflict is imminent.
- The DEIS fails to adequately assess impacts on land inholdings and valid existing rights within and adjacent to the NCE as documented and requested within prior scoping documentation.⁴ (see attachment 1)
- The DEIS focuses on the impacts relating to the introductory phase and federal costs and fails to evaluate the socioeconomic costs during the post-introductory phase as bear populations grow and disperse out of the designated recovery zone.
- Introduction of zones 2 and 3 are not in the original scoping process and the effort failed to hold public meetings in those areas in the scoping process and assessment of impacts which statutorily violates the NEPA scoping process and invalidates the resulting Draft Grizzly Bear Recovery Plan and EIS.

1. Socio-economic impacts on the human environment

Studies in other states have shown that costs associated with effective mitigation of bear dispersion outside of recovery zones into unwanted regions could be roughly 1/3 the cost in comparison to the impacts and costs on the human environment associated with uncontrolled bear dispersion/presence.⁵

If bears were present in the North Cascade Ecosystem (NCE) and dispersed outside the NCE recovery zone, the mitigation should be directed at the bears, primarily by relocating the bear into the appropriate recovery zones, or in the case of a bear attacking and/or killing livestock or a person the bear should be killed.

USFWS signifies bears will be tolerated dispersing outside the NCE insofar as they remain conflict-free. This view fails to understand the fact that even where depredation is not occurring the presence of apex predators within the vicinity of confined domestic livestock grazing allotments induces stress on cattle contributing to unfavorable grazing conditions, poor nutrition, and higher risk of disease.⁶ The bottom line is that the presence of Grizzly bears around cattle even when not depredating can contribute to net losses for domestic livestock producers and agencies need to account for these losses.

As evidenced in Montana and Wyoming management within recovery zones has predominately focused on mitigating the human environment by mitigating human recreational and productive activities such as hunting, fishing, domestic livestock grazing, and roads.⁷ These impacts need to be further assessed relating to bear management within the NCE recovery zone to thoroughly balance the needs of the human environment with the natural environment.

Grizzly restoration in the GYE and NCDE demonstrates that these bears are both unpredictable and uncontrollable. Despite the vast resources spent on precautionary measures to reduce conflict, interactions between grizzlies and humans are documented to be increasing across the range, with an associated level of human mortality. Agency miscalculations and bias against the human environment have allowed the U. arctos population to expand and disperse unchecked across a 15,000 square mile area outside of the 9,600 square mile NCDE recovery area.⁸ Instead of mitigating bear dispersion and protecting domestic sheep grazing allotments from depredation within USFS rangelands and NPS systems, domestic sheep allotments are being phased out.⁹ The general conclusion of the DEIS regarding the NCE is that an increase in grizzly bear population correlates with increased potential for bear-human conflict. As the bear population increases or a bear decides to wander into the Range of Influence outside NCE into human

population areas or intersect with human use of natural resources bear-human conflict will also increase. Analysis in the present DEIS first covers the impact within the NCE and then the 7 counties that fall within the boundaries of the NCE. This range of influence also includes the gateway communities located within 20 miles of a park.¹⁰ The ROI of the NCE is isolated from larger urban centers and exists predominately in rural areas. The primary emphasis for analysis of socioeconomic impacts is on the introductory phase which establishes the 25 initial bears to be introduced into the NCE. Predictions and assessments once the grizzly bears move outside of the NCE are described in general terms.¹¹

The tone of the analysis minimizes these impacts. For example, the gateway communities have a history of tourism. Originally many of these communities relied on agriculture, timber, and mining, but have turned to tourism due to the fact the historic industries are less lucrative or available. Tourism spending associated with outdoor recreation on public lands currently supports the majority of local jobs and income in the ROI. The net cash income from farm operations in ROI is approximately half the cash farm income in the state of Washington. Timber harvest is in general decline. However, no mention is made of environmental activism which has pushed for limiting commercial activity such as mining, timber harvest, and grazing over the desire to have pristine untouched ecosystems and the associated wilderness experience. This was often achieved by identifying and listing species of concern as threatened or endangered such as the spotted owl which also created restrictions on commercial timber activity on public lands. Similarly listed anadromous fish are now creating controversy over the availability of water.

These factors are seen as a plus that support tourism in the NCE with enhanced participation of anglers and hunters since the presence of grizzly bears has not harmed the sustained participation in states like Wyoming and Montana. However, Washington state has seen the opposite. Due to the listing of the Grey Wolf as endangered, there has been a decline in available game such as mule deer and many streams and rivers have closures due to the listing of Steelhead and Chinook salmon as threatened or endangered under the ESA. The addition of another apex predator, the grizzly bear, will contribute to further access limits to the principal uses: recreation, timber, grazing, minerals, functioning watersheds, and wildlife and fish under the Federal Land Planning Management Act.

In regions 1 and 6 (Okanogan County and Pend Oreille County) USFS is managing habitat to support grizzly bears. This means that forest treatment to prevent wildfire is not permitted. Gate closures related to this habitat preservation are creating problems with illegal entry. The closures prevent forest harvest and wildfire management treatment. Any project to harvest timber in national forests is in jeopardy for implementation whether harvest is for wildfire mitigation or a timber sale. Every forest service project faces these restrictions if it involves activity on grizzly bear habitat¹².

The initiation of the 10j non-essential population will create such restrictions. The EIS must identify and articulate these impacts, the loss of revenue, access to forests, and the inability to mitigate wildfire.

Economic impacts of depredation, agricultural damages, and the general human environment are not adequately considered. Only the costs of DEIS implementation to the Services are considered in Appendix C. The primary considerations in the DEIS focus on the introductory phase and do not evaluate the effects once population goals are reached in the NCE and bears begin dispersing into zones 2 and 3 as well as the ROI around the NCE. Bears from the North Continental Divide Ecosystem and the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem have exceeded their restoration goals and are leaking outside their recovery zones into areas of human development and agricultural use of land. These factors should provide the data for economic and human-bear conflicts from bears migrating into the human environment. Without these long-term costs and a liability vs benefit analysis, the DEIS is not forthcoming with the public regarding their costs for mitigating attractants, fencing, and other defense mechanisms against bear actions. The extent of human presence and the presence of rural economics should be a factor in not introducing an apex predator like the grizzly bear. The ESA in this sense becomes an instrument to mitigate the people and limit their economic viability which can push people to leave rural areas, which has happened as economic opportunities are reduced.¹³

These effects were not considered for zones 2 and 3 and failed to include the people in those areas in the commenting process and assessment of impacts. This factor including the fact that the designated recovery zone should only be the NCE contributes to the inadequacies of the present DEIS.

2. Federalism implications

When federal actions impose costs and budgetary impacts on local governments and the private sector, those impacts must be assessed and accounted for, ensuring special consideration to small governments and private sector interests in federal regulatory actions. The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act specifically addresses this with the purpose to assist Federal agencies in their consideration of proposed regulatory actions by,

"Requiring that Federal agencies prepare and consider estimates of the budgetary impact of regulations containing Federal mandates upon State, local, and tribal governments and the private sector before adopting such regulations, and ensuring that small governments are given special consideration in that process"¹⁴

The termination of the former EIS and associated recovery plan by Secretary of Interior Bernhardt and the decision for the agencies to no longer pursue recovery of grizzly bears into the NCE was based on such special consideration of the input from local governments and considerable public opposition to such actions.¹⁵ This administration reinitiating these recovery plans and associated impacts analysis is forcing local governments, associations, and private sector interests to reallocate time and resources to address regulatory actions that were already thoroughly addressed and rightfully terminated by the federal government in response to opposition and input provided in the official record.¹⁶

These actions have a high likelihood of cumulatively imposing mandates in a manner that may displace other essential local governmental priorities.¹⁷ The Small Business Regulatory Enforcement and Fairness Act (SBREFA) amended the Regulatory Flexibility Act to require federal agencies to provide a statement of the factual basis for certifying that a rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. The SBREFA was passed in the context of Congress finding that:

"a vibrant and growing small business sector is critical to creating jobs in a dynamic economy" 5 USC 601 note Sec. 202 findings (1)

And that,

". . .small businesses bear a disproportionate share of regulatory costs and burdens. . ." 5 USC 601 note Sec. 202 findings (2).

Federal agencies governing by executive edict are systemically resulting in statutory obligations being ignored by agencies resulting in greater regulatory burdens and unfunded mandates on small entities than necessitated by statute.¹⁸ The Department of Interior (DOI) failed to publish this rule in its semiannual Regulatory Flexibility Agenda as required by the Regulatory Flexibility Act and Executive Order 12866.

Executive Order 13132 was issued to guarantee the division of governmental responsibilities between the national government and the States intended by the Framers of the Constitution, ensuring that the principles of federalism established by the Framers guide the executive departments and agencies in the formulation and implementation of policies, and to further the policies of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act. Section 1 of this order defines "Policies that have federalism implications" and refers to:

"Regulations, legislative comments or proposed legislation, and other policy statements or actions that have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government."

The current rule under this definition poses significant federalism implications which is evidenced by like-kind issues being faced with such distribution of powers and responsibilities of various levels of government in Montana, Idaho, and Wyoming. EO 13132 clarifies fundamental

federalism principles stating:

"The people of the States created the national government and delegated to it enumerated governmental powers. All other sovereign powers, save those expressly prohibited the States by the Constitution, are reserved to the States or to the people."

And that,

"The constitutional relationship among sovereign governments, State and national, is inherent in the very structure of the Constitution and is formalized in and protected by the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution."

The EO further establishes federalism policymaking criteria stating,

"There shall be strict adherence to constitutional principles. Agencies shall closely examine the constitutional and statutory authority supporting any action that would limit the policymaking discretion of the States and shall carefully assess the necessity for such action."¹⁹

DOI and USFWS have failed to adhere and comply with clear statutory obligations in the Regulatory Flexibility Act, Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Act, and Executive Order 12866, 13132, posing significant federalism implications which have not been thoroughly addressed.

Local Police Power and Protection of Private Property

We contend that nothing in the ESA, insofar as it is according to the limited and enumerated powers within the US Constitution, can supersede or impede the unenumerated reserved powers of state and local governments under the 9th and 10th amendments which are best positioned to protect the inviolable rights of the person in his life, liberty, and property.²⁰ This is especially true in relationship to apex predators straying outside of their recovery ecosystems and intruding into privately owned agricultural lands.

Public health and safety falls under the police powers of state and local governments. The doctrine of *in para materia* requires that all like-kind statutes are to be interpreted as a whole. "Statutes" Justice Frankfurter once wrote, "cannot be read intelligently if the eye is closed to considerations evidenced in affiliated statutes."²¹

"State governments have the authority and responsibility to protect the public health, safety, and welfare. This authority is an inherent attribute of State governmental sovereignty and is shared with local governments" "... Substantive due process is the constitutional doctrine that legislation must be fair and reasonable in content and designed so that it furthers a legitimate governmental objective. The doctrine of substantive due process is based on the recognition that the social compact upon which our government is founded provides protections beyond those that are expressly stated in the U.S. Constitution against the flagrant abuse of government power. *Calder v Bull*, 3 U.S. 386 (1798)."²²

Federal land use statutes²³ also reinforce the principle that police power is reserved to the State and local governments. Title 7 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA)²⁴ at 43 U.S.C. 1701, note(g)(6) states that "Nothing in this Act shall be construed as limiting or restricting the power and authority of the United States or - (6) as a limitation upon any State criminal statute or upon the police power of the respective States, or as derogating the authority of a local police officer in the performance of his duties ... on the national resource lands."²⁵

3. 10(j) Non-essential Population of Grizzly Bears in the NCE and Associated Management Zones:

The USFWS's preferred alternative is to introduce a non-essential population of bears into the NCE which acknowledges the fact that such a population is not essential for the continued existence of

an endangered or threatened species.²⁶ On this basis, alternative B is an illegitimate action for USFWS to pursue because it is not essential for the recovery of the animal. Furthermore, the NCE is not geographically distinct from the Kettle-Granby and Stein-Nahatlatch Grizzly Populations in Canada. This makes preferred alternative C to introduce an experimental population into the NCE illegitimate by violating clear language in the ESA at 16 U.S.C. 1539 SEC. 10(j)(2). On this basis, the only lawful and appropriate action is no action.

The USFWS acknowledges that NEPs are to be geographically distinct from nonexperimental populations of bears under 50 CFR 17.80.²⁷ This section emphasizes the separation of experimental populations from nonexperimental populations in the lower 48 states but says nothing of the Grizzly Bear Population Unit in British Columbia which is geographically connected with the Washington state NCE recovery area which poses statutory (16 U.S.C. 1539 SEC. 10(j)(2)) non-compliance issues with an experimental population of bears in the NCE.

The DEIS specifically states:

"FWS considered separation of the NEP from other nonexperimental populations of grizzly bears within the lower 48 states as necessary under FWS regulations (50 CFR 17.80). This separation of experimental and nonexperimental populations helps ensure that extant populations retain their protections under the ESA and that the regulations that apply to each population are clearly defined." DEIS p. 36

The USFWS goes from here to proposing management zones 1, 2, and 3. As seen in the map below, zone 1 is the primary recovery zone within the NCE. Management zone 2 is "meant to accommodate natural movement or dispersal by grizzly bears" southward through Pierce, Lewis, Yakima, Skamania, and Klickitat counties. This includes areas that butt up with the Oregon state border. Also, eastern Okanogan and Ferry counties contain portions of Zone 2. Management Zone 3 encompasses the entirety of the state except the northeastern corner. The DEIS states "grizzly bears may occur in portions of this zone." The zone is intended to provide broader management capabilities but inappropriately allows for bears to disperse and reside within the zone.

Figure 4: Alternative C Management Zones
[FIGURED ATTACHED]

The Draft EIS as shown in the map above designates virtually the whole State of Washington as a 10(j) non-essential population habitat for Grizzly bears. Yet despite this, the present DEIS confines its analysis to the North Cascades Ecosystem:

"This chapter describes the current and future conditions for those elements of the human environment (physical, natural, cultural, and socioeconomic) that would be affected by implementing the actions considered in this North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan / Environmental Impact Statement (plan/EIS). Grizzly bear restoration actions proposed in this plan/EIS would be applied within the roughly 6.1-million-acre North Cascades Ecosystem (NCE) grizzly bear recovery zone as described in the NCE chapter of the US Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) Grizzly Bear Recovery Plan (FWS 1997)."²⁸

Qualifications for recovery include a sustainable population that is able to offset some level of human-induced mortality and influences of demographic and environmental variation and reproducing bears are distributed throughout the recovery area²⁹. In this DEIS zone 1 is stated to serve as the core habitat for survival, reproduction, and disposal. As stated Zones 2 & 3 are considered dispersal zones with consideration that Zone 3 has well-developed human activity but some areas may provide habitat for the grizzly bear.

One significant problem with these planning zones is the failure to disclose these in the original scoping document resulting in misleading people to think the NCE is the recovery zone. It also contradicts the Grizzly Bear Recovery Program Report, 2022. In addition, the present DEIS is invalid for including this material without proper scoping, preparing the public, and limiting the current comment process only to the communities around the NCE. People, businesses, and communities in zones 2 and 3 were not adequately included in the current planning attempt to develop a Restoration Plan and associated DEIS, such as hosting public meetings in these regions.

The present DEIS is a statutory violation of the NEPA process. The current Restoration Plan / DEIS exceeds the intent noted in the 2022 Grizzly Bear Report where the NCE is discussed as the only recovery zone in the state of Washington. Therefore, any future planning must confine all recovery attempts to the NCE with a definition of the sustainable population for the NCE only. Allowing for the dispersal and occupancy of bears outside the NCE into zones 2 and 3 should not be permitted in any restoration efforts.

4. Southern Washington and Oregon are not documented by USFWS Grizzly Recovery Plans as an ecosystem and are therefore not a recovery zone for Grizzly Bears

The DEIS already falls significantly short of assessing impacts on land inholdings and valid existing rights within and adjacent to the NCE as documented and requested within prior scoping documentation.³⁰ The inclusion of zones 2 and 3 which presumably allows dispersion and occupancy of grizzly bears southward and eastward, broadens cumulative and indirect impacts to at least 6 other counties outside and beyond adjacency to the NCE ecosystem which has not been quantified and assessed in a cost-benefit context.

USFWS has longstanding maps of 6 grizzly bear ecosystems³¹ which do not include southern Washington or Oregon. There is no population of bears South of the NCE region and therefore no basis for connectivity. Furthermore, not being within an established ecosystem/recovery zone, there is no basis for managing habitat for grizzly bears. Zone 2 south of the NCE is inappropriate and exceeds USFWS regional responsibilities for the recovery of grizzlies.

[FIGURE HERE]

Further, because Experimental populations must be geographically distinct from non-experimental populations of bears, zone 2 east of the NCE is also inappropriate for USFWS to prioritize and allow dispersion and occupancy of bears within this region. We strongly oppose any permits, proposals, or other efforts by Federal/State agencies or Environmental NGOs to introduce or incentivize the dispersal of grizzly bears into any part of Washington state, particularly outside the NCE ecosystem. There should be no distributional objectives outside the NCE where natural connectivity is lacking, and increased human conflict is eminent.

5. ESA considerations

As stated, the preferred alternative for an experimental population acknowledges this process is not necessary for the recovery or conservation of the species. USFWS has no justifiable basis to introduce grizzlies into the NCE itself, let alone allow for dispersal and occupancy of zones far outside the recovery zone. The ESA does not provide a rational basis for allowing dispersion of dangerous apex predators outside of recovery zones into unwanted regions especially when conditions for recovery of the species have already been met.

If a species is stable throughout a significant portion of its range, agencies have no rationale under the ESA to allow the dispersion and/or introduction of any dangerous species into a region not classified as an ecosystem, and therefore not a recovery zone for the species.

Endangered Species are defined in the ESA as:

The term "endangered species" means any species which is in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range other than a species of the Class Insecta determined by the Secretary to constitute a pest whose protection under the provisions of this Act would present an overwhelming and overriding risk to man.

Threatened Species are defined in the ESA as:

The term "threatened species" means any species which is likely to become an endangered species within the foreseeable future throughout all or a significant portion of its range.

The potential loss of human life, livestock depredation, and increased regulatory costs to local governments are exacerbated by what is an unnecessary introduction of an apex predatory species.

6. Conclusion

There is insufficient rationale for initiating a new scoping process and the resulting Draft

Restoration Plan and EIS. The Secretary of the Interior, David Bernhardt terminated the EIS process for restoring grizzly bears in the NCE32 due to the socioeconomic impacts and local response to the introduction. The DEIS provides no new scientific information that contradicts previous comments that the grizzly bear should be delisted. The non-essential experimental population, preferred alternative C tacitly admits that the introduction of the U. arctos into the NCE is not necessary for the survival of the species.

The main rationale of the DEIS is to offer the 10(j) non-essential experimental population as a means to address objections and concerns people have about bear management, especially in situations involving bear-human interactions. However, a comparison of the two management options reveals a common problem: the private property owner, rancher, farmer, individual or business must experience the conflict, threat, depredation, and property damage before action is taken. Action taken is also predicated on proper deterrence or removal of attractants and protection of livestock through electrified fencing. The DEIS does not adequately account for such socioeconomic impacts and costs. This criticism is exasperated due to the expanded recovery-dispersion zones 2 and 3. The NPS and FWS will be recreating the situations that led to the diminishment and extirpation of the Grizzly Bear while expecting the human population to live with these circumstances.

Based on issues and conflicts identified in these comments, initial scoping comments, and substantive comments on the former DEIS we strongly recommend the no action alternative A. We appreciate the opportunity to inform this process and hope to see USFWS responsive to our concerns and recommendations.

Attachment I
Table Identifying Inadequate Response to Scoping Comments

1)

Issue:

USFWS proceeded with NCE Grizzly bear introduction process without responding to State petitions to delist. USFWS was 7 months late in meeting statutory response requirements to 3 state petitions to delist the Grizzly bear under the ESA. USFWS rejected Idaho's petition to delist the bear in the lower 48 states and is now proceeding to establish an experimental population of Grizzlies into the NCE.

Statement:

On December 17, 2021 The Governor of Montana issued a petition to FWS to delist the distinct population segment of U. arctos in NCDE

On January 10, 2022 the State of Wyoming issued a similar petition to delist U. arctos in the GYE

On March 9, 2022 the State of Idaho issued a petition to delist U. arctos across the Lower 48 United States

Idaho on November 17, 2022 issued a letter to Martha Williams of FWS urging the timely processing of their petition and meet the 90 day deadline.

USFWS responded Feb. 6th 2023 and will consider Montana and Wyoming petitions but rejected the Idaho petition.

"The response is seven months late, and it took a threat of legal action from the State of Idaho to simply receive a response," Governor Little said in a prepared statement. "While we continue to evaluate the decision from (the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service), this is another example of federal overreach and appears to have a disproportionate impact on North Idaho."

Reference:

See - J.R. Carlson at. el. - A
Statutory, Policy and Technical
Analysis and Alternatives For

Inclusion in the Scoping and EIS
North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly
Bear Restoration Plan - (Dec. 13th
2022) p. 5, 6, and attachment A,
Alternative 3 Table.
notice_intent_sue_grizzly_2-2-
2023_final.pdf (idaho.gov
Federal Register :: Endangered and
Threatened Wildlife and Plants; 90-
Day Findings for Three Petitions To
Delist the Grizzly Bear in the
Lower-48 States

- - -

2)

Issue:

The 10j experimental population is
inappropriate and fails to meet
procedural requirements.

Statement:

The ESA does not provide a rational basis for the introduction of *U. arctos* into the NCE when the conditions for recovery are met, as the present species is stable throughout a significant portion of its range.

10(j) process may only be used when the proposed 10(j) experimental population would be geographically isolated from existing populations. The WA NCE is not geographically distinct from Grizzly Bear Population Units in British Columbia. The Secretary of the Interior has not adequately determined through regulatory processes that an experimental population would further conservation of the species.

There is no evidence in the public record that the NCE proposal would significantly further the conservation of *U. arctos*. (No new data or science is noted in the Federal Register notice from the two years since the former EIS was terminated).

Reference:

Okanagan County Code

18.04.080(C)(4)

See - J.R. Carlson at. el. - A

Statutory, Policy and Technical

Analysis and Alternatives For

Inclusion in the Scoping and EIS

North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly

Bear Restoration Plan - (Dec. 13th

2022) p. 8, 9, and attachment A,

Alternative 2 Table.

California v. Bernhard, 472

F.Supp.3d 573 "While the

Executive branch holds the power

to issue executive orders, an agency

cannot flip-flop regulations on the

whims of each new administration."

16 U.S.C. 1539 SEC. 10(j)(2)(B)

16 U.S.C. 1539 SEC. 10(j)(2)(C)(i)

16 U.S.C. 1539 SEC. 10(j)(2)

- - -

3)

Issue:

The proposal conflicts with recreational access such as the Pacific Northwest National Scenic Trail.

Further the proposal will adversely impact most recreational pursuits in the NCE once a population of bears is established.

Statement:

The issue is recreational user safety as the trail bisects the NCE and associated federal lands.

USFWS in the Draft EIS propose permitting recreational uses in the NCE to mitigate potential human bear conflict. But the administrative costs and impacts on the thousands of recreational pursuits into the NCE is not adequately assessed. Such permitting requirements would inhibit public access and significantly increase costs and personnel of the agency tasked with permitting.

Reference:

See - J.R. Carlson at. el. - A
Statutory, Policy and Technical
Analysis and Alternatives for
Inclusion in the Scoping and EIS
North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly
Bear Restoration Plan - (Dec. 13th,
2022) p. 9, 10, 13

- - -

4)

Issue:

The NOI and resulting EIS violates the Federal Data Quality Act and Peer Review

Statement:

After the Termination of the EIS process by the Secretary Of Interior, the Services have issued the proposal again to reintroduce grizzlies into the NCE without citing any new science that justifies this action. The only substantive new information introduced is the recommendation to delist. The NOI violates the Data Quality Act

Reference:

See - J.R. Carlson at. el. - A
Statutory, Policy and Technical
Analysis and Alternatives for
Inclusion in the Scoping and EIS
North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly
Bear Restoration Plan - (Dec. 13th,
2022) p. 10, 11

- - -

5)

Issue:

NEPA considerations are insufficient
The DEIS acknowledges that human bear "encounters" will likely increase and deter some people from recreating but fails to take a hard look at the nature of these encounters and to assess costs and impacts to the human environment including the inestimable cost of human life and safety (evidenced by issues faced in Idaho, Montana, Wyoming and portions of Canada).

Statement:

The actual introduction of grizzly bears into the NCE will have indefinite cumulative effects. The Agencies have focused on unlikely impacts during the introductory phase, but has not done due diligence on the secondary phase when bears populate and disperse within and outside of the NCE recovery zone. Analysis must include all impacts that will likely occur in the future and impacts on the human environment must be interpreted and assessed comprehensively.

Reference:

A central purpose of an EIS is lost "if consideration of the cumulative effects of successive interdependent steps is delayed until the first step has already been taken." *Thomas v. Peterson*, 753 F.2d 754,761 (9th Cir. 1984).

See - J.R. Carlson at. el. - A Statutory, Policy and Technical Analysis and Alternatives for Inclusion in the Scoping and EIS North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan - (Dec. 13th, 2022) p. 11, 12, Attachment A, and Attachment B Fatal Grizzly Bear Attacks on Humans in North America 2010 - 2022

6)

Issue:

The NCDE is a comparative recovery zone to the NCE. It appears USFWS failed to utilize actual data from the

NCDE to assess the cumulative and indirect impacts that result when bear populations and dispersion increase. Agency predictive methodologies have been unreliable for these purposes and have allowed extensive population and dispersion rates way outside of initial recovery areas.

Statement:

The NCDE foretell multiple layers of regulation for the public around the NCE who will be liable for fines and penalties if found in noncompliance in responding to bear problems. Even if ESA protection are absent, the regulatory mechanism and conservation framework will continue. The cost for these controls must be quantified for the NCE.

Grizzly restoration in the GYE and NCDE demonstrates that U. arctos is both unpredictable and uncontrollable. Despite the vast resources spent on precautionary measures to reduce human/bear conflict, interactions between U. arctos and humans is on the increase, with an associated level of human mortality.

Reference:

See - J.R. Carlson at. el. - A Statutory, Policy and Technical Analysis and Alternatives for Inclusion in the Scoping and EIS North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan - (Dec. 13th, 2022) p. 13, 14, and Attachment B. Bear Biologist [REDACTED] says grizzlies have nearly doubled their original range in the NCDE, and expanded faster than FWP predictions, leading to an increase in livestock depredations along the eastern edge of the ecosystem. The estimated occupied range for the NCDE grizzly bear population is almost 25,000 square miles, which is a 42% increase from what was estimated in 2004, and it's a 25% increase from what was estimated in 2010. Montana Wool Growers Want More Funding For Livestock Depredation Investigations / Montana Public Radio (mtpr.org)

- - -

7)

Issue:

Depredation and bear presence will have Socioeconomic Impact that must be addressed:

- a. Flawed Predictive Models
- b. The Taxpayer will bear the burdens from depredation.
- c. Takings implications

- d. Public Health and safety
- e. There are significant inholdings and lands within the NCE.

Statement:

a. FWS predictive models for bear reproduction and dispersion rated far exceeded projection in GYE and NCDE. In contrast the preference for seclusion and the measures to reduce contact and interactions with humans, the bears area both unpredictable and uncontrollable. The concept that NCE bears will be less carnivorous than GYE grizzlies due to feeding habits will translate into less depredation is blue sky reasoning. Depredation will increase with bear population.

b. Fiscal loss to the property owner, crops and livestock will be transferred to the tax-payer. The cost should not be considered mitigation measures, but just compensation for property takings and damages. The level of the expenses of all impacts must be accounted for in the EIS.

c. The Presidential Executive Order 12630 requires federal agencies to analyze the economic effects or takings implication in proposed policies, decision, rule and regulation on private property and rights. EO 12620 also directs administrative agencies to assess the potential takings of private property under the 5th & 14th Amendments.

d. This area is under the jurisdiction of the police powers of state and local governments. The NCE introduction of grizzly bears has federalism implications that will substantially override the inherent attribute of State governmental sovereignty which is also shared by local governments in Washington State

e. These inholdings ae significant State and federal lands within and adjacent to the NCE recovery area. Introduction of the grizzly bear has huge takings issues with access and use of private forest lands, private property, limitations on recreational and personal freedom to use property or recreate on public lands and may restrict forest management practice and wildfire mitigation. Government decision makers are to carefully evaluate the effect of their administrative, regulatory and legislative action on constitutionally protected property rights. For purposes of this current DEIS any decision to introduce bears into the NCE must be associated with a comprehensive cost benefit analysis addressing all the concerns and items within this table and prior scoping documents.

Reference:

EO 13132

EO-12630

See - J.R. Carlson at. el. - A

Statutory, Policy and Technical

Analysis and Alternatives for

Inclusion in the Scoping and EIS

North Cascades Ecosystem Grizzly

Bear Restoration Plan - (Dec. 13th,

2022) p. 16, 17, and Attachment A
Alternative 3 Conflicts with
Existing Law

Attachment II
A Statutory, Policy and Technical Analysis and Alternatives For
Inclusion in the Scoping and EIS

Correspondence ID: 14625Project:112008Document:132104
Address: N/A, ID N/A
United States of America
Outside Organization: State of Idaho, Governor's Office of Species Conservation and Idaho Department of Fish and
Game State Government(Official Rep.)
Received: Nov,13 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Comments on Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/EIS, North Cascades Ecosystem
By the State of Idaho, Governor's Office of Species Conservation
and Idaho Department of Fish and Game
Submitted November 13, 2023

Idaho has invested considerable resources in grizzly bear conservation. Idaho has participated in the Interagency Grizzly Bear Committee (IGBC) and on-the-ground management and monitoring efforts in our state for decades. We do not oppose the principle of restoration of a symbolic grizzly bear population for social and ecological purposes in North Cascades National Park, associated federally designated wilderness, and adjacent British Columbia. We do, however, object to misapplying the 10(j) provisions of the ESA to do so. As indicated by our scoping comments for preparation of the draft EIS, use of the ESA's 10(j) provisions for restoration of a small grizzly bear population in the North Cascades is not appropriate as a matter of law or as a matter of science.

We do not understand why USFWS and NPS ignored our scoping comments and did not consider a reasonable, lawful alternative to an arbitrary ESA 10(j) listing: restoration in North Cascades National Park (or adjacent federally designated wilderness) in coordination with state authorities without ESA-listed status. Grizzly bears are protected as a state endangered species in Washington

It does not help social acceptance for grizzly bears in Idaho to misapply ESA protections and ESA recovery resources to the North Cascades. We incorporate by reference Idaho's delisting petition , which describes why the current lower-48 listed entity for grizzly bear is a non-species and should be delisted.

The alternative for restoration as a 10(j) nonessential experimental population in most of Washington state is a ready illustration of the merits of Idaho's petitioned delisting of the current listed entity. The draft EIS does not clearly identify what ESA "species" being recovered. The draft EIS should clearly identify grizzly bear as subspecies belonging to the brown bear species taxon, neither of which is ESA-listed. ESA protections may only apply to taxonomic species, subspecies and distinct population segments (of vertebrate taxa) that interbreed when mature. See 16 U.S.C. §1532(16). There is not a connection between the 10(j) nonessential experimental population and an entity qualifying as a DPS under the ESA.

The spatial extent of the grizzly bear subspecies is over 55,000 individuals and distributed across a range exceeding 1.7 million square miles, from the Northern Rocky Mountains of the United States through western Canada to Alaska. USFWS' 2016 SSA Framework indicates that resiliency is measured at the population level, representation at the species (biological) and possibly, population level, and redundancy is measured at the species level. The draft EIS muddles this analysis.

The draft EIS does not - and cannot -explain what "distinct population segment" of grizzly bears this 10(j) nonessential

experimental population is supposed to support the recovery of, or under what criteria it will determine that "species" is recovered, or how the entirety of that entity could be delisted in the future. The ESA does not provide a basis for an untethered nonessential experimental population to be subject to perpetual ESA protection. Yet, that is what the 10(j) alternative would do, creating an ESA limbo status for an anticipated 60 to 100 years or more.

USFWS cannot reconcile its 10(j) alternative for a nonessential experimental population for the North Cascades with the structure of the ESA. The ESA is not supposed to provide perpetual federal protection when it is not biologically necessary for continuation of taxonomic (biological) species. USFWS cannot reconcile this proposal with its 1996 DPS policy, which is supposed to further Congress' intent to provide ESA protections to "distinct population segments" "sparingly," and ensure that ESA protections be reserved for populations that are distinct and significant to the taxon (i.e., biological species or subspecies). 61 Fed. Reg. 4,722-5 (1996).

The draft EIS recognizes that from 1990 to 2022 USFWS identified that the North Cascades grizzly bear population was warranted-but-precluded for uplisting to endangered. However, the draft EIS does not appear to recognize that this ESA status could only lawfully apply to the North Cascades if the population were itself a stand-alone DPS (because it is not a taxonomic species or subspecies).

The draft EIS reflects that USFWS considers the North Cascades population to be functionally extirpated (i.e., it is not a population). The draft EIS continues to refer to the geography of the North Cascades in the United States and Canada as distinct and isolated from other grizzly bear populations. USFWS has identified 3 populations within male dispersal distance of the North Cascades restoration area, and those populations are all in British Columbia. This setting indicates that the North Cascades does not align with any other portion of the listed "lower-48" entity to constitute a DPS.

The draft EIS also describes that achievement of a restored isolated population size of 200 grizzly bears in the North Cascades would be "self-sustaining" (see Elements Common to All Action Alternatives). This and similar descriptions of the "3R" benefits of a population of a restored isolated population for the North Cascades is inconsistent with the recovery criteria USFWS has applied to occupied recovery zones, including Greater Yellowstone.

The proposed action and preferred alternative imply at least 60-100 years of ESA protections to support a restoration objective of 200 grizzly bears and a carrying capacity of 200-300 grizzly bears. These population sizes are below the minimum population size of 500 grizzly bears that USFWS has identified for short-term genetic fitness (USFWS 2022 Species Status Assessment, p. 80; see also Franklin 1980) and a self-sustaining population.

USFWS is not applying the same framework to the North Cascades population that it is applying to its requirements for delisting populations like the GYE. The restored North Cascades population of 200 (or even 300) does not attain a size, distribution, ecology, or genetic fitness to meet USFWS' current delisting requirements. Nor does a potentially restored North Cascades population present resiliency, representation, or redundancy significant from the overall perspective of the widely distributed, 55,000+ grizzly bear subspecies, or the more extensive brown bear species (taxon). The restored population size is not one that meets USFWS criteria for independent viability or self-sustainability. For potential delisting of Greater Yellowstone, USFWS has made clear 500 is a minimum population threshold and that population goals must be "well above" this threshold. See USFWS 2022 Species Status Assessment, p. 80; see also the Conservation Strategies for the NCDE and GYE.

Federal attorneys recently told a federal judge in Wyoming that USFWS needed until July 31, 2024 to make a "legally and scientifically sound decision" related to a "12-month" determination that it was required under the ESA to make by January 2023 for the petitioned delisting of Greater Yellowstone grizzly bears. At the same time USFWS seeks to further prolong its review processes before delisting the GYE and NCDE recovery areas, it has speedily prepared and issued a draft EIS that indicates that the GYE and NCDE are appropriate source populations for the restoration. The draft EIS describes the GYE and NCDE as healthy and removal of grizzly bears for relocation to the North Cascades would not affect their population viability. This inconsistency in criteria and approach undermines trust that is essential in conservation efforts that involve interagency cooperation and social tolerance.

At the recent meeting on the North Cascades Subcommittee of the IGBC, USFWS and NPS indicated a driver for accelerated consideration of a 10(j) proposal for the North Cascades is the potential for Canadian Provincial or First Nation authorities to

reintroduce grizzly bears into the small isolated portion of the North Cascades in British Columbia, an area not part of the current grizzly bear listed entity. Even if that were to occur, the 1996 DPS policy does not support providing ESA protections to individual reintroduced grizzly bears straying southward to the United States in the North Cascades; these isolated reintroduced individuals are not part of a distinct population segment sufficiently significant to qualify as species to which ESA protections may apply (See 1996 DPS Policy's explanation of "significance").

It is also inappropriate for the USFWS and NPS to proceed with a preferred alternative that devotes ESA personnel and fiscal resources at the expense of the performance of USFWS' responsibilities in areas that grizzly bears currently occupy in Idaho and adjacent states. In other communications with Idaho concerning USFWS' inability to complete documents, meet monitoring expectations, or support conflict management, USFWS has repeatedly cited limitations on its personnel and fiscal resources.

While Appendix C of the draft EIS provides budget figures and personnel numbers for restoration, it is implausible that USFWS' fiscal and personnel challenges regarding areas that grizzly bears currently occupy will be alleviated by USFWS' undertaking reintroduction of a grizzly bear population into an area that hasn't supported them for decades. A reintroduction into the North Cascades comes with inherent responsibilities for grizzly bear monitoring, conflict management, public safety, and oversight of bear-related infrastructure. USFWS has not explained how it will perform these responsibilities without coming at further expense of the challenges it already faces in currently occupied recovery areas.

Based on the track record of litigation involving grizzly bears, and 10(j) proposals involving grizzly bear and wolves, it is also reasonable to anticipate additional litigation involving both in the 10(j) listing and in the proposed additional allowances for grizzly bear take. We incorporate by reference our December 4, 2022 scoping comments related to a pattern of litigation and administrative decision-making that has limited touted flexibility of 10(j) or 4(d) take regulations in other comparable scenarios.

The following are additional comments on specific topics.

The Proposed NEP geography

The proposed NEP geography does not align with the processes for delineation of conservation areas for other grizzly bear populations to the east (i.e., the Selkirk and the designated experimental population area for the Bitterroot ecosystem). Given our participation in the IGBC and case law related to the need for "remnant analyses" to prevent ESA listed entities from becoming legal orphans, we are especially disappointed with the lack of coordination on this point.

Again, the proper legal framework for consideration of this proposal is through federal and state authorities outside of the ESA, as a delisted restoration experiment.

The draft EIS indicates that "the proposed NEP area includes most of the State of Washington except for an area in northeastern Washington that encompasses the Selkirk Ecosystem Grizzly Bear Recovery Zone." This statement may be misinterpreted that USFWS has identified the Columbia River as the boundary of the Selkirk Recovery Zone. No such determination has been made, and the Selkirk Recovery Zone delineation remains the same in the United States as that identified in the 1993 USFWS Recovery Plan.

Over a year ago, the IGBC directed the Selkirk Cabinet-Yaak Subcommittee to proceed with finalizing a conservation strategy for the Selkirk and Cabinet-Yaak Recovery Areas, including an update of the outdated demographic criteria and completion of federal land habitat criteria. However, these efforts have only recently resumed in earnest, and are still in the initial aspects of discussion.

USFWS and USFS have also recently begun to undertake a separate EIS to consider restoration of grizzly bears in the Bitterroot Recovery Area, and are still pondering the appropriate geography to apply to the analysis. The current Experimental Population Area for the Bitterroot 10(j) rule is defined to the west by US Highway 95 (south to New Meadows and the junction of Idaho state highway 55).

Identification of the scope of the North Cascades NEP was not been coordinated with either the Selkirk/Cabinet-Yaak or the Bitterroot efforts. The delineation of the North Cascades eastern boundary appears to make unsupported assumptions about these other processes.

IDFG would tentatively propose the Pend Oreille River and Highway 95 south to I-90 as the western boundary of a Selkirk/Cabinet-Yaak population area (which includes areas of human development that is generally unsuitable for grizzly bear occupancy). However, IDFG's potential delineation assumes that the area west of the Selkirk is able to be properly delisted and would not be part of any grizzly bear distinct population segment that qualifies as a species under the ESA.

Idaho continues to oppose ESA listing of grizzly bear non-species that consign our citizens to perpetual ESA protections that are not necessary and are unrelated to prevention of endangerment or threat of species extinction.

Proposed Management Zone boundaries

Despite being a proposal involving translocation of 25 bears to reach a restoration objective of 200-300 bears between 60 and 100 years from now, the 10 (j) proposal indicates designation of a wide swath of scattered parcels of national forest system lands as "Management Zone 2" to support future dispersal of grizzly bears

The level of social acceptance of grizzly bear restoration in historical habitat changes based on how issues are approached, bear population density and conflicts, and how much confidence people have in federal, state, and tribal wildlife managers. There is not a biological basis to expand the current level of habitat restriction and programs to areas well outside core restoration areas, especially in the Colville, Okanagan-Wenatchee, and the Gifford Pinchot National Forests. This is especially true for checkerboard ownership and small isolated pockets of national forest system lands that are insufficient for supporting grizzly bear home ranges or any extended occupancy.

Designation of Management Zones (1, 2, and 3), is not used for the GYE population, but is used for the NCDE population. In the NCDE, designation as Management Zone 2 indicates an area of opportunity for movement of grizzly bears between primary conservation (recovery areas). ecosystems. This application of Management Zone 2 does not have a place in the North Cascades restoration. The areas outside of the main North Cascades area would appear to correspond to the NCDE's designation of Management Zone 3 or entirely outside of the grizzly bear management framework. The North Cascades restoration project has not been formulated to connect with the Selkirk Recovery Area or other U.S. populations because of human development in interlying areas, conflict potential, and public safety concerns. Expansive designation of Management Zone 2 would imply a practical override of interlying areas of Management Zone 3, which would not bode well for social acceptance.

While we defer to our sister state of Washington on the particulars, approaches taken by USFWS and federal land management agencies in Washington can significantly affect social acceptance of grizzly bear conservation in Idaho. The extensive delineation of Management Zone 2 for this proposal does not appear grounded in biological needs of grizzly bears, and may be interpreted as an attempt to make de facto land use decisions or restrictions on national forest system lands (e.g., motorized uses, forest products, mineral development, developed recreation). This interpretation would be unlikely to improve and promote social acceptance of expansion of grizzly bear populations in Idaho.

Proposed Management Flexibility Within Management Zones / Proposed measures to prevent and minimize human-grizzly bear conflicts

See our above comments regarding our skepticism, based on experience, that proposed management flexibility will actually be effected, based on litigation outcomes and USFWS administrative implementation.

We note recent literature on actions to address maladaptive culture in grizzly bears. Servheen and Gunther, Conservation and management of the culture of Bears, Ecol. and Evaluation, April 2022.

Potential Adverse Effects to Grizzly Bear Donor Populations

Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming have been interacting with USFWS for over a year on updating the interagency conservation strategy for the Greater Yellowstone population and the related Tri-State Memorandum of Agreement for state management of discretionary mortality to support delisting and post-delisting management.

USFWS has given these documents considerable scrutiny concerning post-delisting management of discretionary mortality, but did not identify potential use of the GYE population as a source population for restoration in the North Cascades.

Transfer out of the GYE population to support reintroduction in the North Cascades would be counted as discretionary mortality for the GYE. For a delisted GYE population, removal of grizzly bears from the GYE (from areas other than the National Parks) to support North Cascades restoration would require host state approval. This removal would count against the donor state's allocation of discretionary mortality, unless other agreement was reached among the states. Translocation

plans that may rely on using grizzly bears from the National Parks should be communicated to states and the public in advance to avoid perception of actual mortality and to promote proper management of other actual mortality that is discretionary.

Biological or ecological requirements of the grizzly bear as related to the proposed NEP area, management zones, or proposed regulations.

As noted above, the delineation of national forest system lands as Management Zone 2 is inconsistent with the framework of North Cascades restoration because of its relative isolation. Delineation of checkerboard and small parcels as Management Zone 2 is also unsound because of grizzly bear home range sizes and other ecological requirements. See USFWS 2022 Species Status Assessment, p. 44 (describing differences in male and female home ranges based on variability in population densities, habitat productivity and other factors).

Scientific Information

The draft EIS does not include current information relative to the GYE population size, etc. following implementation of the integrated population model by the Interagency Grizzly Bear Study Team in 2021.

The draft EIS correctly observes that grizzly bears are opportunistic omnivores that have demonstrated considerable diet plasticity. However, British Columbia populations would seem to provide better analogs for climate and food selection for the North Cascades than the referenced small Cabinet-Yaak geography or the 1999 Jacoby study referenced diet of males in the NCDE and GYE.

The draft EIS does not detail monitoring methods and resources, and these are not uniform in currently occupied populations. It is unclear what agency or agencies will have the responsibility for monitoring the population. The Greater Yellowstone grizzly bear is one of the most studied populations in the world, and involves considerable interagency resources that do not appear to be involved with this proposal. The habitat of the Selkirk/Cabinet-Yaak and NCDE Recovery Areas are less conducive to intensive monitoring because of terrain and forest cover, and monitoring in the Selkirk Cabinet-Yaak has been limited by USFWS personnel resources and apparent pursuit of other priorities. The information presented by the draft EIS seems to minimize the challenges of monitoring grizzly bears. Maintaining radio collars requires recaptures, which are not always successful, and males are prone to "casting" their collars as they gain and lose body fat during the annual cycle.

1986 Interagency Grizzly Bear Committee Guidelines for Nuisance Status (Appendix D)

Agency control actions regarding removal of grizzly bears constituting nuisances are subject to the conditions of 50 CFR 17.40(b). On federal lands (national park system, national forest system and bureau of land management), 1986 Interagency Guidelines apply based on mapped "Management Situation Areas." The "Management Situation Areas" terminology is distinct from the EISs identification of Management Zones 1, 2 and 3. The 1986 Guidelines, as well as documents contemporary with the Guidelines' adoption, indicate they do not apply to non-federal lands. E.g., 51 Fed. Reg. 42,863 et seq. The differential in application of the guidelines to federal and non-federal lands should be made clearer in future discussion.

Bear Management Units

USFWS previously divided the North Cascades Recovery Area into 42 Bear Management Units. BMUs and subunits are used in occupied Recovery areas for habitat and occupancy criteria. However, the body of the draft EIS does not appear to include a map illustrating the BMUs. A BMU map is relegated to appendix E. Of the previously identified 42 BMUs, several have significant portions that are now mapped as Management Zone 3, and at least one unit is mapped entirely as Management Zone 3. Discussion of BMUs appears cursory, so the final EIS should explain to the extent they apply in criteria development.

Conclusion

Social acceptance is key to grizzly bear conservation in Idaho and elsewhere, and a legally and scientifically flawed 10(j) proposal undermines our collective efforts. The people of the Kootenai River Valley and Fremont County currently shoulder costs and consequences from the successful expansion in size and number of grizzly bears in Idaho, including conflicts in residents' actual backyards. The 10(j) alternative implies a 60 to 100-year limbo status under the ESA untethered to any distinct population segment. Our greatest concern is the damage this proposal may have on people and grizzly bears in Idaho, through diversion of USFWS' limited fiscal and personnel resources away from the management challenges of areas already occupied by grizzly bears.

Grizzly bear management in a socially acceptable manner is not a responsibility to be taken lightly. It should also not be undertaken with a philosophy that puts more bears in more places based on a flawed legal framework and thinning of on-the-ground resources for monitoring and management activities.

Endnotes

i - Letter dated Dec. 14, 2022, from the Idaho Office of Species Conservation and Idaho Dept. of Fish and Game.
ii - Idaho's petition, submitted March 9, 2022, is available at: <https://idfg.idaho.gov/sites/default/files/idaho-petition-delist-grizzly-bears-0322.pdf>. Idaho has challenged USFWS's denial of Idaho's delisting petition as a cross claim in pending litigation, Save the Yellowstone Grizzly v. Williams, Case No. 4:23-cv-363-DCN.

Correspondence ID: 14626Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Sedro Woolley, WA 98284
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023

Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: To the office of the Superintendent,

I am writing about by concerns about bringing the grizzlies back to the west coast. Are you bringing the Native grizzlies which are the brown bear or Kodiak bear?

You brought the Canadian wolfs which are bigger and meaner than the native wolves, now the native wolves have been killed off by the Canadian Wolves. It sounds like another government screw-up.

Yours Respectfully

Correspondence ID: 14627Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Seattle, WA 98115
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,09 2023

Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: Dear Mr. Striker,

I am writing to endorse Alternative B of the proposed Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan. And while introducing bears using Alternative C under the 10(j) rule is better than not introducing bears at all, I fear it might end up doing more harm than good, and put undue stress on the bears.

As the daughter of a Nat. Parks Service Ranger, I had the rare privilege of growing up in the Badlands of South Dakota in the 1960's when it was a Nat. Monument. It has since become a national park. In 1963 bison were introduced, and in 1964 so were bighorn sheep. At this time I recall my father talking about black-footed ferrets which were thought to be extinct, but had recently been found and were going to be introduced as well. In all cases, 60 years later, there are sustaining populations of all three species - a true conservation success story.

In closing, I strongly support the introduction of grizzly bears to their historical range and appreciate all of your efforts to make this a reality. As a keystone species, the ecosystem needs them. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Correspondence ID: 14628Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023

Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: I oppose another attempt of forced introduction of Grizzlies. If this area is so lucrative for them they would be here.

The laws protect them, they can cross international borders at any time. I cannot condone a forceful Federal Introduction of an Apex Predator.

Correspondence ID: 14629Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Kirkland, WA 98034
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,08 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: I am late sending my views on Grizzly Restoration in the North Cascades, but I still want to contribute my thoughts.
Who was there pt in the North Cascades?? the grizzlies & the indigenous tribes, where both bears and indigenous people respected the land and all its creatures. Indigenous peoples all over the world are/were capable of successfully managing, cherishing & nurturing their environs on this planet.
Introducing the White Man into North America was/is a complete failure as we have invaded, gutted, pillaged, destroyed, abused, infected, trashed, & discounted the value of what the indigenous tribes could teach us.
Bringing grizzly bears back into the North Cascades would be a start to restore the land & wildlife back to its former unspoiled abundance.
Do the right thing!

Correspondence ID: 14630Project:112008Document:132104

Address: East Wenatchee, WA 98802
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: In response to the introduction of the Grizzly Bear to Washington and The North Cascades 10(j) rule. First of all, I don't agree with the introduction of the grizzly bear to Washington State or the North Cascades for the following reasons.

(1) The grizzly bear was here, and while I can't deny that; It was also hunted and trapped by the early settlers of the region. There was no moratorium on the hunting of bears at that time. As is stated, "They are opportunistic omnivores and display great diet plasticity, even within a population, shifting their diet, according to foods that are most nutritious (i.e., high in fat, protein, and/or carbohydrates) and by availability. They consume almost any food available, including living and dead mammals or fish, insects, worms, plants, human-related foods, garbage, livestock and agricultural crops." The grizzly became easy prey as they came to the farmed land to feed, as there wasn't sufficient food supply in the higher mountains. Therefore, the early settlers could easily remove them, and they did.

(2) Also as stated, "In a diet study of grizzly bears in several western ecosystems, researchers found that adult grizzly bears were more carnivorous than any other age, sex or class, with diets composed of around 70 percent meat (Jacoby et al. 1999, pp. 924-926)." If sufficient game animals are not in their home range, they will devour the livestock in the lower farm lands of the state. They will also venture out of the North Cascades into other populated parts of the state. One remedy would be to introduce large mammals before introducing the grizzly bear and see if the grizzly bear will come back into the North Cascades naturally to feed on them. As the bison were here previously, reintroduce bison into the region first to serve as a food source. This would be less objectional. The grizzly bear were in the Docotas and as the bison were killed off the grizzly bear left.

(3) At the meeting in Omak, one speaker stated that a trapper, who had lived at Domke Lake for 60 years, collected over 300 bear hides, but also stated that he had not known how many were actually grizzly, likely very few, if any, indicating that few or no grizzly were in the Domke Lake region. Also, most of the bears trapped or shot were attracted by bait and garbage left out. This would indicate that the bears would not have been in that region if it weren't for the food made available by the settlers living there. This may be supposition, but without any firm statistics regarding the number of bears that were populating the area prior to the settlers coming, it would appear that humans had actually attracted them to that area.

(4) Depending on the ecosystem and density, the "Average home range size for males varies from 183 to 835 (sq. mi.)" (USFWS 2022, p. 44). A bit nit picky, in my opinion, the average is defined as, $(a + b) / 2$, therefore, $(183 + 835) / 2 = 509$ (sq. mi.). This would mean that the average would be 509 (sq. mi.), or it should have said, and likely what they meant is, the home range size is from 183 to 895 (sq. mi.) not that this is the average range. With a range of up to 895 square miles, this would allow any one bear to wander anywhere in Washington State without introducing them.

(5) Just as a note: The Pacific Crest Trail in WA is only 505.7 miles. Therefore a one mile wide trail from the Columbia River to Canada is less than 509 sq. mi., the average range of an adult male grizzly bear.

Correspondence ID: 14631Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Normandy Park, WA 98166
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023

Correspondence Type: Park Form

Correspondence: I am resubmitting the letter I wrote several years ago on this topic. SW

Reintroducing Grizzlies to the North Cascades National Park is a bad idea. I'm afraid that people have a very idealistic and misguided view of what this would mean to an area well used by humans. Grizzlies are not animated Disney characters or selfie opportunities; they are dangerous wild animals. When encounters between grizzlies and people take place, the consequence for the human is most often dire or deadly.

I lived in Alaska with my family for over two decades. I spent many hours in the wilderness, either trail running or hiking in summers or cross-country skiing during the winter months. While this was exhilarating and wonderful, it was also filled with a tension that just wouldn't go away because of the possibility of a bear encounter. We had to always make sure to have a large enough group so we could

"appear big" to a bear in case of an encounter. It was always important to make enough noise so that we could be heard from some distance so that we didn't surprise a bear. These were not mere groundless fears from paranoid city slickers. During my time in Alaska, two members of a well-known Anchorage family were killed by a grizzly sow who was defending a moose kill. This happened not 5 miles from Anchorage. While we lived there, many more attacks occurred to hikers, runners, and bikers, and since leaving, these attacks have increased in number as more people venture into the wilderness. Some have been deadly, some causing critical injuries to the victim.

Washington state has a far greater human population than Alaska, and numerous people take advantage of outdoor opportunities in our beautiful state. When grizzlies once occupied the North Cascades in great numbers, this was not the case. They roamed freely without us in their way. Bringing in grizzlies I fear would be similar to the mountain goat relocation in the Olympics. What seemed like a nice idea at the time turned deadly for one hiker and terrifying to others as both the goat and human populations increased the number of face to face encounters. Can you picture darting and airlifting grizzlies out of the North Cascades because this decision to repopulate was not thoroughly thought through?

I would strongly suggest studying not just the impact of bears being reintroduced into the North Cascades National Park environment alone, but the impact of bears on people in that same environment. Living along side these predators is no simple matter. I don't believe that most of us are equipped to deal with an attack by this powerful, aggressive animal. Let's make sure that this decision, one way or the other is realistically decided by those who have actual wilderness experience.

Correspondence ID: 14632Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tonasket, WA 98855
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023

Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: I am opposed to transplanting grizzly bears to the North Cascades. Option A. No Action.

I feel that our ranchers and orchards would be at risk. With the fires that occurred in 2015 between Omak and Winthrop there is really no good vegetation for the Grizzly Bears to thrive. I feel that because of that, that they will get very hungry and start looking for things, people, animals, fruit in the orchards, etc. to eat.

I fear people, animals and property will be destroyed and lots of lawsuits will be coming. I feel we should just leave them right where they are.

Correspondence ID: 14633Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Tonasket, WA 98855
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023

Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: I oppose the transplanting of the grizzly bears - Alternative A - No Action.

I have personally seen a grizzly bear sow and her cub in the state of Washington. I came across them when I was hunting deer, they had drug a elk about 1/2 mile and was in the lower area feeding on a elk carcass. I backed away and got before being spotted. I felt very endangered.

I own 72 acres of Douglas fir and Ponderosa pine in Okanogan County and I'm out working, thinning trees at least 5 days a week. We already have at least two wolves that I know of and mountain lions. I do not want to have to carry a 44 magnum and continuously look over my shoulder while working!! To me this seems like more of the environmentalist plot. If you go up in the National Forest between Omak and Winthrop you can see what the environmentalist has created. Because of the logging operations and tree thinning being shut down by the environmentalist group. They were the main cause of the 2015 forest fire. With that being said, there is no longer any vegetation left for the bears to thrive. It has taken 8 years for the trees to come back naturally and it will take 100 years to completely be restored.

Correspondence ID: 14634Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Twisp, WA 98856
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023

Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: RE: Grizzly bear Restoration plan comments

Dear Superintendent,

Thank you for allowing myself and others to offer comments regarding the grizzly bear restoration plan. I am in favor of Alternative C, but with the following comments:

Loomis State Forest

1) The Loomis State Forest has been designated as Zone 3, though this 134,000 acre forest adjoins the Pasayten Wilderness (Zone 1), Okanogan National Forest (Zone 1), and the Canadian Border and that country's Snowy Mountain Protected Area. Instead, the Loomis State Forest should be either Zone 1

(preferred) or Zone 2 at the least. There is no change of habitat quality when going from the adjoining areas (Zone 1) in the Pasayten Wilderness and Okanogan NF to the Loomis State Forest. Both public lands are located in the same ecosystem and have no hard borders between them.

2) Since the North Cascades Grizzly Bear Recovery Area was formed, the Loomis State Forest has been has fallen under this designation. The Loomis State Forest has 3 designated areas to maintain either its road less character and natural processes (NRCA) or botanical treasures (Chopaka NAP). These 2 designations total around 30,000 acres and are situated in the highest elevations of the Loomis State Forest.

The NRCAs were created when the 1998 Loomis State Forest management plan violated the grizzly bear recovery area guidelines. Because of the management plan violations to the grizzly bear recovery area, a lawsuit was settled that allowed the citizens of Washington State to raise over 18 million dollars to remove 25,000 acres from trust management and into the protected NRCA status.

To move the Loomis State Forest from a possible Zone 1 or 2 designation to Zone 3 seems to be a violation of what the citizens of Washington State wanted when they raised the money to protect these areas.

3) If best science is to be applied to restore the grizzly bear to the N. Cascades Ecosystem, the Loomis State Forest should be in Zone 1, at worst Zone 2. There is plenty of habitat for the bears to utilize, just as there is on the adjoining Zone 1 lands.

Loup Loup State Forest

The Loup Loup State Forest should also be either in Zone 1 or Zone 2, not as designated in the preferred alternative as Zone 3. This 30,000+ state forest adjoins the Okanogan NF Zone 1. It makes no scientific sense to have a public forest go from Zone 1 on adjoining lands to a Zone 3, also on public lands.

Colockum Wildlife Area

The Colockum Wildlife Area should also be included in either Zone 1 or Zone 2. This 88,000+ acre WDFW managed area

ranges from about 600' to over 6800' in elevation and would make great dispersal habitat. This Washington State wildlife area adjoins Zone 1 (Okanogan/Wenatchee NF) and so should either also be designated as Zone 1 or Zone 2, if science is the driver for the restoration of grizzly bears in the N. Cascades.

By the way, I lived for over 20 years in an inholding in the Loomis State Forest. I would sincerely like to see the grizzly bear restored to its rightful place in the Loomis State Forest and adjoining public lands.

Thanks for accepting my comments.

Correspondence ID: 14635Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Wenatchee, WA 98801
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Superintendent
North Cascades National Park
810 State Route 20
Sedro Woolley, WA 98284

Thank you for allowing me to comment on the EIS, North Cascades Ecosystem regarding grizzly bears. Please make my comment part of the official record of the EIS.

NO! PLEASE DO NOT BRING GRIZZLY BEARS FROM ELSEWHERE INTO THE NORTH CASCADES NATIONAL PARK!

If one really looks at the bigger picture of environmental health of wilderness over the long term, the "reintroduction" of grizzly bears into the North Cascades is downright silly. Bringing back an organism that is at the top of the food chain adds positively to biodiversity and to important dispersal of botanical species? I am certain that is not true. I am certain that the protection of thousands of other species NOT at the top of the food chain is far more important.

I have personally observed a small (maybe 350 pounds) grizzly spend less than five minutes digging for its lunch (a rodent.) In those few minutes that grizzly did more damage to a half acre of the landscape than a bull dozer could do in twice that much time. As a human visitor to the wilderness, if I had done such damage to the natural landscape, I would have been fined, jailed and held financially accountable for restoration of the landscape. Grizzlies, artificially brought in, would not be a friendly addition to our current North Cascades landscapes.

In addition to landscape concerns, grizzly/human conflict is a huge issue to be considered. One of the most pleasant activities I have personally enjoyed over my lifetime is traveling alone in our beautiful wilderness. One cannot safely hike or climb alone in wilderness where there are grizzly bears. Artificially bringing in these bears seems to me unfair to future generations of human wilderness users in this and many other ways.

More than once, my friends and I have planned climbing trips into the Selkirks in Canada only to be told we could not go to the specific area planned due to ongoing grizzly problems. Grizzly bears in wilderness are increasingly preventing safe recreation for people, or at least that is the case for me and my friends who enjoy back country hiking and climbing.

If grizzlies are reintroduced artificially, ie, by means other than by natural re-migration, human/grizzly conflict will become an increasingly dangerous and expensive nightmare for the National Park Service, for the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, for numerous Washington State agencies, local agencies, and especially for those of us citizens who enjoy recreation in the wilderness.

Please consider the thousands of PCT through hikers. None of them want all that added weight of bear spray, bear canisters, etc. In addition, I think we can guarantee that if grizzlies are artificially brought to the North Cascades, there will be days that

people are not even allowed into certain areas at all because of the bear risks.

Also, please consider the EXPENSE of both Alternative B and Alternative C. Consider the cost of the procedure of capturing, collaring, and transporting these bears. Consider the cost of ongoing management. Consider the cost of additional personnel for both planning and management. Consider that we currently have a huge federal deficit, and there just isn't money available for such a questionable plan as this.

No doubt, if grizzlies are brought into the North Cascades artificially, there will be an occasional human fatality. I realize that we humans are not on the endangered species list, but is it really worth it? I say "NO!"

PLEASE, AS REGARDS THE EIS, THE ONLY SENSIBLE CHOICE IS ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION)

PLEASE DO NOT TRANSPORT GRIZZLY BEARS FROM ELSEWHERE INTO THE NORTH CASCADES.

Correspondence ID: 14636Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Unknown, WA Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,04 2023

Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: November 4, 2023

Dear Don:

This note amounts to one of those that either gets done now or it dies on the vine.

You and I had a brief visit during a break in the meeting in Darrington last Thursday. I'm the old guy who recalled not shooting a grizzly in Alaska long ago. You summarized a somewhat similar personal experience involving a worn .. Not sure it's important to establish that connection but I'd like to share a small take away from that gathering ..

A youngish woman made what I think were some important points. She was perhaps No. 15 in the lineup of speakers, athletic, mountaineer, white water shredder, animal owner perhaps a Darrington area resident.. She pointed out a truism: Outdoor activity amounts to accepting some measure of danger. I think she mentioned specifically the possibility of catastrophic falls. It would be easy to add to that list, drowning, hypothermia, etc etc .. I'm 86yo, pushing 87 pretty hard. Driving home in the dark, only about 45 miles, I began to think what the hell I'm likely in greater danger of serious injury here inside the vehicle than I would be hiking in Denali!!

I checked your bio online briefly so that now I'm satisfied you're well acquainted with statistics .. Folks in Darrington and likely elsewhere trotted out horror stories of grizzly attacks. For the sake of avoiding dissent let's assume they are all true .. But what about less dramatic causes of serious injury or fatalities like attacks or injuries caused by pet dogs or even livestock like horses. Going on: how about road rage, personal affronts these days involving gun fire, for God's sake mass shootings hardly get more than a day or two notice in the press .. Now back to statistics: how about attacks by grizzlies ranked by some reference to a per capita basis maybe related to user days in wilderness inhabited by grizzlies. I'm not smart enough to know how to do that but you may be or likely you'd have plenty of resources to help with something like that.. Hmmm, it might rank almost up there with getting struck by lightning!!

Moving on, I doubt thumping the tub for more beavers will get much traction. Maybe just a brief distraction while it's put aside, but those critters were surely part of the landscape when salmon and grizzlies were dominant members of the ecosystem. But enough of that ..

In a recent note from Brenda Cunningham she mentioned that she was glad you and I had met .. I count Brenda and Tim as good friends ..

Exit laughing, or at least smiling,
Fred Hodge

OKTOBER 21, 2023

GRIZZLEY RESTORATION EIS

810 STATE ROUTE 20

SEDRO-WOOLLEY, WASHINGTON 98284"

To members of the public comments committee:

ABSTRACT

Stable populations of grizzlies exist in British Columbia, Idaho and Montana. Allowing members of those groups to reclaim suitable territory in the north cascades without human intervention, is preferable to capturing them and reintroducing them artificially.

Funds from all sources, including those targeted for grizzly bear rehabilitation, should be used to study the use of beavers to enhance biodiversity by damming streams to slow runoff in the face of vanishing glaciers.

INTRODUCTION/DISCUSSION

These are a layman's perspective based on recollections and experience beginning with an elk hunt with John Craighead and Maurice Homaker in the west fork of the Bitterroot River in 1958. John Craighead had just begun landmark grizzly bear studies in Yellowstone Park. The endangered species act has since provided state and federal agencies funding making possible the steady growth of grizzly populations in "the lower 48" including the noble goal of reintroduction of grizzly bears into the north cascades ecosystem. My first encounter with a grizzly occurred north of Gulkana in the Copper River area of Alaska sixty three years ago. Working in Alaska sporadically since then I've had several more encounters with grizzlies and brown bears .. People accustomed to working in those areas don't take them for granted, they understand grizzlies can be very dangerous, and or deadly. Nowadays accounts of attacks are commonplace. Whether or not they are lethal they invariably lead to destruction of the off ending bear.. Government involvement in reintroducing grizzlies incurs some degree of responsibility/liability, thus the hue and cry following an attack will likely be accompanied by litigation as well as sustained public criticism.

Nature abhors a vacuum. That implies grizzlies from slowly growing populations neaby will drift back into the north cascades when or if their numbers begin to exceed the carrying capacity of their present range. Allowing grizzlies to return to the north cascades naturally would give wilderness users sufficient time to become accustomed to their presence. Advocates of capture/release claim it would take too long for grizzlies to reclaim the north cascades though their estimates of population growth using capture/release methods would take roughly 100 years to reach optimal levels. So., why not try bait .. Rapidly vanishing glaciers due to global warming means less water during drier hotter summer months. Why not advocate for more beavers. Articles documenting the presence of grizzlies in the north cascades appear to be largely anecdotal, such as referring to Hudson's Bay Trading Company records of grizzly bear skins. Early Hudson's Bay records contain accounts of brigades of trappers sent to catch as many beavers as possible to satisfy a demand for expensive hats and to simultaneously, discourage immigration by making the Pacific Northwest "a beaver desert" .. Paleological evidence would document extensive beaver populations in the cascades. Beavers are drivers of biodiversity, they are natural engineers damming streams slowing down runoff but terrain surrounding dams ponds will ultimately contain a diverse array of flora and fauna that amount, among other things, to naturally occurring bait for omnivorous bears. That scenario is far from counter intuitive in the face of the benefits of pushing increases in beavers and wolves in Yellowstone Park. There's no doubt more beavers in the north cascades would enhance biodiversity to the betterment of the ecosystem as well as to all of its inhabitants .. Sincerely, [REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 14637Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Winlock, WA 98593
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: March 21, 2017 What's changed?

Superintendent's Office
North Cascades National Park Service Complex
810 State Route 20
Sedro-Wooley, WA 98284

Dear Superintendent's Office:

Why would we want to put the lives of men, woman, children, livestock and other animals in danger of being maimed, mauled or killed by a grizzly bear? Grizzly bears are unable to live (very long) on ants, nuts or berries. They are carnivorous animals who eat live flesh and blood from a chipmunk to a moose, plus you and me.

Grizzly bears are not endangered so why say that? Where was Kia Relyea born and raised to become an authority on grizzly bears? We know that the Hollywood elite give big bucks to animal rights and environment groups so I guess by throwing out the names of [REDACTED] we should be all in? I don't think the Hollywood elite will be back packing, hunting or fishing the North Cascades of Washington.

It has cost our state and many others millions of dollars to restore the wolves, for what? We cannot afford to fix our roads and bridges or fully fund education and you want to spend millions on a bear. Think about it.

Several outfitters have been put out of business from the wolves killing off game animals in the states and the grizzly bear would only add to this. Bears will attract and kill every moose, elk and deer that is giving birth they can find. These animals will be unable to run or defend themselves at this vulnerable time. You never see these scenes shown on television. You realize there are approximately 20 grizzly bears in the North Cascades now, so instead of playing God why don't you let them take care of their own restoration. I am sure they are not all of one sex. I was born in 1940 and raised in Toledo, Washington. I have ridden my horse, hiked, hunted, fished, and camped the high Cascades all my life. Mostly the St. Helens, Goat Rocks and Pasayten areas. I have seen all kinds of animals and I hope it stays that way. These animals do not need to be at risk of being eaten by grizzly bears. God help the person that gets between a grizzly bear sow and her cubs. Think about it.

I would like to hear back from you. Will there be any public meetings held on this matter? If so, when and where?

Why do you insist on trying to kill something or someone?

Correspondence ID: 14638Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Unknown, UN Unknown
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,23 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: To whom it may concern,

I am against introducing grizzlys into the North Cascades. There are already grizzlys in Alaska, Montana, Idaho, and northeastern Washington. Many people hike and climb in the North Cascades and bear encounters would be inevitable. Ranchers would also not benefit.

Thank you for your consideration,
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 14639Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Issaquah, WA Unknown
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,28 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Superintendent;

I take time to put pen to paper to voice by opposition to any grizzly restoration to Washington State.

My wife in younger years with 3 kids trailing or on her back use to hike every trail off the I-90 corridor up to the pass. I could only envision an "incident" with current hiking mothers + kids happening with grizzly bears.

An excellent book "Taken by Bear in Yellowstone", Kathleen Snow, 2016 would qualify my concerns about introducing + protecting such a massive predator.

As a former hunter who has hunted in different states, I say again "NO" to grizzly introductions in this state.

Thank you

██████████
Issaquah, WA

Correspondence ID: 14640Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Issaquah, WA Unknown
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Oct,28 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: To whom it may concern:

I am a mom of 5 children, and now have 4 grandchildren. We've hiked the trails up and down the I-90 corridor. When my kids were younger, I would pack a kid who got tired on my back. It's almost unimaginable to think about meeting a huge grizzly on the trail. As grizzlies can travel long distances, they could end up near these trails. Even 1 life is precious, whether it's a child, a parent defending a child, or a grizzly shot for killing a child. Please reconsider. Thank you.

██████████
P.S. also your relocation monies are wasted if a grizzly evading capture needs to be killed.

Correspondence ID: 14642Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Bellingham, WA 98229
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Dear Sirs,

I am writing to you to protest releasing grizzlies in the North Cascade National Park. That is a terrible idea! We enjoy a lovely park with our citizens able to raise their livestock and make a living. We live in a beautiful state and let us enjoy the beauty and be responsible for our safety and those that visit.

Sincerely,

Correspondence ID: 14643Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Unknown, UN Unknown
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Superintendent Don Striker,

NOCA Grizzly Bear EIS

It is best to follow the existing management plan and encourage the grizzly bears from BC to migrate down across the border to the NOCA ecosystem. The NOCA Wilderness Committee with the Resource Management division created and embraced a strategy to manage NOCA as grizzly habitat back in the 1990's. It worked for wolves; it should work for the bears.

The proposal to introduce grizzly bears, a different gene pool, from the Rockies has unrealistic expectations. It is a strange NPS priority for funding in the face of our climate challenge issues. It is an inappropriate financial commitment for NOCA given the seriously inadequate base funding and subsequent staff vacancies. NOCA cannot handle the additional workload with the massive responsibilities and commitment of this new initiative. All other divisions will be drug into the grizzly bear program needing to support the planned operation and, when things go wrong. No division operates in a vacuum.

Park staff should be focusing on the overflowing trail head issues with the subsequent safety situation along Hwy 20. It appears the use at NOCA has skyrocketed since the pandemic. NOCA needs financial support from WASO and Congress to address this growth and keep our visitors safe.

The estimates for helicopter use are woefully low. Nothing could be worse for the NOCA wilderness and the grizzly bears than helicopters. Does this 1 million dollar per year program for ten years have an estimated carbon footprint to share with us all? A clean energy shuttle bus program up and down Hwy 20 would be more appropriate. From Marblemount to Winthroppe stopping at every trailhead and campground.

The NPS once had visions of leading the nation in the climate change challenge.

What happened to that priority?

Regards,

██████████
NOCA NPS retired

Correspondence ID: 14644Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Unknown, WA Unknown
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Comment on Proposed Rule 10(j)
November 2023:

I have spoken against the draft EIS in Darrington earlier this month.

This short comment is to state that I am also opposed to the Proposed Rule 1 OG):

I see that it is an attempt to provide more assurance to hikers and residents of the Skagit Valley/North Cascades. However, in order for it to come into effect, something either troublesome or very bad, would have to happen FIRST! In addition, it is not always easy to tell WHICH bear caused the problem, and it might take a series of negative events for authorities to identify and take action on the correct bear.

Leave our mountains and valley as they are!

██████████
Correspondence ID: 14645Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Unknown, UN Unknown
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: November 2023

Robert Claus: Comment on Draft EIS: Page 1

I am opposed to the introduction of grizzly bears into the North Cascades, either experimentally or otherwise. We have had

two families of children in Alaska since 2010, and visit often.

Every trail we walk on has warning signs about bears and how to react if you are attacked. We always carry bear spray and are scared anytime we hike there. Education is not enough. Grizzlies are unpredictable and can appear quickly. You can carry bear spray in your hand, but can you keep your young children from bouncing ahead of you on the trail??

Our daughter was widowed by an Eagle River grizzly attack in 2018. In the same town, she is friends with a couple whose only child daughter was killed in 2017 when she ran out of bear spray as the bear returned repeatedly.

Since 2010:

* On the Army base in Anchorage, where our daughter had been stationed, a female hiker has been mauled, and a soldier on maneuvers was killed very recently, both by grizzlies.

* A 12 year old in Anchorage, waiting for the school bus by his mailbox was attacked by a sow grizzly and survived.

* A man near by in Hope who was clearing brush on his land was killed by grizzly several years ago.

* A 13-14 year old boy taking part in a sponsored race through forested or bushy areas in Anchorage, texted a bear was following him, but the black bear killed him before help could come.

Our daughter frequently hikes on the south fork of Eagle River trail directly across from her house. So do I, but it always scares me. This summer, our daughter's female friend was charged by a grizzly twice, low down on that trail not too far from the parking lot, with houses right across the paved road.. She had bear spray and a cell phone, retreated a bit higher up out of the trees, and the park managed to rescue her by helicopter.

These bear are dangerous and won't stay up high in federal lands. They will come down lower, where food is more plentiful. If we are supposed to enjoy seeing them, where will that be? Surely not begging for treats along Hwy 20 while we are in our car. Maybe in Marblemount near our chicken coop? Otherwise, it is going to be on a trail, far away from everyone, and from help. Right now our trails are safe. Let's leave them that way.

██████████
November 2023

Correspondence ID: 14646Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Unknown, UN Unknown
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,13 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Comment on the proposed 10(j) rule:

I am just as opposed to the reintroduction of the grizzly as an non-essential experimental population as I am, to the Draft EIS method of introduction.

I do not support the proposed 10(j) rule.

For a bear to be established as problematic, and various corrective measures to be taken, it would have to be clearly identified, and an undesirable event or even tragedy would have already occurred.

██████████
November 2023

Correspondence ID: 14647Project:112008Document:132104
Address: Snohomish, WA 98291
United States of America
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Nov,10 2023
Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: Please return grizzlies to their home in the North Cascades - they have a right to be here - coexistence is possible. I have been fortunate to see a grizzly in the North Cascades from the mid-1960s

Thank you
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 14648Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Unknown, UN Unknown
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,12 2023

Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: To the Office of the Superintendent,

In regards to relocating grizzly bears, I hope you are planning to use native West Coast grizzlies. Those are the brown bears and Kodiak Bear. These bears primarily live on salmon and the occasional human. Common sense dictates this should not be done.

Respectfully,
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 14649Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Everson, WA 98247
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023

Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent,

Just because something occurred, does not mean it should occur again. Just because Tyrannosaurus Rex walked the earth at one point in time, does not mean it should be reintroduced into our lives again (should this be possible).

I am a taxpayer in Washington State and have been for fifty years. I oppose my taxes paying for the folly of reintroducing the Grizzly Bear to the North Cascade Range. We have prospered without this killer bear for hundreds of years and never missed it. Let us continue to do so.

NO TO KILLER GRIZZLY BEARS BEING REINTRODUCED INTO THE NORTH CASCADES.

Respectfully,
[REDACTED]

Correspondence ID: 14650Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Dayton, WA 99328
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Nov,13 2023

Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: I vote for Alternative A-NO CHANGE.

Washington State citizens have already voiced in, and their elected Senators and Representatives have codified RCW 77.12.035, " Grizzly bears SHALL NOT be transported into the state The department is directed to fully participate in discussions and negotiations with federal and state agencies, and shall fully communicate, support and implement the policies of this section."

Of the statistics available, in the past 15 years, 183 attacks, 21 of them fatal. Word has it that it takes between seconds, and a few minutes for a grizzly bear to kill a human. Grizzlies are known to grow 3 to 4 ft. on all 4's, but 8 ft standing up,

and would terrorize most people who are enjoying the outdoors, camping, walking.

Most of these attacks have occurred in the Yellowstone, Glacier National Park, area of Montana, where the vast majority of grizzly bears are located, and Feds, enviro's, tribes, think they need to be relocated to WA and other designated places, RZ, or "relocation zones", such as Frank Church River of No Return Wilderness, Idaho, due to overcrowding. Sort of a "do no harm" solution.

WE DO NOT WANT THEM!

Grizzly bears are very aggressive, when overcrowded, where they are currently located. The way proposed of "managing" the population, is to move them to become some other state's "problem".

The grizzly bear cannot be fenced in, nor controlled where it roams, into neighborhoods, eating people's pets, killing livestock, or any other farm animal, and endangering those citizens who live in any rural area. Even Spokane WA had a black bear roaming in an inner city area residential neighborhood, last week.

The Indian tribes say these bears are an important part of their culture, yet the bear's biggest diet is SALMON, which the tribe also wants us to remove our dams to protect the salmon. The grizzly is one of only a handful of species that have no predators. They are omnivores (meat eating), and prey on other animals, including salmon, bison, elk, deer, moose, and humans, for most of their diet.

If these Grizzlies are increasing in numbers, so rapidly, that they need to be controlled, they need to be DELISTED, from the ESA list, and have them harvested, as was the intent of the ESA (or so it was stated), when a species recovered, through naturally increased recovery. In 2016, comments were taken to delist these bears, in Yellowstone but this did not happen, even though MT, ID & WY, signed off on that.

Thank you for considering my comments. Please keep your bears in your own backyard.

Correspondence ID: 14651Project:112008Document:132104

Address: Manson, WA 98831
United States of America

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Oct,16 2023

Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: Washington State has a law that stipulates, "Grizzly bears shall not be transplanted or introduced into the state. Only grizzly bears that are native to Washington state may be utilized by the department for management programs" I don't believe that the U.S. Constitution enumerated powers to transport or install grizzly bears into Washington state, therefore, state law prevails. This is a "states rights issue".

Because Washington D.C., is not a state, The Federal Government does have the right to add Grizzly bears to any "District of Columbia" park that you see fit. Please let us know how that goes, and we can discuss it further.

I am strongly against any plan to relocate grizzly bears into Washington State. This is not the first time that this plan has been brought before the public for comment. How many times must you bring this forward?

Thank you,

██████████
